

SENATE

WEDNESDAY, MARCH 21, 1951

(Legislative day of Friday, March 16, 1951)

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

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Our Father God, in whose love and wisdom lies all our hope: We thank Thee for life's loveliness that cannot be shattered nor shaken by all the world's hate, nor by wars or rumors of wars. We are grateful for friendships which sanctify, for music which gives wings to our jaded spirits, for truth which breaks the shackles of the mind, and for shining human character where Thou dost show sufficient of Thy light for us in the dark to rise by. Immersed in this world of facts and figures, daily facing demanding duties, we pause to acknowledge that we cannot live by bread alone, nor in the flesh alone; that our spirits must have an escape into that higher realm measured not by clocks nor calendars.

Make real to us that kingdom within whose radiant realities are its faith, its ideals, its visions of beauty, and its aspiration that lay hold of God and goodness. Help us this and every day to live more nearly as we pray. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. McFARLAND, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Tuesday, March 20, 1951, was dispensed with.

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, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

- H. R. 578. An act for the relief of Sister Anna Ettl;
 H. R. 621. An act for the relief of the Morgan Foods Corp.;
 H. R. 632. An act for the relief of Janina Wojcicka, Wojciech Andrzej Wojcicki, and Stanislaw Wojcicki;
 H. R. 645. An act for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. A. C. Lupcho;
 H. R. 652. An act for the relief of the estate of Mattie Mashaw;
 H. R. 671. An act for the relief of Mrs. Sylvia Laquidara;
 H. R. 699. An act for the relief of Mrs. Blanche Richards, owner of the Bozarth Nursing Home, Toppenish, Wash.;
 H. R. 767. An act for the relief of Mrs. Catherine V. Mycuc;
 H. R. 781. An act for the relief of Frederick Edmond Tomkins, Mary Ann Tomkins, and Edward Marshall Tomkins;
 H. R. 783. An act for the relief of Bela Abeles and Maria Abeles;
 H. R. 789. An act for the relief of John Yan Chi Gee;
 H. R. 794. An act for the relief of Arthur E. Hackett;
 H. R. 887. An act for the relief of First Lt. Walter S. Moe, Jr.;
 H. R. 899. An act for the relief of Malka Dwojra Kron;

- H. R. 953. An act for the relief of Joseph A. Myers, Hazel C. Myers, and Helen Myers;
 H. R. 1117. An act for the relief of Kimiko Shibuya;
 H. R. 1121. An act for the relief of Chin Yok Kong;
 H. R. 1163. An act for the relief of Paolo Danesi;
 H. R. 1235. An act for the relief of John Clarke;
 H. R. 1253. An act for the relief of Jack A. Witham;
 H. R. 1263. An act for the relief of Dr. Chia Len Liu;
 H. R. 1422. An act for the relief of Carl Parks;
 H. R. 1424. An act for the relief of T. L. Morrow;
 H. R. 1451. An act for the relief of Charles R. Keicher;
 H. R. 1479. An act for the relief of Joseph Bernstein;
 H. R. 1690. An act for the relief of Carl M. Campbell, James R. White, and Frederick J. Powers;
 H. R. 1704. An act for the relief of Jack Stuckey;
 H. R. 1792. An act for the relief of Emmet Wood and Viola Wood;
 H. R. 1798. An act for the relief of the estate of Yoshio Fukunaga, deceased;
 H. R. 1800. An act for the relief of Lucy Kong Lee;
 H. R. 2064. An act for the relief of Dr. Ihor Sevcenko;
 H. R. 2073. An act for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Thomas H. Campbell;
 H. R. 2175. An act for the relief of Addie Dean Garner Scott;
 H. R. 2257. An act for the relief of Lucia Adamos;
 H. R. 2450. An act for the relief of Concetta Santagati Giordano;
 H. R. 2552. An act for the relief of Eleanor Mansour;
 H. R. 2782. An act conferring jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims to hear and determine the claim of Auf der Heide-Aragona, Inc., and certain of its subcontractors against the United States;
 H. R. 2918. An act for the relief of Peter E. Kolesnikoff; and
 H. R. 3002. An act for the relief of George H. Whike Construction Co.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to a concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 83) providing for the adjournment of the House from March 22, 1951, until April 2, 1951, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

INSTRUCTIONS TO PUBLIC PRINTER
RELATIVE TO REPRINTING BILLS,
ETC.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, for the information of Members of the Senate and in order that they may have due notice, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a letter addressed by me, as chairman of the Joint Committee on Printing, to the Public Printer, advising him of the resolution adopted by the Joint Committee, containing instructions not to reprint any bill, amendment thereto, or joint resolution for the sole purpose of adding the names of additional cosponsors.

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

MARCH 13, 1951.

THE PUBLIC PRINTER,
Government Printing Office,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SIR: Please be advised that the Joint Committee on Printing at a meeting

held on March 2, 1951, adopted the following resolution:

"Whereas the practice of reprinting bills, amendments thereto, or joint resolutions for the exclusive purpose of adding the names of additional Members of the Senate as cosponsors is considered to be duplication and waste in public printing and binding, in addition to causing considerable confusion; and

"Whereas opportunities exist whereby the names of such Senators may be added to any bill, amendment thereto, or joint resolution without the necessity of a reprint; Therefore be it

"Resolved, That the Public Printer shall not reprint any bill, amendment thereto, or joint resolution for the sole purpose of adding the names of additional Members of the Senate as cosponsors."

Very truly yours,

CARL HAYDEN, *Chairman.*

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

On his own request, and by unanimous consent, Mr. GEORGE was excused from attendance on the sessions of the Senate until April 2 next.

COMMITTEE MEETING DURING SENATE
SESSION

On request of Mr. McCLELLAN, and by unanimous consent, the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments was authorized to meet this afternoon during the session of the Senate.

TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President I ask unanimous consent that Senators be permitted to present petitions and memorials, submit reports, introduce bills and resolutions and transact other routine business without debate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

PETITIONS

Petitions were presented and referred as indicated:

By Mr. CLEMENTS:

A resolution of the House of Representatives of the Commonwealth of Kentucky; to the Committee on Public Works:

"Resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States to take or cause to be taken such action as may be required to proceed with and complete the proposed Falmouth Dam project on the Licking River

"Whereas the proposed Falmouth Dam project would provide valuable benefits to the Commonwealth of Kentucky in the way of flood control and power development; and

"Whereas the project would result in creating a body of water admirably suited to the development of a State park and accompanying recreational facilities which are particularly needed in the northern part of Kentucky and which would promote the general welfare of the people of Kentucky; Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the General Assembly of the Commonwealth of Kentucky:

"That the Congress of the United States is requested and urged to take or cause to be taken such action as is required in order to proceed with and complete the proposed Falmouth Dam project on the Licking River.

"That the clerk of the house of representatives is directed to send copies of this resolution to each United States Senator from Kentucky and to each Representative in Congress from Kentucky."

By Mr. DWORSHAK:

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Idaho; to the Committee on Finance:

"Senate Joint Memorial 6

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

"We, your memorialists, the Senate and the House of Representatives of the State of Idaho, in legislative session assembled, most respectfully represent and petition as follows:

"Whereas the lead-mining industry of the United States has suffered serious injury from an unprecedented peacetime flood of lead and imported ores, concentrates, metal, and scrap from Mexico, Canada, Australia, Peru, Germany, Yugoslavia, and elsewhere in 1949 and 1950 by reason of a low tariff on lead ores and metals and the unforeseen circumstance of foreign-currency devaluation in 1948 in Mexico and in nearly all other foreign lead-producing countries in September 1949; and

"Whereas devaluation has given foreign lead producers in North America, South America, Australia, Africa, and elsewhere a grossly unfair competitive advantage over the domestic miners to enable them not only to overcome the slight tariff protection given to lead, but also to obtain an indirect subsidy on their own production or to lower the grade of ore competitively minable; and

"Whereas lead imports into the United States have increased to such an extraordinary degree that in 1950 imports exceeded domestic production; and

"Whereas part of the competition to which the American lead-mine industry is now subjected comes from lead diverted from Europe to the United States by communistic Yugoslavia, where labor conditions are utterly different from what they are in this country; and

"Whereas wages of lead miners in the United States have increased approximately 250 percent since 1930, with other costs steadily advancing, and the disparity between wages paid in the United States and those paid to miners in Latin America, Africa, Australia, and British countries is very great, while in this same period tariff protection has been cut in half; and

"Whereas the lead-mining industry is an important defense industry which must be preserved at all costs; and

"Whereas exploration for new lead mines is at a low ebb in the United States compared with the potentialities: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved, That the Senate and House of Representatives of the State of Idaho in a regularly called session of the legislature assembled, do hereby memorialize and petition the Congress of the United States to amend the Trade Agreement Extension Act of 1951 to make mandatory that provision be made in any new trade agreement or revision of an existing trade agreement, including tariff revisions now being negotiated at Torquay, England, for proper allowance for the effect of foreign-currency devaluation in 1948 and 1949 in the adjustment of tariff rates on metals imported into the United States; and be it further

"Resolved, That the secretary of state of the State of Idaho be, and he is hereby, directed to forward copies of this memorial to the President of the United States Senate, to the Speaker of the United States House of Representatives, and to each member of the Idaho delegation of the United States Congress.

"This senate joint memorial passed the senate on the 10th day of March 1951.

"EDSON H. DEAL,

"President of the Senate.

"This senate joint memorial passed the house of representatives on the 12th day of March 1951.

"W. L. MILLS,

"Speaker of the House of Representatives.

"I hereby certify that the within senate Joint Memorial No. 6 originated in the senate during the thirty-first session of the Legislature of the State of Idaho.

"CARL C. KITCHEN,

"Secretary of the Senate."

ECONOMIC CONDITIONS IN AREA OF CUMBERLAND, MD.—JOINT RESOLUTION OF MARYLAND LEGISLATURE

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. President, on several previous occasions I have called the attention of the Senate to the desirability of action which would help to correct the greatly depressed economic conditions presently current in the Cumberland area of western Maryland.

I send to the desk a joint resolution adopted by the Maryland Legislature which cites the advantages of this area for industrial purposes and requests the Office of Defense Mobilization to establish defense industries in that region.

With so many other areas crowded with defense activities beyond the available housing facilities and other installations, it would seem most appropriate that an area such as this, which has both the labor and housing at hand should be given every possible consideration for future installations.

I ask unanimous consent that the joint resolution be appropriately referred and printed in the RECORD.

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

House Joint Resolution 5

Joint resolution requesting the Office of Defense Mobilization to establish defense industries in the city of Cumberland and in Allegany County

Whereas the United States again is embarking upon a huge program of partial defense and mobilization in order to assure its continued strength and existence; and

Whereas, in this gigantic effort, the industrial facilities and the manpower of the entire Nation must be mobilized and utilized to the full advantage; and

Whereas the city of Cumberland offers splendid possibilities for the establishment of defense and military industries, having a pool of available manpower experienced in industrial pursuits, having raw materials easily available, being a railroad center of long standing and being strategically located in a military and tactical sense; and

Whereas the Cumberland area has been designated as an area of serious unemployment according to recent Federal surveys;

Whereas the imminent completion of the Savage River Dam will much improve the industrial water resources of this area; and

Whereas a large field of natural gas has recently been discovered in Garrett County and is now in the process of development, this great natural resource being adjacent to the city of Cumberland and to Allegany County; and

Whereas the establishment of defense industries in the Cumberland area would permit the large working population to earn a livelihood without removing their present homes and avoid the serious economic dislocation which would result from a heavy

exodus of the present residents of this area: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the General Assembly of Maryland, That the Office of Defense Mobilization be requested to give full consideration to the splendid possibilities of the city of Cumberland as a place for establishing defense industries; and be it further

Resolved, That the secretary of state be directed to send copies of this resolution under the great seal of the State of Maryland to the President of the United States, to Mr. Charles E. Wilson, Director of the Office of Defense Mobilization and to each member of the Maryland delegation in the Congress of the United States.

UNITED NATIONS—RESOLUTION OF CHIZUK AMUNO YOUNG PEOPLE'S LEAGUE

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. President, I present for appropriate reference, and ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, a resolution adopted by the Chizuk Amuno Young People's League, affirming their faith in the United Nations and their determination to support its developments.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas the peace of the world is in a very precarious condition, and a third world war would have catastrophic consequences for civilization; and

Whereas the forces of pessimism and doctrinalism, both in this country and in the other major world power, are combining to accelerate our drift toward the oblivion of another world war; and

Whereas the United Nations represents the chief instrument for effecting a peaceful solution of the present impasse in world affairs; and

Whereas our faith, as well as religion generally, teaches us to seek the ways of peace, even if they cannot always be found; and

Whereas working for a better world is one of the chief elements in the program of the National Young People's League, as well as an implicit element in our constitutional statement of purposes: Be it therefore

Resolved, That the executive committee of the Chizuk Amuno Young People's League shall determine ways and means for the support and development of the United Nations, as an agency and an idea to preserve world peace.

ELIMINATION OF POLLUTION FROM WATERS OF MASSACHUSETTS—RESOLUTION OF MASSACHUSETTS GENERAL COURT

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, when the Lodge-Furcolo bill, calling for a comprehensive survey of the principal New England rivers, was first proposed in January 1949, one of the principal stated objectives to be accomplished by this survey was a program to solve the problem of stream pollution.

In introducing the bill, which was later incorporated in section 205 of the 1950 Flood Control Act, I said:

We have fine rivers in New England which in many cases constitute a menace to healthy living conditions because of pollution. Moreover, pollution prevents development of these rivers for recreational purposes. There are many areas which would provide splendid, beautiful recreational facilities for citizens living in nearby cities and towns—swimming, boating, fishing, and pic-

nicking. Licking the pollution problem would mean much to residents of these areas for that reason alone.

It gives me, therefore, great pleasure to ask unanimous consent, on behalf of myself and the senior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL], that a resolution of the General Court of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, adopted on March 13, 1951, memorializing Congress to appropriate funds for the elimination of pollution from the rivers, streams, inland, and tidal waters of the Commonwealth be printed at this point in the RECORD, and appropriately referred.

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

THE COMMONWEALTH OF MASSACHUSETTS,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,
State House, Boston 33.

Resolution memorializing Congress to appropriate funds for the elimination of pollution from the rivers, streams, inland and tidal waters of the Commonwealth

Resolved, That the General Court of Massachusetts urges the Congress of the United States to enact forthwith legislation appropriating money to be spent in conjunction with funds of the commonwealth or any of its political subdivisions for the elimination of pollution from the rivers, streams, inland and tidal waters of the commonwealth; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of these resolutions be sent forthwith by the Secretary of the Commonwealth to the President of the United States, to the presiding officer of each branch of Congress and to the Members thereof from this Commonwealth.

In house of representatives, adopted March 7, 1951.

LAWRENCE R. GROVE, *Clerk*.

In senate, adopted, in concurrence, March 13, 1951.

IRVING N. HAYDEN, *Clerk*.

A true copy.

Attest:

[SEAL]

EDWARD J. CRONIN,
Secretary of the Commonwealth.

POST OFFICE AT WEISSERT, NEBR.—
MEMORIAL

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I present for appropriate reference a memorial signed by 88 citizens of Weissert, Nebr., who would be directly affected, remonstrating against the planned abandonment of the Post Office at Weissert. I ask unanimous consent that the memorial, together with the signatures attached, be printed in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The memorial will be received and appropriately referred, and, without objection, the memorial and attached signatures will be printed in the RECORD. The Chair hears no objection.

The memorial and signatures attached, were referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, as follows:

To POSTMASTER GENERAL,
Bureau of Post Office Operation,
Washington, D. C.:

We, who are patrons of the post office at Weissert, Custer County, Nebr., residing within a radius of 4 miles of the post office, protest the order to discontinue the office.

The closing of the post office would cause great inconvenience to us as we either re-

ceive mail at the office or mail packages and first-class mail through the office. In addition to this we patronize the businesses conducted in Weissert and the discontinuance of the post office would injure the places of business now at Weissert and would no doubt result in the discontinuance of many of the facilities at Weissert, which would result in much inconvenience to the patrons of the post office and businesses in the community of Weissert.

Mrs. Hetty Haumont, Fred E. Govier, Alice Govier, Carl Swanson, Mary E. Cooksley, G. M. Cooksley, Mrs. Howard Spencer, Mr. Howar Spencer, Warren Lammers, Mrs. Rosella Lammers, Frank J. Haumont, Mrs. Della Peterson, Andrew Peterson, Avalo R. Grim, Mrs. Avalo R. Grim, Mrs. Mable Peterson, John Peterson, C. R. Pracht, Mrs. Nora Pracht, Miss Harriet Pracht, Ethard B. Thompson, Fern Peterson, Leo Peterson, Lewis Peterson, Mrs. Shirley Swanson, Mrs. Dorothy Mars, Harold Mars, F. O. Gutzman, Geo. Daugherty, Mrs. Albert Kleeb, Lee Sams, Mrs. Lee Sams, Harvey Mason, J. S. Moseley, Mrs. Adah Moseley, Fay R. Sams, Mrs. Helen Wiebusch, R. C. Wiebusch, Mrs. Ethelyn Thompson, R. B. Sams, Mrs. Goldie Sams, Ralph Spencer, Mrs. Elsie Spencer, Miss Kathlene Spencer, R. D. Moseley, Stella E. Gutzman, Mrs. Alvin Hughes, Alvin Hughes, Mrs. Gail Powell, Mr. Claude Powell, Mrs. Fern Mason, Merle H. Fairfield, Mrs. Verleen Sams, Mrs. Alice Little, Wm. J. Allen, Mrs. Laye Allen, Mrs. Joanne Allen, J. Lester McAbee, E. W. Mills, Mrs. E. W. Mills, E. D. Mills, Mrs. Margie Mills, Mrs. Wilma Peterson, Leo C. Cooksley, Mrs. Jardis Kleeb, Albert V. Powell, Mrs. Naomi Powell, Lester Little, M. M. Pederson, Gilbert Campbell, Roy Pirnie, Allona Pirnie, Leland McAlice, Mrs. Mabel McAbee, Mrs. George Kallin, Geo. H. Kaelin, R. J. Mills, Pete Peterson, Mrs. Mary Bell Cooksley, Albert Kleeb, Harvey Kleeb, Gilbert Powell, Mrs. Irene Powell, S. J. Bence, Mrs. Dora Bence, Mrs. Alvina Pirnie, Earl A. Pirnie, Robert Pirnie.

REPORTS OF A COMMITTEE

The following reports of a committee were submitted:

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

S. 952. A bill authorizing the conveyance of certain lands to the Ogden (Utah) Chamber of Commerce; without amendment (Rept. No. 190); and

S. J. Res. 35. Joint resolution to permit the board of supervisors of Louisiana State University and Agricultural and Mechanical College to transfer certain lands to the police jury of the parish of Rapides for use for holding livestock and agricultural exhibitions; without amendment (Rept. No. 191).

REPORT ON LABOR-MANAGEMENT RELATIONS IN BONNEVILLE POWER ADMINISTRATION (REPT. NO. 192)

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, from the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, I submit, under authority of Senate Resolution 71, Eighty-second Congress, a report on labor-management relations in the Bonneville Power Administration, which has been unanimously approved by the committee, and I ask unanimous consent that it be printed, with an illustration.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The report will be received and printed, as requested by the Senator from Montana.

DEFENSE HOUSING AND COMMUNITY FACILITIES AND SERVICES ACT OF 1951—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE (REPT. NO. 189)

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, from the Committee on Banking and Currency, I report favorably with an amendment the bill (S. 349) to assist the provision of housing and community facilities and services required in connection with the national defense, which was rewritten and approved yesterday by the Committee on Banking and Currency. The amendment is in the nature of a substitute. The report of the committee on the bill will not be completed until next week.

I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be printed in the RECORD, because many Members of the House of Representatives desire to have the text before them during the recess of the House.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be placed on the calendar, and, without objection, the amendment will be printed in the RECORD, as requested by the Senator from South Carolina.

The amendment is as follows:

TITLE I—CRITICAL DEFENSE HOUSING AREAS, PROCEDURES FOR EXERCISE OF AUTHORITY, AND EXPIRATION DATE

SEC. 101. (a) Notwithstanding any other provisions of this act, the authority contained in titles II, III, or IV of this act shall not be exercised in any area unless the President shall have determined that such area is a critical defense housing area.

(b) No area shall be determined to be a critical defense housing area pursuant to this section unless the President finds that in such area the following conditions exist:

(1) a new defense plant or installation has been or is to be provided, or an existing defense plant or installation has been or is to be reactivated or its operation substantially expanded;

(2) substantial in-migration of defense workers or military personnel is required to carry out activities at such plant or installation; and

(3) a substantial shortage of housing required for such defense workers or military personnel exists or impends which impedes or threatens to impede activities at such defense plant or installation, or that community facilities or services required for such defense workers or military personnel are not available or are insufficient, or both, as the case may be.

SEC. 102. In order to assure that private enterprise shall be afforded full opportunity to provide the defense housing needed wherever possible, in any area which the President, pursuant to the authority contained in section 101 hereof, has declared to be a critical defense housing area—

(a) first, the number of permanent dwelling units (including information as to types, rentals, and general locations) needed for defense workers and military personnel in such critical defense housing area shall be publicly announced by the Housing and Home Finance Administrator;

(b) second, residential credit restrictions under the Defense Production Act of 1950 shall be relaxed in such manner and to such extent as the President determines to be appropriate and necessary to obtain the production of housing needed in such area for defense workers or military personnel;

(c) third, the mortgage insurance aids provided under title II of this act shall be made available to obtain the production of

housing needed in such area for defense workers or military personnel; and

(d) fourth, no permanent housing shall be constructed by the Federal Government under the provisions of title III hereof except to the extent that private builders or eligible mortgagees have not, within a period of not less than 60 days (as the Housing and Home Finance Administrator shall specify) following public announcement of the availability of such mortgage insurance aids under title II of this act, indicated through bona fide applications (which are eligible for approval) for exceptions from such residential credit restrictions or for mortgage insurance or guaranty that they will provide the housing determined to be needed in such area for defense worker; and military personnel and publicly announced as provided by subsection (a) of this section.

SEC. 103. In order to assure that community facilities or services required in connection with national defense activities shall, wherever possible, be provided by the appropriate local agencies with local funds, in any area which the President, pursuant to the authority contained in section 101 hereof, has declared to be a critical defense housing area—

(a) no loan shall be made pursuant to title III of this act for the provision of community facilities or equipment therefor required in connection with national defense activities in such area unless the chief executive officer of the appropriate political subdivision certifies, and the Housing and Home Finance Administrator finds, that such facilities or equipment could not otherwise be provided when needed;

(b) no grant or other payment shall be made pursuant to title III of this act for the provision, or for the operation and maintenance, of community facilities or equipment therefor, or for the provision of community services, required in connection with national defense activities in such area unless the chief executive officer of the appropriate political subdivision certifies, and the Housing and Home Finance Administrator finds, that such community facilities or services cannot otherwise be provided when needed, or operated and maintained, as the case may be, without the imposition of an increased excessive tax burden or an unusual or excessive increase in the debt limit of the appropriate local agency; and

(c) no community facilities or services shall be provided, and no community facilities shall be maintained and operated, by the United States directly except where the appropriate local agency is demonstrably unable to provide such facilities and services, or to maintain or operate such community facilities and services adequately with its own personnel, with loans, grants, or payments authorized to be made pursuant to title III hereof.

For the purposes of this section, the term "chief executive officer of the appropriate political subdivision" shall mean appropriate principal executive officer or governing body having primary responsibility with respect to the community facility or service involved.

SEC. 104. After June 30, 1953: (a) no mortgage may be insured under title IX of the National Housing Act, as amended (except (i), pursuant to a commitment to insure issued on or before such date, or (ii) a mortgage given to refinance an existing mortgage insured under that title and which does not exceed the original principal amount and unexpired term of such existing mortgage); (b) no agreement may be made to extend assistance for the provision of community facilities or services under title III of this act, and no construction of housing or community facilities by the Housing and Home Finance Administrator may be begun under such title; (c) no land

may be acquired by the Housing and Home Finance Administrator under title IV of this act; and (d) no loan may be made or obligations purchased by the Housing and Home Finance Administrator under section 102a of the Housing Act of 1948, as amended (except pursuant to a commitment issued on or before June 30, 1953, or to refinance an existing loan or existing obligations held under such section by said Administrator on June 30, 1953).

TITLE II—MORTGAGE INSURANCE FOR DEFENSE HOUSING

SEC. 201. The National Housing Act, as amended, is amended by the addition of the following title at the end thereof:

"TITLE IX—NATIONAL DEFENSE HOUSING INSURANCE

"SEC. 901. As used in this title, the terms 'mortgage,' 'first mortgage,' 'mortgagee,' 'mortgagor,' 'maturity date,' and 'State' shall have the same meaning as in section 201 of this act.

"SEC. 902. There is hereby created a National Defense Housing Insurance Fund which shall be used by the Commissioner as a revolving fund for carrying out the provisions of this title, and mortgages insured under this title shall be known and referred to as 'national defense housing insured mortgages.' The Commissioner is hereby authorized and directed to transfer to such fund the sum of \$10,000,000 from the War Housing Insurance Fund established pursuant to the provisions of section 602 of this act. General expenses of operation of the Federal Housing Administration under this title may be charged to the National Defense Housing Insurance Fund.

"SEC. 903. (a) This title is designed to supplement systems of mortgage insurance under other provisions of the National Housing Act in order to assist in providing adequate housing in areas which the President, pursuant to section 101 of the Defense Housing and Community Facilities and Services Act of 1951, shall have determined to be critical defense housing areas. The Commissioner is authorized, upon application by the mortgagee, to insure under this section or section 908 as hereinafter provided any mortgage which is eligible for insurance as hereinafter provided and upon such terms as the Commissioner may prescribe to make commitments for the insuring of such mortgages prior to the date of their execution or disbursement thereon: *Provided*, That the property covered by the mortgage is in an area which the President, pursuant to section 101 of the Defense Housing and Community Facilities and Services Act of 1951, shall have determined to be a critical defense housing area, and that the total number of dwelling units in properties covered by mortgages insured under this title in any such area does not exceed the number authorized by the Housing and Home Finance Administrator from time to time as needed in such area for defense purposes and to be insured pursuant to this title: *Provided further*, That the aggregate amount of principal obligations of all mortgages insured under this title shall not exceed such sum as may be authorized by the President from time to time for the purposes of this title pursuant to his authority under section 217 hereof: *Provided further*, That the Commissioner shall have power to require properties covered by mortgages insured under this title to be held for rental for such periods of time and at such rentals or other charges as he may prescribe; and, with respect to such properties being held for rental, (1) to require that the property be held by a mortgagor approved by him, and (2) to prescribe such requirements as he deems to be reasonable governing the method of operation and prohibiting or restricting sales of such properties or interests therein or agreements relating to such sales: *And provided further*,

That no mortgage shall be insured under this title unless the mortgagor certifies under oath that in selecting tenants for any property covered by the mortgage he will not discriminate against any family by reason of the fact that there are children in the family, and that he will not sell the property while the insurance is in effect unless the purchaser so certifies, such certification to be filed with the Commissioner. Violation of any such certification shall be a misdemeanor punishable by a fine of not to exceed \$500.

"(b) To be eligible for insurance under this section a mortgage shall—

"(1) have been made to, and be held by, a mortgagee approved by the Commission as responsible and able to service the mortgage properly;

"(2) involve a principal obligation (including such initial service charges, appraisal, inspection, and other fees as the Commissioner shall approve) in an amount not to exceed 90 percent of the appraised value (as of the date the mortgage is accepted for insurance) of a property, urban, suburban, or rural, upon which there is located a dwelling designed principally for residential use for not more than two families in the aggregate, which is approved for mortgage insurance prior to the beginning of construction, the construction of which is begun after the date of enactment of this title. The principal obligation of such mortgage shall not, however, exceed \$8,100 if such dwelling is designed for a single-family residence, or \$15,000 if such dwelling is designed for a two-family residence except that the Commissioner may by regulation increase these amounts to not to exceed \$9,000 and \$16,000, respectively, in any geographical area where he finds that cost levels so require: *Provided*, That if the Commissioner finds that it is not feasible within the aforesaid dollar amount limitations to construct dwellings containing three or four bedrooms per family unit without sacrifice of sound standards of construction, design, and livability, he may increase such dollar amount limitations by not exceeding \$1,080 for each additional bedroom (as defined by the Commissioner) in excess of two contained in such family unit if he finds that such unit meets sound standards of livability as a three-bedroom or a four-bedroom unit, as the case may be;

"(3) have a maturity satisfactory to the Commissioner but not to exceed 25 years from the date of the insurance of the mortgage;

"(4) contain complete amortization provisions satisfactory to the Commissioner;

"(5) bear interest (exclusive of premium charges for insurance) at not to exceed 4½ percent per annum on the amount of the principal obligation outstanding at any time;

"(6) provide, in a manner satisfactory to the Commissioner, for the application of the mortgagor's periodic payments (exclusive of the amount allocated to interest and to the premium charge which is required for mortgage insurance as herein provided) to amortization of the principal of the mortgage; and

"(7) contain such terms and provisions with respect to insurance, repairs, alterations, payment of taxes, default reserves, delinquency charges, foreclosure proceedings, anticipation of maturity, additional and secondary liens, and other matters as the Commissioner may in his discretion prescribe.

"(c) The Commissioner is authorized to fix a premium charge for the insurance of mortgages under this title but in the case of any mortgage such charge shall not be less than an amount equivalent to one-half of 1 percent per annum nor more than an amount equivalent to 1½ percent per annum of the amount of the principal obli-

gation of the mortgage outstanding at any time, without taking into account delinquent payments or prepayments. Such premium charges shall be payable by the mortgagee, either in cash or in debentures issued by the Commissioner under this title at par plus accrued interest, in such manner as may be prescribed by the Commissioner: *Provided*, That the Commissioner may require the payment of one or more such premium charges at the time the mortgage is insured, at such discount rate as he may prescribe not in excess of the interest rate specified in the mortgage. If the Commissioner finds upon the presentation of a mortgage for insurance and the tender of the initial premium charge or charges so required that the mortgage complies with the provisions of this title, such mortgage may be accepted for insurance by endorsement or otherwise as the Commissioner may prescribe; but no mortgage shall be accepted for insurance under this title unless the Commissioner finds that the project with respect to which the mortgage is executed is an acceptable risk in view of the needs of national defense. In the event that the principal obligation of any mortgage accepted for insurance under this title is paid in full prior to the maturity date, the Commissioner is further authorized in his discretion to require the payment by the mortgagee of an adjusted premium charge in such amount as the Commissioner determines to be equitable, but not in excess of the aggregate amount of the premium charges that the mortgagee would otherwise have been required to pay if the mortgage had continued to be insured under this title until such maturity date; and in the event that the principal obligation is paid in full as herein set forth the Commissioner is authorized to refund to the mortgagee for the account of the mortgagor all, or such portion as he shall determine to be equitable, of the current unearned premium charges theretofore paid.

"(d) Notwithstanding any other provisions of this or any other act, except provisions of law enacted hereafter expressly referring to this paragraph (d), the Commissioner, with the approval of the Housing and Home Finance Administrator, is further authorized to prescribe such procedures as are necessary to secure to persons engaged or to be engaged in national defense activities preference or priority of opportunity to purchase or rent properties, or interests therein, covered by mortgages insured under this title.

"(e) With respect to any mortgage insured under this section, the mortgagor shall agree (i) to certify under oath, upon completion of the physical improvements on the mortgaged property or project, and prior to final endorsement of the mortgage, the amount of the actual net cost of the said improvements exclusive of off-site public utilities and streets and organization and legal expense, and (ii) to require each contractor, subcontractor, and architect to certify through the mortgagor the amount of such cost attributable to him, and (iii) to pay, within 60 days after such certification, to the mortgagee, for application to the reduction of the principal obligation of such mortgage, the amount by which the principal obligation of the mortgage exceeds 90 percent of such certified cost. As used in this section, 'actual net cost' shall be defined by the Administrator to exclude any kick-backs or rebates (excluding normal trade discounts) received in connection with the construction of the said physical improvements, and to include only the actual moneys paid for architectural and engineering services.

"(f) Any contract of insurance heretofore or hereafter executed by the Commissioner under this title shall be conclusive evidence of the eligibility of the mortgage for insurance, and the validity of any contract of

insurance so executed shall be incontestable in the hands of an approved mortgagee from the date of the execution of such contract, except for fraud or misrepresentation on the part of such approved mortgagee.

"Sec. 904. (a) In any case in which the mortgagee under a mortgage insured under section 903 shall have foreclosed and taken possession of the mortgaged property, in accordance with regulations of, and within a period to be determined by, the Commissioner, or shall, with the consent of the Commissioner, have otherwise acquired such property from the mortgagor after default, the mortgagee shall be entitled to receive the benefit of the insurance as hereinafter provided, upon (1) the prompt conveyance to the Commissioner of title to the property which meets the requirement of rules and regulations of the Commissioner in force at the time the mortgage was insured, and which is evidenced in the manner prescribed by such rules and regulations; and (2) the assignment to him of all claims of the mortgagee against the mortgagor or others, arising out of the mortgage transaction or foreclosure proceedings, except such claims as may have been released with the consent of the Commissioner. Upon such conveyance and assignment the obligation of the mortgagee to pay the premium charges for insurance shall cease and the Commissioner shall, subject to the cash adjustment hereinafter provided, issue to the mortgagee debentures having a total face value equal to the value of the mortgage and a certificate of claim, as hereinafter provided. For the purposes of this subsection, the value of the mortgage shall be determined, in accordance with rules and regulations prescribed by the Commissioner, by adding to the amount of the original principal obligation of the mortgage which was unpaid on the date of the institution of foreclosure proceedings, or on the date of the acquisition of the property after default other than by foreclosure, the amount of all payments which have been made by the mortgagee for taxes, ground rents, and water rates, which are liens prior to the mortgage, special assessments which are noted on the application for insurance or which become liens after the insurance of the mortgage, insurance of the mortgaged property, and any mortgage insurance premiums paid after either of such dates and by deducting from such total amount any amount received on account of the mortgage after either of such dates and any amount received as rent or other income from the property, less reasonable expenses incurred in handling the property, after either of such dates: *Provided*, That with respect to mortgages which are foreclosed before there shall have been paid on account of the principal obligation of the mortgage a sum equal to 10 percent of the appraised value of the property as of the date the mortgage was accepted for insurance, there may be included in the debentures issued by the Commissioner, on account of the cost of foreclosure (or of acquiring the property by other means) actually paid by the mortgagee and approved by the Commissioner an amount—

"(1) not in excess of 2 percent of the unpaid principal of the mortgage as of the date of the institution of foreclosure proceedings and not in excess of \$75; or

"(2) not in excess of two-thirds of such cost, whichever is the greater: *And provided further*, That with respect to mortgages to which the provisions of sections 302 and 306 of the Soldiers' and Sailors' Civil Relief Act of 1940, as now or hereafter amended, apply and which are insured under section 903, and subject to such regulations and conditions as the Commissioner may prescribe, there shall be included in the debentures an amount which the Commissioner finds to be sufficient to compensate the mortgagee for any loss which it may

have sustained on account of interest on debentures and the payment of insurance premiums by reason of its having postponed the institution of foreclosure proceedings or the acquisition of the property by other means during any part or all of the period of such military service and 3 months thereafter.

"(b) The Commissioner may at any time, under such terms and conditions as he may prescribe, consent to the release of the mortgagor from his liability under the mortgage or the credit instrument secured thereby, or consent to the release of parts of the mortgaged property from the lien of the mortgage.

"(c) Debentures issued under this title shall be in such form and denominations in multiples of \$50, shall be subject to such terms and conditions, and shall include such provisions for redemption, if any, as may be prescribed by the Commissioner with the approval of the Secretary of the Treasury, and may be in coupon or registered form. Any difference between the amount of debentures to which the mortgagee is entitled under this section or section 908 of this act and the aggregate face value of the debentures issued, not to exceed \$50, shall be adjusted by the payment of cash by the Commissioner to the mortgagee from the National Defense Housing Insurance Fund.

"(d) The debentures issued under this section to any mortgagee shall be executed in the name of the National Defense Housing Insurance Fund as obligor, shall be signed by the Commissioner by either his written or engraved signature, and shall be negotiable. All such debentures shall be dated as of the date foreclosure proceedings were instituted, or the property was otherwise acquired by the mortgagee after default, and shall bear interest from such date at a rate determined by the Commissioner, with the approval of the Secretary of the Treasury, at the time the mortgage was accepted for insurance, but not to exceed 3 percent per annum, payable semiannually on the 1st day of January and the 1st day of July of each year. Such debentures shall mature 10 years after the date thereof. Such debentures shall be exempt, both as to principal and interest, from all taxation (except surtaxes, estate, inheritance, or gift taxes) now or hereafter imposed by any Territory, dependency, or possession of the United States, or by the District of Columbia, or by any State, county, municipality or local taxing authority, and shall be paid out of the National Defense Housing Insurance Fund, which shall be primarily liable therefor, and they shall be fully and unconditionally guaranteed as to principal and interest by the United States, and such guaranty shall be expressed on the face of the debentures. In the event that the National Defense Housing Insurance Fund fails to pay upon demand, when due, the principal of or interest on any debentures issued under this title, the Secretary of the Treasury shall pay to the holders the amount thereof which is hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, and thereupon to the extent of the amount so paid the Secretary of the Treasury shall succeed to all the rights of the holders of such debentures.

"(e) The certificate of claim issued by the Commissioner to any mortgagee under this section shall be for an amount determined in accordance with, and shall contain provisions and shall be paid in accordance with, the provisions of section 204 (e) and section 204 (f) of this act which are applicable to mortgages insured under section 207, except that the reference in section 204 (f) to 'the housing insurance fund' shall be deemed for the purposes of this section to be a reference to the National Defense Housing insurance fund.

"(f) Notwithstanding any other provision of law relating to the acquisition, handling, or disposal of real property by the United States, the Commissioner shall have power to deal with, complete, rent, renovate, modernize, insure, make contracts or establish suitable agencies for the management of, or sell for cash or credit, in his discretion, any properties conveyed to him in exchange for debentures and certificates of claim as provided in this section; and, notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Commissioner shall also have power to pursue to final collection, by way of compromise or otherwise, all claims against mortgagors assigned by mortgagees to the Commissioner as provided in this title: *Provided*, That section 3709 of the Revised Statutes shall not be construed to apply to any purchase or contract for services or supplies on account of such property if the amount thereof does not exceed \$1,000. The power to convey and to execute in the name of the Commissioner deeds of conveyances, deeds of release, assignments, and satisfactions of mortgages, and any other written instrument relating to real property or any interest therein heretofore or hereafter acquired by the Commissioner pursuant to the provisions of this act, may be exercised by the Commissioner or by any Assistant Commissioner appointed by him, without the execution of any express delegation of power or power of attorney: *Provided*, That nothing in this subsection shall be construed to prevent the Commissioner from delegating such power by order or by power of attorney in his discretion, to any officer, agent, or employee he may appoint.

"(g) No mortgagee or mortgagor shall have, and no certificate of claim shall be construed to give to any mortgagee, or mortgagor, any right or interest in any property conveyed to the Commissioner or in any claim assigned to him; nor shall the Commissioner owe any duty to any mortgagee or mortgagor with respect to the handling or disposal of any such property or the collection of any such claim.

"Sec. 905. (a) Moneys in the National Defense Housing Insurance fund not needed for the current operations of the Federal Housing Administration under this title shall be deposited with the Treasurer of the United States to the credit of the National Defense Housing Insurance fund, or invested in bonds or other obligations of, or in bonds or other obligations guaranteed as to principal and interest by, the United States. The Commissioner may, with the approval of the Secretary of the Treasury, purchase in the open market debentures issued under the provisions of this title. Such purchases shall be made at a price which will provide an investment yield of not less than the yield obtainable from other investments authorized by this section. Debentures so purchased shall be canceled and not reissued.

"(b) Premium charges, adjusted premium charges, and appraisal and other fees, received on account of the insurance of any mortgage insured under this title, the receipts derived from any such mortgage or claim assigned to the Commissioner and from any property acquired by the Commissioner, and all earnings on the assets of the National Defense Housing Insurance fund, shall be credited to the National Defense Housing Insurance fund. The principal of and interest paid and to be paid on debentures issued in exchange for any mortgage or property insured under this title, cash adjustments, and expenses incurred in the handling of such mortgages or property and in the foreclosure and collection of mortgages and claims assigned to the Commissioner under this title, shall be charged to the National Defense Housing Insurance fund.

"Sec. 906. Nothing in this title shall be construed to exempt any real property ac-

quired and held by the Commissioner under this title from taxation by any State or political subdivision thereof, to the same extent, according to its value, as other real property is taxed.

"Sec. 907. The Commissioner is authorized and directed to make such rules and regulations as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this title.

"Sec. 908. (a) In addition to mortgages insured under section 903 of this title, the Commissioner is authorized to insure mortgages as defined in section 901 of this title (including advances on such mortgages during construction) which are eligible for insurance as hereinafter provided.

"(b) To be eligible for insurance under this section a mortgage shall meet the following conditions:

"(1) The mortgaged property shall be held by a mortgagor approved by the Commissioner. The Commissioner may, in his discretion, require such mortgagor to be regulated or restricted as to rents or sales, charges, capital structure, rate of return, and methods of operation. The Commissioner may make such contracts with, and acquire for not to exceed \$100 stock or interest in any such mortgagor, as the Commissioner may deem necessary to render effective such restriction or regulation. Such stock or interest shall be paid for out of the National Defense Housing Insurance Fund, and shall be redeemed by the mortgagor at par upon the termination of all obligations of the Commissioner under the insurance.

"(2) The mortgage shall involve a principal obligation in an amount—

"(A) not to exceed \$5,000,000 and

"(B) not to exceed 90 percent of the amount which the Commissioner estimates will be the value of the property or project when the proposed improvements are completed: *Provided*, That such mortgage shall not in any event exceed the amount which the Commissioner estimates will be the cost of the completed physical improvements on the property or project exclusive of off-site public utilities and streets and organization and legal expenses and

"(C) not to exceed \$8,100 per family unit (or \$7,200 per family unit if the number of rooms in such property or project does not equal or exceed four per family unit) for such part of such property or project as may be attributable to dwelling use: *Provided*, That the Commissioner may by regulation increase such dollar amount limitations by not exceeding \$900 in any geographical area where he finds that cost levels so require.

"(3) The mortgagor shall agree (i) to certify under oath, upon completion of the physical improvements on the mortgaged property or project, and prior to final endorsement of the mortgage, the amount of the actual net cost of the said improvements exclusive of off-site public utilities and streets and organization and legal expenses, (ii) to require each contractor, subcontractor, and architect to certify through the mortgagor the amount of such cost attributable to him, and (iii) to pay, within 60 days after such certification, to the mortgagee, for application to the reduction of the principal obligation of such mortgage, the amount by which the principal obligation of the mortgage exceeds 90 percent of such certified cost. As used in this section, 'actual net cost' shall be defined by the Administrator to exclude any kick-backs or rebates (excluding normal trade discounts) received in connection with the construction of the said physical improvements, and to include only the actual moneys paid for architectural and engineering services.

"The mortgage shall provide for complete amortization by periodic payments within such term as the Commissioner shall prescribe, and shall bear interest (exclusive of premium charges for insurance) at not to exceed 4 percent per annum on amount of the principal obligation outstanding at any

time. The Commissioner may consent to the release of a part or parts of the mortgaged property from the lien of the mortgage upon such terms and conditions as he may prescribe and the mortgage may provide for such release.

"(c) The mortgage shall be entitled to receive debentures in connection with mortgages insured under this section in the amount and under the conditions specified in subsection (g) of section 207 of this act, and the references in said subsection (g) to the cash adjustment provided for in subsection (j) of section 207 and to the certificate of claim provided for in subsection (h) of section 207 shall be deemed to refer respectively to the cash adjustment provided for in subsection (c) of section 904 of this act and to the certificate of claim provided for in subsection (d) of this section.

"(d) The certificate of claim issued by the Commissioner to any mortgagee under this section shall be for an amount determined in accordance with, and shall contain provisions and shall be paid in accordance with, the provisions of section 207 (h) of this act, except that the reference in section 207 (h) to the 'Housing Insurance Fund' shall be deemed for the purposes of this section to be a reference to the National Defense Housing Insurance Fund.

"(e) Debentures issued under this section shall be issued in accordance with the provisions of section 904 (c) and (d) except that such debentures shall be dated as of the date of default as determined in subsection (c) of this section, and shall bear interest from such date.

"(f) The provisions of section 207 (k) and section 207 (l) of this act shall be applicable to mortgages insured under this section and to property acquired by the Commissioner hereunder, except that as applied to such mortgages and property (1) all references in such sections 207 (k) and 207 (l) to the 'Housing Fund' shall be construed to refer to the National Defense Housing Insurance Fund, and (2) the reference therein to 'subsection (g)' shall be construed to refer to subsection (c) of this section."

Sec. 202. Sections 1 and 5 of the National Housing Act, as amended, are further amended by striking out the words "titles II, III, VI, VII, and VIII" each time they appear and inserting in lieu thereof the words "titles II, III, VI, VII, VIII, and IX."

Sec. 203. Section 212 (a) of said act, as amended, is hereby amended by deleting the words "or under title VIII, a mortgage or investment" and by inserting in lieu thereof the words "or under title VIII, or under section 908 of title IX a mortgage or investment."

Sec. 204. Section 215 of said act, as amended, is hereby amended by deleting the words "or title VIII" and inserting in lieu thereof the words "title VIII, or title IX."

Sec. 205. Section 301 (a) of said act as amended, is hereby amended by striking out of paragraph (1) the words "or section 8 of title I of" and inserting in lieu thereof the words "section 8 of title I, or title IX of."

Sec. 206. Section 608 of said act, as amended, is further amended by striking out paragraph (g) thereof and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

"(g) The Commissioner shall also have power to insure under this title, title I, title II, title VIII, or title IX any mortgage executed in connection with the sale by him of any property acquired under any of such titles without regard to limitations upon eligibility, time, or aggregate amount contained therein."

Sec. 207. Section 24 of the Federal Reserve Act, as amended, is hereby amended by striking out of the third sentence "or section 8 of title I" and inserting in lieu thereof the words "section 8 of title I, or title IX."

Sec. 208. Section 10 of the Federal Home Loan Bank Act, as amended, is further

amended by striking out of subsection (a) (1) the words "or title VIII" and inserting in lieu thereof the words "title VIII, or title IX."

TITLE III—PROVISION OF DEFENSE HOUSING AND COMMUNITY FACILITIES AND SERVICES

SEC. 301. Subject to the provisions and limitations of title I hereof and subject to the provisions and limitations of this title, the Housing and Home Finance Administrator (hereinafter referred to as the "Administrator") is authorized to provide housing needed for defense workers or military personnel or to extend assistance for the provision of, or to provide, community facilities or services required in connection with national defense activities in any area which the President, pursuant to the authority contained in section 101 hereof, has determined to be a critical defense housing area.

SEC. 302. (a) To the maximum extent feasible and consistent with other requirements of national defense, housing constructed pursuant to the authority of this title shall be of permanent construction and shall consist of one- to four-family dwelling structures (including row houses) so arranged that they may be offered for separate sale. All housing of permanent construction which is constructed or acquired under the authority of this title shall be sold as expeditiously as possible and in the public interest taking into consideration the continuation of the need for such housing by persons engaged in national defense activities. All dwelling structures of permanent construction designed for occupancy by not more than four families (including row houses) shall, wherever feasible, be offered for separate sale, and preference in the purchase of any such dwelling structure shall be granted to occupants and to veterans over other prospective purchasers. As among veterans, preference in the purchase of any such dwelling structure shall be given to disabled veterans whose disability has been determined by the Veterans' Administration to be service-connected. All dwelling structures of permanent construction in any housing project which are designed for occupancy by more than four families (and other structures in such project which are not sold separately) shall be sold as an entity. On such sales first preference shall be given for such period not less than 90 days nor more than 6 months from the date of the initial offering of such project as the Administrator may determine, to groups of veterans organized on a mutual ownership or cooperative basis (provided that any such group shall accept as a member of its organization, on the same terms, subject to the same conditions, and with the same privileges and responsibilities, required of, and extended to, other members of the group any tenant occupying a dwelling unit in such project, at any time during such period as the Administrator shall deem appropriate, starting on the date of the announcement by the Administrator of the availability of such project). The Administrator shall provide an equitable method of selecting the purchasers when preferred purchasers (or groups of preferred purchasers) in the same preference class or containing members in the same preference class compete with each other. Sales pursuant to this section shall be for cash or credit, upon such terms as the Administrator shall determine, and at the fair value of the property as determined by him: *Provided*, That full payment to the Government for the property sold shall be required within a period of not exceeding 25 years with interest on unpaid balances at not less than 4 percent per annum.

(b) Where it is necessary to provide housing under this title in locations where, in the determination of the Administrator, there appears to be no need for such housing be-

yond the period during which it is needed for housing persons engaged in national defense activities, the provisions of section 102 hereof shall not be applicable and temporary housing which is of a mobile or portable character or which is otherwise constructed so as to be available for reuse at other locations shall be provided. All housing constructed pursuant to the authority contained in this title which is of a temporary character, as determined by the Administrator, shall be disposed of by the Administrator not later than the date, and subject to the conditions and requirements, hereafter prescribed by the Congress: *Provided*, That nothing in this sentence shall be construed as prohibiting the Administrator from removing any such housing by demolition or otherwise prior to the enactment of such legislation.

(c) When the Administrator determines that any housing provided under this title is no longer required for persons engaged in national defense activities, preference in admission to occupancy thereof shall be given to veterans pending its ultimate sale or disposition in accordance with the provisions of this title. As among veterans, preference in admission to occupancy shall be given to disabled veterans whose disability has been determined by the Veterans' Administration to be service-connected.

SEC. 303. The cost per family dwelling unit for any housing project constructed under the authority of this title shall not exceed an average of \$9,000 for two-bedroom units in such project, \$10,000 for three-bedroom units in such project, and \$11,000 for four-bedroom units in such project: *Provided*, That the Administrator may increase any such dollar limitation by not exceeding \$1,000 in any geographical area where he finds that cost levels so require: *Provided further*, That in the Territories and possessions of the United States the Administrator may increase any such dollar limitation by 50 percent: *And provided further*, That for the purposes of this section the cost of any land acquired by the Administrator upon the filing of a declaration of taking in proceedings for the condemnation of fee title shall be considered to be the amount determined by the Administrator, upon the basis of competent appraisal, to be the value thereof.

SEC. 304. In furtherance of the purposes of this title and subject to the provisions hereof, the Administrator may make loans or grants, or other payments, to public and nonprofit agencies for the provision, or for the operation and maintenance, of community facilities and equipment therefor, or for the provision of community services, upon such terms and in such amounts as the Administrator may consider to be in the public interest: *Provided*, That grants under this title to any local agency for hospital construction, or for school construction or maintenance and operation, may be made only after such action by the local agency to secure assistance (1) in the case of hospitals, under Public Law 725, Seventy-ninth Congress, approved August 13, 1946, as amended, or Public Law 380, Eighty-first Congress, approved October 25, 1949, or (2) in the case of schools, under title II of Public Law 815, Eighty-first Congress, approved September 23, 1950, or under Public Law 874, Eighty-first Congress, approved September 30, 1950, as the case may be, as is determined to be reasonable under the circumstances, and only to the extent that the required assistance is not available to such local agency under said Public Law 725, said Public Law 380, title II of said Public Law 815, or said Public Law 874, as the case may be: *Provided further*, That grants or payments for the provision, or for the maintenance and operation, of community facilities or services under this section shall not exceed the portion of the cost of the provision, or the maintenance and operation, of such facilities or

services which the Administrator estimates to be attributable to the national defense activities in the area and not to be recovered by the public or nonprofit agency from other sources, including payments by the United States under any other provisions of this act or any other law: *And provided further*, That any such continuing grant or payment, shall be reexamined and adjusted annually upon the basis of the ability of the agency to bear a greater portion of the cost of such maintenance, operation, or services as a result of increased revenues made possible by such facility or by defense activities.

SEC. 305. With respect to any housing or community facilities or services which the Administrator is authorized to provide, or any property which he is authorized to acquire, under this act, the Administrator is authorized by contract or otherwise (without regard to secs. 1136 and 3709 of the Revised Statutes, as amended, sec. 322 of the act of June 30, 1932 (47 Stat. 412), as amended, the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended, and prior to the approval of the Attorney General) to make plans, surveys, and investigations; to acquire (by purchase, donation, condemnation, or otherwise), construct, erect, extend, remodel, operate, rent, lease, exchange, repair, deal with, insure, maintain, convey, sell for cash or credit, demolish, or otherwise dispose of any property, land, improvement, or interest therein; to provide approaches, utilities, and transportation facilities; to procure necessary materials, supplies, articles, equipment, and machinery; to make advance payments for leased property; to pursue to final disposition by way of compromise or otherwise, claims both for and against the United States (exclusive of claims in excess of \$5,000 arising out of contracts for construction, repairs, and the purchase of supplies and materials, and claims involving administrative expenses) which are not in litigation and which have not been referred to the Department of Justice; and to convey without cost to States and political subdivisions and instrumentalities thereof property for streets and other public thoroughfares and easements for public purposes: *Provided*, That any instrument executed by the Administrator and purporting to convey any right, title, or interest in any property acquired pursuant to this title or title IV of this act shall be conclusive evidence of compliance with the provisions thereof, insofar as title or other interest of any bona fide purchasers, lessees, or transferees of such property is concerned. Notwithstanding any provisions of this act, housing or community facilities constructed by the United States pursuant to the authority contained herein (except housing or community facilities of a temporary character) shall, to the maximum extent practicable, taking into consideration the availability of materials, conform to the requirements of State or local laws, ordinances, rules, or regulations relating to health, sanitation, and building codes.

SEC. 306. Any Federal agency may, upon request of the Administrator, transfer to his jurisdiction without reimbursement any lands, improved or unimproved, or other property real or personal, considered by the Administrator to be needed or useful for housing or community facilities, or both, to be provided under this title, and the Administrator is authorized to accept any such transfers. The Administrator may also utilize any other real or personal property under his jurisdiction for the purpose of this title without adjustment of the appropriations or funds involved. Any property so transferred or utilized, and any funds in connection therewith, shall be subject only to the authorizations and limitations of this title. The Administrator may, in his discretion, upon request of the Secretary of Defense or

his designee, transfer to the jurisdiction of the Department of Defense without reimbursement any land, improvements, housing, or community facilities constructed or acquired under the provisions of this title and considered by the Department of Defense to be required for the purposes of the said Department. Upon the transfer of any such property to the jurisdiction of the Department of Defense, the laws, rules, and regulations relating to property of the Department of Defense shall be applicable to the property so transferred, and the provisions of this title and the rules and regulations issued thereunder shall no longer apply.

Sec. 307. Notwithstanding any other provisions of law, the acquisition by the United States of any real property pursuant to this title or title IV of this act shall not deprive any State or political subdivision thereof of its civil or criminal jurisdiction in and over such property, or impair the civil or other rights under the State or local law of the inhabitants of such property. Any proceedings by the United States for the recovery of possession of any property or project acquired, developed, or constructed under this title or title IV of this act may be brought in the courts of the States having jurisdiction of such causes.

Sec. 308. The Administrator shall pay from rentals annual sums in lieu of taxes and special assessments to any State and/or political subdivision thereof, with respect to any real property, including improvements thereon, acquired and held by him under this title for residential purposes (or for commercial purposes incidental thereto), whether or not such property is or has been held in the exclusive jurisdiction of the United States. The amount so paid for any year upon such property shall approximate the taxes and special assessments which would be paid to the State and/or subdivision, as the case may be, upon such property if it were not exempt from taxation and special assessments, with such allowance as may be considered by him to be appropriate for expenditures by the Federal Government for the provision or maintenance of streets, utilities, or other public services to serve such property.

Sec. 309. In carrying out this title—

(a) notwithstanding any other provisions of this title, so far as is consistent with emergency needs, contracts shall be subject to section 3709 of the Revised Statutes;

(b) the cost-plus-a-percentage-of-cost system of contracting shall not be used, but contracts may be made on a cost-plus-a-fixed-fee basis: *Provided*, That the fixed fee shall not exceed 6 percent of the estimated cost;

(c) whenever practicable, existing private and public community facilities shall be utilized or such facilities shall be extended, enlarged, or equipped in lieu of constructing new facilities; and

(d) all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to any community facilities constructed by the United States pursuant to the authority contained in this title shall (if such agency is willing to accept such facility and operate the same for the purpose for which it was constructed) be disposed of to the appropriate State, city, or other local agency having responsibility for such type of facility in the area not later than 1 year after the expiration date specified in title I hereof, and subject to the conditions and requirements hereafter prescribed by the Congress.

Sec. 310. (a) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the wages of every laborer and mechanic employed on any construction, maintenance, repair, or demolition work authorized by this title shall be computed on a basic day rate of 8 hours per day and work in excess of 8 hours per day shall be per-

mitted upon compensation for all hours worked in excess of 8 hours per day at not less than one and one-half times the basic rate of pay.

(b) The provisions of the Davis-Bacon Act (49 Stat. 1011), as amended; of title 18, United States Code, section 874; and of title 40, United States Code, section 276c, shall apply in accordance with their terms to work pursuant to this title.

(c) Any contract for loan or grant, or both, pursuant to this title shall contain a provision requiring that not less than the wages prevailing in the locality, as predetermined by the Secretary of Labor pursuant to the Davis-Bacon Act, as amended, shall be paid to all laborers and mechanics employed in the construction of the project at the site thereof; and the Administrator shall require certification as to compliance with the provisions of this subsection prior to making any payment under such contract.

(d) Any contractor engaged in the development of any project financed in whole or in part with funds made available pursuant to this title shall report monthly to the Secretary of Labor, and shall cause all subcontractors to report in like manner, within 5 days after the close of each month and on forms to be furnished by the United States Department of Labor, as to the number of persons on their respective payrolls on the particular project, the aggregate amount of such payrolls, the total man-hours worked, and itemized expenditures for materials. Any such contractor shall furnish to the Department of Labor the names and addresses of all subcontractors on the work at the earliest date practicable.

(e) The Secretary of Labor shall prescribe appropriate standards, regulations, and procedures, which shall be observed by the Administrator in carrying out the provisions of this title (and cause to be made by the Department of Labor such investigations) with respect to compliance with and enforcement of the labor standards provisions of this section, as he deems desirable.

Sec. 311. Moneys derived from rentals, operation, or disposition of property acquired or constructed under the provisions of this title shall be available for expenses of operation, maintenance, improvement, and disposition of any such property, including the establishment of necessary reserves therefor and administrative expenses in connection therewith: *Provided*, That such moneys derived from rentals, operation, or disposition may be deposited in a common fund account or accounts in the Treasury: *And provided further*, That the moneys in such common fund account or accounts shall not exceed \$25,000,000 at any time, and all moneys in excess of such amount shall be covered into miscellaneous receipts.

Sec. 312. The Administrator shall fix fair rentals based on the value thereof as determined by him which shall be charged for housing accommodations operated under this title and may prescribe the class or classes of persons who may occupy such accommodations, preferences, or priorities in the rental thereof, and the terms, conditions, and period of such occupancy.

Sec. 313. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated—

(a) such sums, not exceeding \$60,000,000, as may be necessary for carrying out the provisions and purposes of this title relating to community facilities and services in critical defense housing areas; and

(b) such sums, not exceeding \$50,000,000, as may be necessary for carrying out the provisions and purposes of this title relating to housing in critical defense housing areas.

Sec. 314. Subject to all of the limitations and restrictions of this act, including, specifically, the requirements of subsection (c)

of section 103 hereof and of subsections (c) and (d) of section 309 hereof, where any other officer, department, or agency is performing, or, in the determination of the President, has facilities adapted to the performance of, functions, powers and duties similar, or directly related, to any of the functions, powers and duties which the Housing and Home Finance Administrator is authorized by this title to perform with respect to the construction, maintenance or operation of community facilities for education, health, refuse disposal, sewage treatment, recreation, water purification, and day-care centers, or the provision of community services, the President may transfer to such other officer, department or agency any of the functions, powers, and duties authorized by this title to be performed with respect thereto if he finds that such transfer will assist the furtherance of national defense activities, and upon any such transfer, funds in such amount as the Director of the Bureau of the Budget shall determine, but in no event in excess of the balance of any moneys appropriated to the Housing and Home Finance Administrator pursuant to the authorization therefor contained in this title for the performance of the transferred functions, powers, and duties, may also be transferred by the President to such other officer, department, or agency: *Provided*, That the President, by Executive order or otherwise, may prescribe or direct the manner in which any functions, powers, and duties, which the Housing and Home Finance Administrator is authorized by this title to perform with respect to assistance for the construction, or the construction of, any community facilities, shall be administered in coordination with other officers, departments, or agencies having functions or activities related thereto.

Sec. 315. As used in this title the following terms shall have the meanings respectively ascribed to them below, and, unless the context clearly indicates otherwise, shall include the plural as well as the singular number:

(a) "State" shall mean the several States, the District of Columbia, and Territories, and possessions of the United States.

(b) "Federal agency" shall mean any executive department or officer (including the President), independent establishment, commission, board, bureau, division, or office in the executive branch of the United States Government, or other agency of the United States, including corporations in which the United States owns all or a majority of the stock, directly or indirectly.

(c) "Community facility" shall mean any facility necessary for carrying on community living, including primarily waterworks, sewers, sewage, garbage and refuse disposal facilities, fire protection facilities, public sanitary facilities, works for treatment and purification of water, schools, hospitals and other places for the care of the sick, recreational facilities, streets and roads, and day-care centers.

(d) "Community service" shall mean any service necessary for carrying on community living, including the maintenance and operation of facilities for education, health, refuse disposal, sewage treatment, recreation, water purification, and day-care centers, and the provision of fire protection and other community services.

(e) "Nonprofit agency" shall mean any agency no part of the net earnings of which inures to the benefit of any private shareholder or individual.

(f) "Project" shall mean housing or community facilities acquired, developed, or constructed with financial assistance pursuant to this title.

(g) "Veteran" shall mean a person, or the family of a person, who has served in the

active military or naval service of the United States at any time (i) on or after September 16, 1940, and prior to July 26, 1947, (ii) on or after April 6, 1917, and prior to November 11, 1918, or (iii) on or after June 27, 1950, and prior to such date thereafter as shall be determined by the President, and who shall have been discharged or released therefrom under conditions other than dishonorable or who shall be still serving therein. The term shall also include the family of a person who served in the active military or naval service of the United States within any such period and who shall have died of causes determined by the Veterans' Administration to have been service-connected.

TITLE IV—PROVISION OF SITES FOR NECESSARY DEVELOPMENT IN CONNECTION WITH ISOLATED DEFENSE INSTALLATIONS

SEC. 401. Subject to the provisions and limitations of title I hereof and subject to the provisions and limitations of this title, upon a finding by the President that in connection with a defense installation (as defined by him) developed or to be developed in an isolated or relatively isolated area (1) housing or community facilities needed for such installation would not otherwise be provided when and where required or (2) there would otherwise be speculation or uneconomic use of land resources which would impair the efficiency of defense activities at such installation, the Housing and Home Finance Administrator (hereinafter referred to as the "Administrator") is authorized to make general plans for the development of necessary housing and community facilities in connection with such defense installation; to acquire, by purchase, condemnation, or otherwise, the necessary improved or unimproved land or interests therein; to clear land; to install, construct, or reconstruct streets, utilities, and other site improvements essential to the preparation of the land for use in accordance with said general plans; and to dispose of such land or interests therein for use in accordance with such plans and subject to such terms and conditions as he shall deem advisable and in the public interest. For the purposes of this title, the Administrator may exercise the powers granted to him in title III for the purposes thereof: *Provided*, That no funds made available under this title shall be used for the erection of dwellings or other buildings, and funds representing the fair value, as determined by the Administrator, of any property acquired under this title and used as sites for dwellings or other buildings or facilities under title III shall be transferred from funds appropriated thereunder and made available for purposes of this title IV: *And provided further*, That the provisions of section 310 shall be applicable to site development work under this title.

SEC. 402. Upon a finding by the President that it is necessary or desirable in the public interest that land shall be acquired by the Administrator not only for the purposes of section 401 hereof but for the defense installation to be served thereby, the Administrator is authorized to acquire improved or unimproved land for such defense installation and, in connection therewith, to exercise any powers granted under this title. The Administrator may transfer such property to the appropriate Federal, State, local, or private agency, person, or corporation upon such terms and conditions as he shall determine to be in the public interest.

SEC. 403. With respect to any real property acquired and held by the Administrator pursuant to this title and with respect to any defense installation owned by the Federal Government in connection with which

such property is acquired, the Administrator may pay annual sums in lieu of taxes to the appropriate State and local taxing authorities: *Provided*, That, in making any such payments, the Administrator shall take into consideration other payments by the Federal Government to the State and local taxing authorities, the value of services furnished by such taxing authorities in connection with the property or installation, and the value of any services provided by the Federal Government. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary and appropriate for the carrying out of the provisions and purposes of this section.

SEC. 404. The Administrator is authorized to obtain money from the Treasury of the United States for use in the performance of the functions, powers, and duties granted to him by this title, not to exceed a total of \$10,000,000 outstanding at any one time. For this purpose appropriations not to exceed \$10,000,000 are hereby authorized to be made to a revolving fund in the Treasury. Advances shall be made to the Administrator from the revolving fund when requested by the Administrator. As the Administrator repays the amounts thus obtained from the Treasury, the repayments shall be made to the revolving fund. The Administrator shall pay into the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts interest on the outstanding advances from the Treasury provided for by this section. The Secretary of the Treasury shall determine the interest rate annually in advance, such rate to be calculated to reimburse the Treasury for its cost, taking into consideration the current average interest rate which the Treasury pays upon its marketable obligations.

SEC. 405. In any city in which, on March 1, 1951, there were more than 12,000 temporary housing units held by the United States of America, the powers authorized by this title may be exercised for the acquisition of land for the provision of improved sites for privately financed defense housing: *Provided*, That acquisitions pursuant to this section shall be limited to land in the general area in which approximately 1,500 units of such temporary housing were unoccupied on said date.

TITLE V—PREFABRICATED HOUSING

SEC. 501. Section 102 of the Housing Act of 1948, as amended, is amended by striking out the words "for the production of prefabricated houses or prefabricated housing components, or for large-scale modernized site construction" at the end of the first sentence thereof and inserting the following: "for production or distribution of prefabricated houses or housing components and for related purposes, or for modernized site construction," and by inserting after the word "determine" in the second sentence thereof the words "and may be made either directly or in cooperation with banks or other lending institutions through agreements to participate or the purchase of participation or otherwise."

SEC. 502. The Housing Act of 1948, as amended, is amended by inserting before section 103 thereof the following new sections:

"**SEC. 102a.** To assure the maintenance of industrial capacity for the production of prefabricated houses and housing components so that it may be available for the purposes of national defense, the Housing and Home Finance Administrator is authorized to make loans to and purchase obligations of any business enterprise or financial institution for the purpose of providing financial assistance for the production or distribution of prefabricated houses or prefabricated housing components and for related purposes.

Such loans may be made upon such terms and conditions and with such maturities as the Administrator may determine and may be made either directly or in cooperation with banks or other lending institutions through agreements to participate or the purchase of participation or otherwise: *Provided*, That the total amount of commitments for loans made and obligations purchased under this section shall not exceed \$15,000,000 outstanding at any one time, and no financial assistance shall be extended under this section unless it is not otherwise available on reasonable terms. The Administrator is further authorized to issue to the Secretary of the Treasury, and the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized to purchase, obligations of the Administrator in an amount outstanding at any one time sufficient to enable the Administrator to carry out his functions under this section, such obligations to be in substantially the same form, and be issued in the same manner and subject to the same conditions, except as to the total amount thereof, as obligations issued by the Administrator pursuant to Reorganization Plan 23 of 1950.

"**SEC. 102b.** In the performance of, and with respect to, the functions, powers, and duties vested in him by Reorganization Plan 23 of 1950, and by section 102a hereof, the Housing and Home Finance Administrator shall, in addition to any powers, functions, privileges, and immunities otherwise vested in him—

"(1) have the powers, functions, privileges, and immunities transferred to him by said reorganization plan and the same powers, functions, and duties as set forth in section 402 of the Housing Act of 1950, except subsection (c) (2) thereof, with respect to loans authorized by title IV of said act;

"(2) take any and all actions determined by him to be necessary or desirable in making, servicing, compromising, modifying, liquidating, or otherwise dealing with or realizing on loans thereunder.

"**SEC. 102c.** Wherever in this act the words 'prefabricated houses' are used they shall be construed to include houses which are of a mobile or portable character."

SEC. 503. The third paragraph of section 24 of the Federal Reserve Act, as amended, is amended by adding in clause (d) the words "or the Housing and Home Finance Administrator" after the words "the Reconstruction Finance Corporation" and by adding the words "or of section 102 or 102a of the Housing Act of 1948, as amended," after the words "provisions of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation act, as amended."

TITLE VI—AMENDMENTS TO EXISTING LAWS AND GENERAL PROVISIONS

SEC. 601. Title VIII of the National Housing Act, as amended, is hereby amended—

(a) By striking out of section 803 (a) "July 1, 1951" and substituting therefor "July 1, 1953."

(b) By inserting before the period at the end of section 803 (b) (3) (C) the following: "*Provided*, That the Commissioner may by regulation increase the \$8,100 limitation by not exceeding \$900 in any geographical area where he finds that cost levels so require."

(c) By inserting after the words "National Military Establishment" in the last sentence of section 803 (d) the words "or the Atomic Energy Commission."

(d) By adding at the end thereof the following new section:

"**SEC. 810.** A mortgage which meets all of the eligibility requirements of this title except those specified in section 803 (b) (2) and which is secured by property designed for rent for residential use by personnel of the Atomic Energy Commission (including military personnel and Government contractors'

employees) employed or assigned to duty at the Atomic Energy Commission installation at or in the area in which such property is constructed shall be eligible for insurance under this title if the Atomic Energy Commission or its designee shall have certified to the Commissioner that the housing with respect to which the mortgage is made is necessary to provide adequate housing for such personnel, that such installation is deemed to be a permanent part of the Atomic Energy Commission establishment, and that there is no present intention to substantially curtail activities at such installation. Notwithstanding the provisions of any other law, preference or priority of opportunity in the occupancy of the mortgaged property for such personnel and their immediate families shall be provided under such regulations and procedures as may be prescribed by the Commissioner. To effectuate the purpose of this title the Atomic Energy Commission or its designee is authorized to exercise all the authority granted to the Secretary of Defense or the Secretary of the Army, Navy, or Air Force pursuant to this title. Nothing herein contained shall impair the powers vested in the Atomic Energy Commission by the Atomic Energy Act of 1946."

SEC. 602. Notwithstanding any other provisions of this or any other act (including the Defense Production Act of 1950), in any critical defense housing area loans for the purchase, construction, alteration, repair, or improvement of residential property may be guaranteed or insured, in accordance with the provisions of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, as amended, on behalf of veterans employed, or to be employed, in defense plants or installations: *Provided*, That any houses purchased or constructed with any such loans, not conforming to credit restrictions under the Defense Production Act of 1950, are within the number programed for the area and are held subject to the terms and conditions prescribed by the Housing and Home Finance Administrator for housing built pursuant to relaxations of such restrictions: *And provided further*, That this section shall not be applicable to dwelling units, the cost of which exceeds \$10,000 for a two-bedroom unit, \$11,000 for a three-bedroom unit, or \$12,000 for a four-bedroom unit.

SEC. 603. The act entitled "An act to expedite the provision of housing in connection with national defense, and for other purposes," approved October 14, 1940, as amended, is hereby amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section 611:

"SEC. 611. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the President is authorized to extend, for such period or periods as he shall specify, the time within which any action is required or permitted to be taken by the Administrator or others under the provisions of this title (or any contract entered into pursuant to this title), upon a determination by him, after considering the needs of national defense and the effect of such extension upon the general housing situation and the national economy, that such extension is in the public interest."

SEC. 604. The National Housing Act, as amended, is hereby amended—

(a) by striking out the period at the end of the second sentence of section 204 (d) and inserting a comma and the following: "except that debentures issued with respect to mortgages insured under section 213 shall mature 20 years after the date of such debentures."

(b) by striking out of the second sentence of section 207 (1) the words "and shall mature 3 years after the 1st day of July following the maturity date of the mortgage in exchange for which the debentures were

issued" and inserting in lieu thereof "and shall mature 20 years after the date thereof."

SEC. 605. Section 207 (c) of the National Housing Act, as amended, is hereby amended (1) by striking out of clause "(1)" in paragraph numbered "(2)" the words "of the property or project" and inserting in lieu thereof the words "of the property or project attributable to dwelling use"; and (2) by striking out of clause "(1)" in paragraph numbered "(2)" the words "and not in excess of \$10,000 per family unit" and inserting in lieu thereof the words "and not in excess of \$10,000 per family unit and (iii) 90 percent of the estimated value of such part of such property or project as may be attributable to nondwelling use"; and (3) by striking out of paragraph numbered "(3)" the words "four and one-half per family unit" and substituting therefor the words "four per family unit."

SEC. 606. The first sentence of section 214 of the National Housing Act, as amended, is hereby amended by striking the word "one-third" and inserting the word "one-half."

SEC. 607. Title II of the National Housing Act, as amended, is hereby amended by adding at the end thereof the following new sections:

"WAIVER OF OCCUPANCY REQUIREMENTS FOR SERVICEMEN

"SEC. 216. The Commissioner is hereby authorized to insure any mortgage otherwise eligible for insurance under any of the provisions of this act without regard to any requirement that the mortgagor be the occupant of the property at the time of insurance, where the Commissioner is satisfied that the inability of the mortgagor to occupy the property is by reason of his entry into military service subsequent to the filing of an application for insurance and the mortgagor expresses an intent to occupy the property upon his discharge from military service.

"GENERAL MORTGAGE INSURANCE AUTHORIZATION

"SEC. 217. Notwithstanding limitations contained in any other section of this act on the aggregate amount of principal obligations of mortgages which may be insured under any title of this act, such aggregate amount shall, with respect to any title of this act (except title VI) be prescribed by the President, taking into consideration the needs of national defense and the effect of additional mortgage insurance authorizations upon conditions in the building industry and upon the national economy: *Provided*, That the aggregate dollar amount of the mortgage insurance authorization prescribed by the President with respect to title IX of this act plus the aggregate dollar amount of all increases in mortgage insurance authorizations under other titles of this act prescribed by the President pursuant to authority contained in this section shall not exceed \$1,500,000,000 and shall be available only for mortgage insurance with respect to housing in critical defense housing areas."

SEC. 608. Notwithstanding any other provision of law or Reorganization Plan 22 of 1950, one of the five or more persons constituting the Board of Directors of the Federal National Mortgage Association shall be appointed by the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs from among the officers or employees of the Veterans' Administration.

SEC. 609. (a) Section 702 of the National Housing Act, as amended, is hereby amended by adding the following new subsection at the end thereof:

"(c) (3) After completion of the project the investor must establish in a manner satisfactory to the Commissioner that the project is free and clear of liens and that there are no other outstanding unpaid obligations contracted in connection with the construc-

tion of the project, except taxes and such other liens and obligations as may be approved or prescribed by the Commissioner. Debentures issued by the investor which are payable out of net income from the project and from the benefits of the insurance contract shall not be construed as 'unpaid obligations' as such term is used in this subsection."

(b) Section 707 of the National Housing Act, as amended, is hereby amended by adding the following new sentence at the end thereof: "Nothing contained in this title or any other provision of law shall be construed as preventing or restricting an investor from assigning, pledging, or otherwise transferring or disposing of, subject to rules and regulations of the Commissioner, any or all rights, claims, or other benefits under any insurance contract made pursuant to this title to an assignee, pledgee, or other transferee, including the holders (or the trustee for such holders) of any debentures issued by the investor in connection with the project to which such insurance contract relates, and the Commissioner is authorized to pay claims or issue debentures in accordance with the provisions of this section and section 708 of this title to any such assignee, pledgee, or other transferee."

SEC. 610. Section 713 (n) of the National Housing Act, as amended, is hereby amended by adding before the period at the end thereof the words "or such lesser amount as shall be agreed upon by the investor and the Commissioner."

SEC. 611. Upon a finding by the Housing and Home Finance Administrator that the acquisition of any real property for a defense installation or industry has resulted, or will result, in the displacement of persons from their homes on such property, he may (notwithstanding any other provision of this or any other law) issue regulations pursuant to which such persons may be permitted to occupy or purchase housing for which credit restrictions established pursuant to the Defense Production Act of 1950 have been relaxed or housing which has been provided or assisted under the provisions of this act (including amendments to other acts provided herein), subject to any conditions or requirements that he determines necessary for purposes of national defense.

SEC. 612. Section 713 (o) of the National Housing Act, as amended, is hereby amended by inserting before the period at the end thereof the words "and income taxes."

SEC. 613. The Secretary of Defense or his designee shall hereafter be included in the membership of the National Housing Council in the Housing and Home Finance Agency, and the Chairman of the Board of Directors of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation or his designee shall not hereafter be included in the membership of said Council.

SEC. 614. During the period from the date of the approval of this act to and including the expiration date specified in section 104 hereof, no project shall be initiated, and the income limitations contained in the United States Housing Act of 1937, as amended, shall not be waived or suspended, pursuant to the authorization therefor in title II of Public Law 671, Seventy-sixth Congress, approved June 28, 1940.

SEC. 615. Insofar as the provisions of any other law are inconsistent with the provisions of this act, the provisions of this act shall be controlling.

SEC. 616. Except as may be otherwise expressly provided in this act, all powers and authorities conferred by this act shall be cumulative and additional to and not in derogation of any powers and authorities otherwise existing. Notwithstanding any other evidence of the intention of Congress,

it is hereby declared to be the controlling intent of Congress that if any provisions of this act, or the application thereof to any persons or circumstances, shall be adjudged by any court of competent jurisdiction to be invalid, such judgment shall not affect, impair, or invalidate the remainder of this act or its application to other persons and circumstances, but shall be confined in its operation to the provisions of this act or the application thereof to the persons and circumstances directly involved in the controversy in which such judgment shall have been rendered.

BILLS INTRODUCED

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

By Mr. CORDON (by request):

S. 1174. A bill to authorize the deposit of Klamath tribal loan funds in approved depositories; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. MARTIN:

S. 1175. A bill for the relief of Zora Krizan, also known as Zorardo Krizanova; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado (by request):

S. 1176. A bill to promote the national security and defense by establishing daylight saving time; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HUNT:

S. 1177. A bill for the relief of Misako Kinoshita; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KNOWLAND:

S. 1178. A bill for the relief of Martin P. Pavlov; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CAPEHART:

S. 1179. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to review the records of commissioned naval and Marine officers who failed of advancement during the war, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. McCARRAN:

S. 1180. A bill to amend subdivision a of section 34 of the Bankruptcy Act, as amended; and

S. 1181. A bill to amend subdivision a of section 55 of the Bankruptcy Act, as amended; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado (by request):

S. 1182. A bill to authorize the President to proclaim regulations for preventing collisions at sea; and

S. 1183. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to authorize the construction, protection, operation, and maintenance of public airports in the Territory of Alaska," as amended; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. McCARRAN:

S. 1184. A bill to extend the Youth Correction Act to the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HUMPHREY:

S. 1185. A bill to provide for the distribution to members of the Armed Forces on active duty of waterproof cards advising them with respect to the requirements for proving the incurrence of service-connected disabilities and to provide for the preparation and immediate forwarding to the United States of duplicate copies of medical records with respect to service-connected injuries or diseases; to the Committee on Armed Services.

S. 1186. A bill to amend section 503 (b) of the Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act of June 25, 1938, as amended; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

PERSONNEL STRENGTH OF MARINE CORPS — AMENDMENT — ADDITIONAL COSPONSOR OF BILL

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, on behalf of myself, the junior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. McCARTHY], the junior Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], the junior Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], the Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON], the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY], the junior Senator from Montana [Mr. ECTON], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. NEELY], the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. DUFF], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN], the Senator from Kansas [Mr. SCHOEPPEL], the junior Senator from New York [Mr. LEHMAN], the junior Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON], the senior Senator from New York [Mr. IVES], the senior Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], the Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], the junior Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HENDRICKSON], the Senator from California [Mr. NIXON], the senior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. THYE], the senior Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART], the junior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], the Senator from Utah [Mr. WATKINS], the senior Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER], the senior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY], the junior Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS], the junior Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], the senior Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN], the senior Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH], the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER], the senior Senator from South Carolina [Mr. MAYBANK], the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG], the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], and the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. SMITH], I submit for appropriate reference, an amendment intended to be proposed by us, jointly, to the bill (S. 677) to fix the personnel strength of the United States Marine Corps, and to make the Commandant of the Marine Corps a permanent member of the Joint Chiefs of Staff. The amendment is on page 2, line 4, after the word "not", to strike out "less" and insert "more", so that it will read "not more than four hundred thousand." I ask unanimous consent that the name of the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. SMITH] be added as an additional cosponsor of the bill.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will be received, referred to the Committee on Armed Services, and printed, and, without objection, the name of the Senator from North Carolina will be added as cosponsor of the bill.

UNION OF CYPRUS WITH GREECE

Mr. McCARRAN (by request) submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 104), which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

Resolved, That it is the sense of the Senate that the President, through the Secretary of State, should instruct the United States delegation to the United Nations that, in connection with any consideration by the General Assembly of the United Nations of the question of the union of Cyprus with Greece, the United States delegation should favor full consideration of the desires of the majority of the Greek population of the Island of Cyprus.

HOUSE BILLS REFERRED OR PLACED ON CALENDAR

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

H. R. 578. An act for the relief of Sister Anna Etti;

H. R. 621. An act for the relief of the Morgan Foods Corp.;

H. R. 632. An act for the relief of Janina Wojcicka, Wojciech Andrzej Wojcicki, and Stanislaw Wojcicki;

H. R. 645. An act for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. A. C. Lupcho;

H. R. 652. An act for the relief of the estate of Mattie Mashaw;

H. R. 671. An act for the relief of Mrs. Sylvia Laquidara;

H. R. 699. An act for the relief of Mrs. Blanche Richards, owner of the Bozarth Nursing Home, Toppenish, Wash.;

H. R. 767. An act for the relief of Mrs. Catherine V. Myeue;

H. R. 781. An act for the relief of Frederick Edmond Tomkins, Mary Ann Tomkins, and Edward Marshall Tomkins;

H. R. 783. An act for the relief of Bela Abeles and Maria Abeles;

H. R. 789. An act for the relief of John Yan Chi Gee;

H. R. 794. An act for the relief of Arthur E. Hackett;

H. R. 887. An act for the relief of First Lt. Walter S. Moe, Jr.;

H. R. 899. An act for the relief of Malka Dwojra Kron;

H. R. 953. An act for the relief of Joseph A. Myers, Hazel C. Myers, and Helen Myers;

H. R. 1117. An act for the relief of Kimiko Shibuya;

H. R. 1121. An act for the relief of Chin Yok Kong;

H. R. 1163. An act for the relief of Paolo Danesi;

H. R. 1235. An act for the relief of John Clarke;

H. R. 1253. An act for the relief of Jack A. Witham;

H. R. 1263. An act for the relief of Dr. Chia Len Lieu;

H. R. 1422. An act for the relief of Carl Parks;

H. R. 1424. An act for the relief of T. L. Morrow;

H. R. 1451. An act for the relief of Charles R. Keicher;

H. R. 1690. An act for the relief of Carl M. Campbell, James R. White, and Frederick J. Powers;

H. R. 1704. An act for the relief of Jack Stuckey;

H. R. 1792. An act for the relief of Emmet Wood and Viola Wood;

H. R. 1798. An act for the relief of the estate of Yoshio Fukunaga, deceased;

H. R. 1800. An act for the relief of Lucy Kong Lee;

H. R. 2064. An act for the relief of Dr. Thor Sevcenko;

H. R. 2073. An act for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Thomas H. Campbell;

H. R. 2175. An act for the relief of Addie Dean Garner Scott;

H. R. 2357. An act for the relief of Lucia Adamos;

H. R. 2450. An act for the relief of Concetta Santagati Giordano;

H. R. 2552. An act for the relief of Eleanor Mansour;

H. R. 2782. An act conferring jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims to hear and determine the claim of Auf der Heide-Aragona, Inc., and certain of its subcontractors against the United States; and

H. R. 3002. An act for the relief of George H. White Construction Co.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1479. An act for the relief of Joseph Bernstein; and

H. R. 2918. An act for the relief of Peter E. Kolesnikoff; ordered to be placed on the calendar.

THE MERCHANT MARINE—ADDRESS BY SENATOR MAGNUSON

[Mr. O'CONNOR asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address relative to the American merchant marine delivered by Senator MAGNUSON at Baltimore last week, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE LATE SENATOR CHAPMAN, OF KENTUCKY

[Mr. CLEMENTS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial from the Cynthiana (Ky.) Democrat, a resolution adopted by the Chamber of Commerce of Paris, Ky., and an introduction to a radio program sponsored by the Associated Industries of Kentucky on March 11, 1951, all paying tribute to the memory of the late Senator Virgil M. Chapman, of Kentucky, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE LATE SENATOR CHAPMAN, OF KENTUCKY

[Mr. CLEMENTS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial from the Kentuckian-Citizen, of Paris, Ky., and an editorial from the Oldham Era, of La Grange, Ky., paying tribute to the memory of the late Senator Chapman, of Kentucky, which appear in the Appendix.]

THE DEATH OF FRANKLIN DELANO ROOSEVELT—ARTICLE BY N. E. NICOLADIES

[Mr. NEELY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "The Calvary of the Great," by N. E. Nicoladies, published in the June issue of the Voice of KEPA, commenting on the death of Franklin Delano Roosevelt, which appears in the Appendix.]

FARM PRICES—EDITORIAL FROM GLENWOOD CITY (WIS.) TRIBUNE

[Mr. WILEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Critics Continue To Blame Farmers for Inflation," published in the Glenwood City (Wis.) Tribune of March 15, 1951, which appears in the Appendix.]

CONFIRMATION OF NOMINATION OF THOMAS FAIRCHILD TO BE UNITED STATES ATTORNEY FOR WESTERN DISTRICT OF WISCONSIN

[Mr. WILEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a statement prepared by him on the subject of the confirmation of the nomination of Hon. Thomas Fairchild to be United States attorney for the western district of Wisconsin, together with certain correspondence on the subject, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE RECORD OF THE SECOND DIVISION—LETTER BY PVT. WILLIAM N. YOUNG, JR.

[Mr. BREWSTER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a letter received from Pvt. William N. Young, Jr., relating to the record of the Second Division in Korea, which appears in the Appendix.]

SHIPMENTS OF WAR MATERIALS TO COMMUNIST CHINA AND KOREA

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. President, in connection with the introduction, on February 19, 1951, of a resolution urging the State Department to exert all efforts to persuade allied nations to discontinue shipments of war useful materials to Communist China and Korea, I inserted a statement giving figures on shipments by nations allied with us to Communist countries. Because of discrepancies in assembling certain of the figures for Great Britain some inaccuracies were included which I now wish to correct. The figures called for shipments of brass and copper alloys and of copper which should have been included in the \$2,118,000 given for nonferrous materials and manufactures.

Under the total of \$2,883,000 given for shipments of electrical goods and apparatus there should have been included the subtotals for cables, wires, and so forth, transmitters, radio and radar, telegraph and telephone equipment, and electrical instruments, which were listed separately.

In the same way figures given for commercial vehicles and rubber tires actually were included in the \$2,569,000 listed for vehicles. An item of \$93,125,000 for machinery should have been \$43,000,000. Thus the total figures of shipments from Great Britain should have been \$63,638,700 for the year 1950.

In justice to our British allies, I think the figures as corrected should be placed on the record, and I ask unanimous consent that a statement I have prepared be printed in the RECORD at this point.

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

Over \$10,000,000 worth of antibiotics manufactured by three leading United States drug firms were exported to Hong Kong and China during 1948, 1949, and 1950.

Senator HERBERT R. O'CONNOR (Democrat, of Maryland) revealed today that these figures were supplied by Merck & Co., Inc., Chas. Pfizer & Co., Inc., and E. R. Squibb & Sons. "These are only preliminary figures," said the Senator, "since other large drug manufacturing companies are being contacted for figures to round out the whole picture of shipment of antibiotics to our enemies."

In 1949, \$1,213,037 worth of penicillin and \$2,467,028 worth of streptomycin manufactured by these three companies were shipped to Hong Kong and China. In 1950 the shipments increased notably, with China and Hong Kong obtaining \$2,418,335 worth of penicillin and \$2,613,754 worth of streptomycin. Total of both drugs shipped to Hong Kong and China was \$1,331,825 in 1948, \$3,680,065 in 1949, and \$5,032,089 in 1950.

There have been persistent reports that the Chinese Communist Army used antibiotics to combat the recent epidemic of typhus among Chinese Red troops fighting in Korea.

"It is very revealing," said Senator O'CONNOR, "that these preliminary figures show a substantial increase during the year 1950, especially in light of the Korean war, which started June 25, 1950. It should be noted," the Senator said, "that these export sales during the periods in question followed United States Government export regulations on such trade. There is no apparent violation of any Government regulations, but the fact that the Government permitted the export of these critical drugs in huge quantities to our enemies, particularly during the last half of 1950, will require further exploration of this entire subject by the Subcommittee on Export Controls and Policies of the Senate Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee."

TRIBUTE TO THE LATE O. S. WARDEN, OF MONTANA

Mr. ECTON. Mr. President, Montana recently lost one of its most successful and influential citizens. O. S. Warden, of Great Falls, Mont., was a truly great publisher, but, more than that, he was one of Montana's pioneers.

Mr. Warden gave 60 years of his life in a devoted endeavor to make Montana a greater State. During those years of activity he was especially and primarily interested in good roads and the conservation of Montana resources. He was very influential in matters of reclamation pertaining not only to our great State, but to the entire Northwest.

On many occasions Mr. Warden came to Washington to appear before committees, and to advise with Members of the Senate, in connection with some of the most essential projects in the interest of the welfare of all the people. Those of us who were permitted to know him always enjoyed visiting with him, and his wise counsel and advice helped us in reaching many decisions in those matters.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "O. S. Warden, a Great Builder," which appeared in the Helena (Mont.) Independent-Record on March 14, 1951.

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

O. S. WARDEN, A GREAT BUILDER

Passing of Oliver S. Warden removed a great Montana builder whose constructive efforts dated from the closing of Territorial days and the advent of statehood for this Commonwealth. On his death at age 85, the Great Falls publisher was credited with more than 60 years of active participation in Montana progress.

Reared and educated in the East, Mr. Warden brought the thrifty ways of New England as a sound foundation for his career in Great Falls. As a young man he handled the business affairs of the first publishing venture he attempted with his partner, William Bole. His day started early and at night he often was seen on a high stool finishing the book work, long after the rest of the limited staff had retired. In those early days he drove himself until his health was threatened. When prosperity came with expansion of his publishing company, he continued his exacting schedule of office routine.

Mr. Warden never sought political office, nor would he put himself forward for any place of honor in his community. Only after persistent efforts by friends and businessmen

of his State or community would he consent to serve in a major role in any undertaking. But, once he had accepted, there was no limit to the time or finances he would personally give to the enterprise at hand.

Back in the early twenties, when his interest centered in better highways, his efforts soon became so outstanding that he was named chairman of the State highway commission. He vowed he would support the better-roads program until "we get Montana out of the mud." And, he did.

He devoted the same energy to reclamation and soon became the president of the National Reclamation Association. That position called for extensive travel throughout the country. There is no doubt that the contacts he made in that work speeded many Montana projects. It was fitting he should also serve on the State water conservation board, so that he could follow through on the broad knowledge of reclamation he had acquired in his national position.

During his years in highway and reclamation work, he found time to handle the duties of national Democratic committeeman for Montana; accept a directorship in the Associated Press; become a director of the National Chamber of Commerce; and take the lead in a wide variety of activities in Great Falls.

Great Falls schools, parks, streets, housing, charities, recreation, and many other projects had the benefit of his full support. One of his major accomplishments in the local field was the development of the North Montana State Fair. He insisted that a good fair plant should be built and paid for before the exposition opened. He wanted the venture to be on a paying status from the start. He would not permit a heavy debt as a handicap on such an undertaking. So, when the fair opened in the early thirties, it did so on a sound business basis. As president of the fair board, it was his pleasure to formally open the exposition which has proved an outstanding success.

Back in the early thirties, when the relief load was heavy, Mr. Warden was informed there was an acute need for warm clothing for many families. That report reached him on a cold winter day. He called his business and news staff for a special conference. He asked them to do whatever was necessary to assemble "ample warm clothing immediately." Within a few days dozens of truckloads of clothing had been assembled from Great Falls residents. But some special orders could not be filled from the collection. "Fill all orders, the Tribune will care for that, only make no mention of our part," was the instruction his associates received.

That was an example of the part he took in community affairs. He wanted action without personal acclaim.

It is not given to many men to live as full a life as did Mr. Warden. And not too many men acquire the ability he displayed for graciously assisting others. A host of admirers remain to honor his memory.

RECENT INCREASES IN FARM COSTS

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, as a part of its study of agricultural and food prices, reports some findings relative to recent increases in farm costs:

Production expenses have been on the increase. In 1950 they were 60 percent of the farmers' gross income as compared with 52 percent of the gross income in 1945.

I call attention of Senators to the table on page 1 of the statement I am about to offer for the RECORD wherein is

XCVII—172

shown the gross farm income for the years 1945 to 1950, both inclusive, also for the same period the production expenses, as well as the realized net income of farm operations and farm operator's net income in 1945 dollars.

It will be noted that with a gross income in 1945 of \$25,400,000,000 the net income for that year was \$12,800,000,000, whereas the gross income for 1950 was \$32,100,000,000, with a net income of \$13,500,000,000, but with net income of \$8,500,000,000 in terms of dollars with a 1945 purchasing power equivalent.

I wish also to call attention to the increased costs in certain categories of the things farmers need, as shown on page 2 of the statement. The percentage increase from 1945 to February 1951 as to items used in family living, was 46, in farm machinery it was 59, in building and fencing materials it was 70, and so on.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the entire statement by the committee be printed in the body of the RECORD following my remarks.

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

RECENT INCREASES IN FARM COSTS

The Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, as a part of its study of agricultural and food prices, reports the following findings relative to recent increases in farm costs:

Production expenses in 1950 were 60 percent of farmers' gross farm income, as compared with 52 percent of gross farm income in 1945.

As a result of rapid increases in production costs since 1945, farm operators' net farm income in 1950 was no higher than in 1945 before the general postwar increase in living costs and price levels. In terms of dollars with a 1945 purchasing power equivalent, farmers in 1950 had a net income of only \$8,500,000,000 as compared with \$12,800,000,000 5 years earlier. The net income of farm operators in 1950 would buy only two-thirds as much goods used by farm families for living purposes as in 1945. The detailed data for 1945 to 1950 follows:

Farm income and production expenses, 1945-50 (Billions of dollars)

	1945	1946	1947	1948	1949	1950
Gross farm income ¹	25.4	29.3	34.6	35.1	32.2	32.1
Production expenses.....	12.6	14.2	16.8	18.6	18.1	19.1
Realized net income of farm operators.....	12.8	15.1	17.8	16.5	15.9	13.0
Farm operators' net income in 1945 dollars ²	12.8	13.4	12.5	10.2	10.5	8.5

¹ Includes cash from marketings, Government payments, value of home consumption, and rental value of dwellings.

² Realized net income adjusted by index of prices paid for items used in farm family living.

Among the costs which have increased most, prices of farm machinery have increased 60 percent, while building and fencing materials increased 70 percent between 1945 and December 1950. Taxes paid by farmers also increased sharply—a total of 71 percent between 1945 and 1950. Prices paid by farmers for items used in family living and production, including interest, taxes, and wage rates of hired labor increased 46 percent between 1945 and February 1951. The percentage increase in selected items between 1945 and February 1951 and between

below:

June 1950 and February 1951 are shown

	Items used in family living	Farm machinery	Building and fencing materials	All items used in production	Taxes payable per acre	Wage rates for hired labor	Prices paid, interest, taxes, and wage rates
Increase 1945 to February 1951, percent.....	46	59	70	53	71	25	46
Increase June 1950 to February 1951, percent.....	19	12	8	9	4	5	8

¹ Increase June to December 1950; data for February not available.

INCOME AND EXPENSES PER FARM, 1950

Recent studies which separate the farms of the United States into economic classes based on size and investment make it possible to estimate the 1950 farm income and production expenses for the average farm in each economic class. This is done in the table shown below.

Estimated average net farm income by economic class, 1950¹

Economic class	Number, 1945	Percent of total	Gross income per farm	Production expenses per farm	Net income per farm ²
Large-scale farms.....	Thous- ands 102.1	2.4	\$51,610	\$34,992	\$16,618
Commercial-family farms:					
Large.....	408.9	9.6	13,797	7,616	6,181
Medium.....	1,173.0	27.5	6,130	3,188	2,942
Small.....	1,661.9	38.9	2,466	1,435	1,031
Small-scale farms.....	923.5	21.6	1,086	630	456
Total ³	4,269.4	100.0			

¹ Estimated from USDA Technical Bulletin 1019 and other BAE data.

² The operators' net farm income as estimated here is a return for the operators' labor, management, and investment. It is used for rental payments, family living, debt repayment and investment. Lack of data prevented adjustment for rentals paid by farm operators to landlords. Less than 40 percent of the large-scale and large family-farm operators are full owners. Approximately half of the operators of smaller farms are full owners.

³ In addition there were 1,489,500 small part-time and nominal farming units enumerated by the census in 1945.

We find that only 12 percent of the full-time farms in the United States were in the two largest-sized economic classes, i. e., large-scale and large-family farms where the average net farm income was \$6,000 or more in 1950. The operators of the medium-sized farms, 27.5 percent of all full-time farms, received net incomes which averaged \$2,942.

The smaller farms, i. e., small-family farms and small-scale units, were 60.5 percent of the total, with average net farm incomes of \$1,031 and \$456, respectively.

FARM INVESTMENTS AT ALL-TIME HIGH LEVELS

As pointed out above, the operator's net farm income is the return for both his labor during the year and his investment in real estate, machinery, livestock, and other equipment and supplies.

Farmers in 1950 had an investment in their farm and operating capital two to three times as large as in the prewar years. Much of this increase was due to rising price levels, but farmers today have larger physical quantities of machinery and livestock and better-equipped and more adequate buildings than in earlier years.

The full owner-operator of a large-family farm in 1950 in most parts of the United States had an investment of \$40,000 to \$80,000

in his farm plant. The comparable investment for the full owner-operator of a medium-sized family farm in 1950 was \$20,000 to \$40,000.

EASTER RECESS VACATION FOR HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 83), which was read by the legislative clerk, as follows:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That when the House adjourns on Thursday, March 22, 1951, it stand adjourned until 12 o'clock meridian Monday, April 2, 1951.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I move that the Senate concur in the resolution.

The motion was agreed to.

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. McFARLAND. 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	Hayden	Malone
Anderson	Hendrickson	Martin
Benton	Hennings	Maybank
Brewster	Hickenlooper	Millikin
Bricker	Hill	Monroney
Butler, Md.	Hoey	Mundt
Byrd	Holland	Murray
Calhoun	Humphrey	Neely
Capehart	Hunt	Nixon
Carlson	Ives	O'Connor
Case	Jenner	O'Mahoney
Chavez	Johnson, Colo.	Pastore
Clements	Johnson, Tex.	Robertson
Connally	Johnston, S. C.	Russell
Cordon	Kem	Saltonstall
Dirksen	Kerr	Schoeppel
Douglas	Kilgore	Smathers
Duff	Knowland	Smith, Maine
Dworshak	Langer	Smith, N. J.
Eastland	Lehman	Smith, N. C.
Eaton	Lodge	Stennis
Ellender	Long	Taft
Ferguson	McCarran	Underwood
Flanders	McCarthy	Watkins
Frear	McClellan	Wherry
Fulbright	McFarland	Wiley
George	McKellar	Williams
Gillette	McMahon	Young
Green	Magnuson	

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I announce that the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER] is absent on official committee business.

The Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN] is absent on official business.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] is necessarily absent.

The Senator from Utah [Mr. BENNETT], the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER], and the Senator from Idaho [Mr. WELKER] are absent on official business.

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] is absent on official business in attendance on the sessions of the Committee on Organized Crime in New York City.

The Senator from Minnesota [Mr. THYE] and the Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] are absent by leave of the Senate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. A quorum is present.

ASSIGNMENT OF GROUND FORCES TO DUTY IN THE EUROPEAN AREA

The Senate resumed the consideration of the resolution (S. Res. 99) approving the action of the President of the United States in cooperating in the common defense efforts of the North Atlantic Treaty nations.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, the question before us today is much broader than the question of whether the Senate shall endorse the policy of sending additional troops to Europe. In its essentials, the pending question is the same one we have been discussing and debating for the past several months. It is this: What policy will keep the peace and yet hold back the threat of aggression and slavery which presses against us and all the free world?

This question, in this form, haunts not only us, but all the free peoples of the free world. We must not lose sight of the fact that this is the real question, nor of the fact that this question must be resolved not only in this Nation, but in harmony with the other peoples and nations of the free world. Upon the correct solution of this problem rests, indeed, the present destiny of mankind.

Every program and proposal for specific action which comes before us must be related to the central question. Every undertaking here proposed must answer these two interconnected and undivorceable inquiries: Will it help to strengthen the force for peace, and will it help to strengthen the will for freedom?

Today we Americans, in company with all the peoples of the free world, must make our way along a narrow and dangerous path. That path—the path of decision—must avoid the pitfalls of disaster on either side; the pit of slavery through loss of liberty and the pit of world war with all its horrors. Between those two perils lies the middle road which we must follow.

Panic, impatience, fear, and hysteria are among the most dangerous obstacles immediately in our way. Fear of the dangers on one side of us can drive us recklessly to disaster on the other. But this need not and must not be. We can find—and will find—the middle way.

In weighing the policy required by our present perils the first question must not be what will most assist us in waging war but rather what will most assist us to prevent war. The second question must not be what will longest delay the loss of our liberties but rather what will most help to stem and turn back the tides of tyranny and secure more firmly than ever the priceless blessings of liberty.

The question of troops for Europe can thus be answered only after we have answered the basic questions. Once we have answered these, the matter of troops for Europe becomes almost a simple matter of means.

Proceeding quickly to the heart of the problem, we must say whether we believe in the concept of collective security. Do we believe that the only path to peace and freedom lies in a strong and unified free world, or do we believe in a policy of each for himself and let the devil take

the hindmost? Do we believe that the United States can remain free and strong in a world completely taken over and subjected by Soviet tyranny, or do we believe that our own freedom and security are inextricably linked with the freedom and security of the rest of the free world?

It seems to me—and this is an article of faith with me—that our freedom is inseparable from the freedom of the peoples of the rest of the world. It seems to me that our security depends to a major and inescapable extent on the security of Western Europe and the other vital areas of the free world. Our security depends fully as much on the peoples of Western Europe as their security depends on us.

First of all, we must see clearly that a policy of withdrawal, retreat, and isolation—which is the inevitable alternative to full collective security—will certainly reduce by a critical number the people who stand with us for the values which we call the rights of man and the institutions based on those values. This is what we call western civilization.

Western civilization was cradled in Europe. From there those values spread west, south, and east. The people of Western Europe have struggled through countless generations for those values. The 200,000,000 people of Western Europe know both the meaning and the worth of freedom.

To turn our backs on these people, on these areas from which freedom sprang, strikes me as being altogether unthinkable. If Western Europe falls under Soviet control, freedom is the first casualty. The extinction of freedom in Western Europe would strike a violent blow at the cause of all freedom. By that much would our own freedom be diminished and its eventual fate sealed.

I must emphasize what I think we are inclined to overlook or to forget—that the 200,000,000 people of Western Europe are, along with us, the chief adherents of the values of western civilization. There are few other groups of people in the world outside this hemisphere who truly know and truly appreciate those values.

The concept of the inalienable rights of man, the concept to which we pledge our lives and fortunes, has few enough—too few—tried and experienced adherents in the world. We must, at all costs and in the face of all difficulties, cling to those who share that concept with us if we would see our principles prevail against the false doctrines of world communism.

The challenge to us today is to expand the area of freedom, and not to permit that area to be narrowed and cut down. Freedom cannot be defended by retreat and withdrawal behind a wall, however high. Enclosed and restricted, freedom languishes and dies. The pages of history bear undeniable testimony to this fact.

These are the ideological reasons against abandonment of Western Europe, and for a policy of intimate cooperation with Western Europe in the defense of that area.

I know that some of us are inclined to dismiss ideological considerations as

being of less validity than immediate, practical, and strategic considerations. I disagree with that attitude. Without question, in the great struggle in which we are engaged, we must be physically strong; the pending question is directed to the building up of physical strength. But I insist that unless our banners are clearly inscribed with the name of freedom, and unless we keep constantly in mind the spiritual values for which we strive, our physical strength will, in the end, be spears of straw and swords of glass and cannot possibly prevail.

Of course, it is true that we must weigh the practical and strategic considerations. Those considerations have been frequently referred to in the course of the debates in this body. They point inevitably to the conclusion that the assumption by Soviet Russia of control over the peoples and resources of Western Europe would be to our terrible and fatal disadvantage, from the sheer viewpoint of strength in a world in which our own strength would be pitted against the strength of the Soviet Union.

There is, first of all, the matter of the technological skills of the people of Western Europe. These people are, except for us, the most technologically skilled, experienced, and equipped of any people in the world. Indeed, it has been only within fairly recent years that our own people have outstripped Western Europeans in this field. To abandon these people to the control and exploitation of the Kremlin would be to abandon to Soviet Russia an irreplaceable resource, a priceless advantage.

Of course, we cannot consider the people of Western Europe a mere resource to be used for our own advantage. But their skills are a priceless resource when added to ours in common dedication to a common cause—the freedom and security and peace—of the world.

Mr. President, I said "peace." This we must never forget. The people of Europe, like us, shrink from war. They shrink especially from war that can possibly be prevented. They have felt war. They know war. The grim reminders of war stare at them in the still-evident rubble of their cities and the devastation of their countryside. The widows and the orphans, the refugees, and the homeless know of the consequences of war. They do not want to fight, if it can possibly be avoided. It is to avoid war, and to prevent it if at all possible, that they are willing to build up and expand their armaments and their defenses, to join in a common effort, with us, to preserve the peace, through strength.

They are willing to defend their freedom and their homes and cities, if it should prove necessary to defend them against Soviet aggression—as long as they are not asked to stand alone, as long as the mighty power of this country is arrayed without reservation at their side. They believe, they pray, and they hope—and we must share this belief, prayer, and hope—that such a posture of defense will discourage and dissuade Soviet Russia from aggression.

They are not willing to be used as pawns, or to have their countries used as a bombing pit, in a contest between

American air power and Soviet ground power. They do not consider our Air Force an unqualified guaranty of their security. They do not wish to be occupied, and then liberated by destruction from the air. We must appreciate that they live in the immediate danger area. The threat is real and close by. Their willingness to join with us in a common and shared defense of Western Europe is, in itself, a mark of courage and resolution.

Mr. President, these countries are moving, at an accelerated pace, to build up their armed forces. I am convinced that they are doing, and will continue to do, their full part. We must do ours. Our assistance in that defense is not an act of philanthropy on our part. It is an inescapable obligation on our part, not only by treaty but by the hard facts of history.

Today the power of Soviet Russia dominates the European Continent. Nothing which the nations of Western Europe, impoverished and bled white by two previous world wars, and stripped of much of their colonial empires, could possibly do in the measurable future could restore the balance of power on the Continent. Only the power of the United States, added to that of Western Europe, can redress that balance. The other side of this coin is the fact that the power and resources of Western Europe, added to those of Soviet Russia, would dangerously and fatally tilt the balance of power against us.

The figures on the steel capacity of Western Europe, the fabricating capacity, the coal, zinc, and other resources have been cited. We know that these resources, in the hands of Soviet Russia, would make our productive capacity, which is the greatest source of our national strength, no longer a dominating factor in the balance of world power. If such a development came to pass, Russia would not only have a productive capacity rivaling ours, but would also be in a position to deny to us access to essential resources which are vital to our industrial needs.

We know, finally, if we recall any history at all, that we could not possibly avoid involvement in war with Russia, if the Soviet Union should attempt to take over all of Western Europe. Twice in this century, Mr. President, we have become involved in wars in Europe, despite a conscientious determination to stay out of them. We know as clearly as we know anything that we could not stand aloof if Russia took over Western Europe.

Hence, we have no real alternative. Our only possible course—our only hope of avoiding a war in which the odds would be against us—is to strive to prevent a war and to maintain and strengthen the forces of the free world which, collectively and potentially, still outweigh those of the Soviet slave world.

The question of sending troops to Europe is a question of the means required to achieve an absolutely essential end. I think that our military leaders must provide the guidance upon the basis of which we must act in this matter. I feel a great confidence in General Marshall, and our General Staff, and in General Eisenhower in these matters. If we do

not trust their judgment in these matters, whose judgment shall we trust?

General Eisenhower feels that a strong and effective force can be built up in Western Europe, strong enough to deter Soviet aggression and effective in meeting Soviet aggression, if it should occur. General Eisenhower feels that such a force would be a force for peace and also a force for freedom. As part of this force, General Eisenhower has recommended a strong component of American ground troops.

Mr. President, I am ready and willing, and I think this country is ready and willing, to support General Eisenhower's recommendations. The Department of Defense, headed by that wise and great man, that peace-loving man, General Marshall, supports and endorses General Eisenhower's recommendations. So, too, does the State Department. And so, too, does the President of the United States. Do we need more evidence of support? Well, then, let the Senate of the United States indicate its support. I trust and hope that such support will be indicated by an overwhelming vote.

I think that in this debate we must take note of the fact that General Eisenhower has already worked well-nigh a miracle in Europe. He has inspired confidence among the peoples of Western Europe—confidence in his leadership, confidence in us, and confidence in themselves. He has brought about a measure of unity, resolution, and determination not there before he undertook his historic mission. He has brought hope—hope for peace, hope for security, and hope for the preservation of freedom. He has succeeded, where perhaps none other might have, in obtaining among the governments and peoples of Europe an agreement to establish a unified defense force in Europe, under his command.

Mr. President, in our absorption with the debate over whether we should permit our troops to operate as part of an international force under General Eisenhower's command, we must keep in mind that the European governments have had to overcome ancient prejudices and the fears of their people in agreeing to the formation of such an army, under the command of an American—an army of which their nationals will furnish by far the largest components. This was a miracle—indeed, a historic miracle. It can be counted a historic step forward in the general direction of the eventual formation of an international police force under the United Nations. That, at least, may be our hope.

Mr. President, the immediate question is whether we, in the United States Senate, shall express our approval of the decision of the President and of the executive branch of the Government to send ground troops for an integrated defense force under General Eisenhower's command.

It is a question of approval, not of law. We have already ratified the Atlantic Pact and passed the Military Assistance Act. We have made appropriations, and have more to make.

Although I am no lawyer, nor an expert on constitutional questions, I do recall some history. I recall—it was within

the span of my own memory—when in 1900 the President of the United States, William McKinley, on the recommendation of his Secretary of State, John Hay, but without the authorization of Congress, sent into China an expeditionary force to form a part of an international force which conducted a full-scale war against insurgent and regular Chinese forces.

That force was placed under the command of a Prussian general. It was an international force, and included contingents of German, French, Russian, Japanese, and British troops, among others. American troops functioned under that international command as a part of that force.

No distinction was made at that time between sending our troops into action as independent units or sending them into action as a part of an international force. There was no real distinction.

But today we hear the voices of some learned Members of this body arguing that, although the President might have the constitutional power to send troops abroad, he does not have the power to send them abroad as a part of an international force, even though the top commander, in the present instance, is our great General Eisenhower.

Some weeks ago, these same distinguished Members of the Senate were arguing that the President had no power at all to send troops abroad under any conditions. They said it was illegal for the President to send troops abroad under any conditions until Congress had given its consent. I am a layman, but I find no law or logic in this position. They apparently found it so, too, because they have shifted ground, reversed their field—not once but several times—and now base their argument on the international-force aspects.

Well, I would refer them to the China Boxer incident, which I have just cited. I would like to recall a few other circumstances from this same Boxer Rebellion. The Chinese forces of that day were defeated after some months of fighting. A pact of peace and settlement was signed, the so-called Boxer Protocol, by 12 nations, including China. Yet there was no challenge that I recall to the President's authority to send this force to engage in this operation, which was of such scope and magnitude that its conclusion resulted in a far-reaching peace settlement. That protocol, incidentally, was never submitted to the Senate for ratification. Yet it resulted in consequences of tremendous historical import.

A part of the pattern of our far-eastern policy was further set, at about the same time, by the famous open-door-policy statement by Secretary of State Hay. Nor was this declaration, which still today forms an essential part of American policy, submitted to the Senate for its approval or consent.

I cite this historical precedent—it is one of many, and there are other Senators better qualified than I to discuss this phase of the question—to indicate my belief that there is every historical

sanction for the exercise by the President of plenary powers in regard to sending troops to Europe, under international command.

So far as I am concerned, Mr. President, I reject the implication that the President is required or should be required, as a matter of law, to submit to the Senate for its approval the question of exactly how many troops should be sent to Europe.

The responsibility is the President's. It is, in my judgment, bad government for the Congress to undertake, at this point in our history, to attempt to legislate on matters involving the constitutional prerogatives of the Executive, and on which, by logic and reason, the Executive must exercise his discretion, based on information which can be available only to him, and to meet the exigencies of the moment. The country can pass its judgment upon his acts at the polls. The Congress has its opportunity for review in the course of making appropriations.

There may be better procedures, but that is the procedure which our Constitution and our historical experience have found best suited for this country.

So far as the pending resolution is concerned, I am ready to vote to express the sense of the Senate that the policy our Government is following in implementing the Atlantic Pact is a sound and constructive one. Such an expression would help consolidate sentiment in this country and would encourage the free world.

I would vote to express the sense of the Senate that the President should consult and collaborate with the appropriate committees, representing the Congress, on the measures he and the executive branch plan to implement our policy. That would also promote national confidence and unity.

But I would oppose language in a resolution which places a limitation on the discretion of the Executive. I disapprove language which directs the Chief Executive to do something which is properly within his discretion. I see little purpose in language which directs the President to consult with his own proper advisers. I certainly oppose language which implies a legal obligation on the President's part to do something which the President cannot by law be obliged to do.

Let us adopt a proper resolution expressing the sense of the Senate on these matters. Let us say what we mean and mean what we say. Let us tell our own people and the world what we mean. Above all, however, let us not tie the hands of those in whom sole and final responsibility is placed, under the Constitution, by law, and by necessity. That would be the sure way to delay, deadlock, and disaster.

Mr. CAIN obtained the floor.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for an insertion?

Mr. CAIN. I ask unanimous consent that, without prejudice to my right to the floor, I may yield to the Senator from New Jersey for that purpose.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the Senator from New Jersey is recognized.

RESOLUTIONS ADOPTED BY THE CHAMBER OF COMMERCE OF GLEN ROCK, N. J.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, out of order, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the body of the RECORD in connection with my remarks the following resolutions passed on March 13 by the Chamber of Commerce of Glen Rock, N. J.:

First. Resolution having to do with the recent Supreme Court decision declaring the State of Wisconsin antistrike law unconstitutional.

Second. Resolution opposing levying of taxes by the State of New York on income earned in New York by New Jersey residents.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, why should the Senator place those resolutions in the body of the RECORD?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I thought that, under the rule, resolutions were printed in the body of the RECORD.

Mr. CONNALLY. I do not object to their being printed in the Appendix, but I think it improper to fill up the body of the RECORD with matters not germane to the unfinished business of the Senate.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, in view of the statement by the Senator from Texas, I amend my request, and ask unanimous consent that the resolutions may be inserted in the Appendix.

Mr. CONNALLY. To that I shall certainly agree. I do not object to their being placed in the Appendix.

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

[The resolutions presented by Mr. SMITH of New Jersey appear in the Appendix.]

REPORT OF TARIFF COMMITTEE OF NEW JERSEY BLUEBERRY FARMERS ASSOCIATION

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Washington yield to me for a moment?

Mr. CAIN. I yield with the same understanding.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, the officers and directors of the New Jersey Blueberry Farmers Association of Pemberton, N. J., have requested that I bring to the attention of my distinguished colleagues in the Senate the extreme hardship that threatens the cultivated blueberry farming enterprise in New Jersey because of the existing low tariff on their products.

I send to the desk for appropriate reference, the report submitted by the Tariff Committee of the New Jersey Blueberry Farmers Association, and I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The report will be referred to the Committee on

Finance and will be printed in the Appendix, as requested.

[The report presented by Mr. HENDRICKSON appears in the Appendix.]

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Washington yield for that purpose?

Mr. CAIN. I yield, provided I do not thereby lose the floor.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from New Jersey suggests the absence of a quorum. The clerk will call the roll.

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

Aiken	Hayden	Malone
Anderson	Hendrickson	Martin
Benton	Hennings	Maybank
Brewster	Hickenlooper	Millikin
Brieker	Hill	Monroney
Butler, Md.	Hoey	Mundt
Byrd	Holland	Murray
Cain	Humphrey	Neely
Capehart	Hunt	Nixon
Carlson	Ives	O'Connor
Case	Jenner	O'Mahoney
Chavez	Johnson, Colo.	Pastore
Clements	Johnson, Tex.	Robertson
Connally	Johnston, S. C.	Russell
Cordon	Kem	Saltonstall
Dirksen	Kerr	Schoeppel
Douglas	Kilgore	Smathers
Duff	Knowland	Smith, Maine
Dworshak	Langer	Smith, N. J.
Eastland	Lehman	Smith, N. C.
Eaton	Lodge	Stennis
Ellender	Long	Taft
Ferguson	McCarran	Underwood
Flanders	McCarthy	Watkins
Frear	McClellan	Wherry
Fulbright	McFarland	Wiley
George	McKellar	Williams
Gillette	McMahon	Young
Green	Magnuson	

The VICE PRESIDENT. A quorum is present. The Senator from Washington has the floor.

CONFIRMATION OF NOMINATIONS IN THE ARMED FORCES

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

Mr. CAIN. I gladly yield to the Senator from Georgia.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, as in the executive session, from the Senate Committee on Armed Services I report certain routine nominations in the armed services, none of them being above the rank of lieutenant colonel, and I ask unanimous consent that they may be confirmed. By following this course a considerable saving in printing will be made.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, as in the executive session, the nominations are confirmed, and without objection, the President will be notified.

Mr. RUSSELL. I thank the Senator from Washington.

Mr. CAIN. The Senator from Georgia is more than welcome.

ASSIGNMENT OF GROUND FORCES TO DUTY IN THE EUROPEAN AREA

The Senate resumed the consideration of the resolution (S. Res. 99) approving the action of the President of the United States in cooperating in the common defense efforts of the North Atlantic Treaty nations.

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, as a Member of the Senate Committee on Armed Services, as a veteran of the last war, and a presently active member of the Reserve Corps of the Army of the United States, the junior Senator from Washington rises to oppose Senate Resolution 99, which is pending, and Senate Concurrent Resolution 18, which is on the Senate calendar. I do not take lightly the task of opposing what appears to be a majority approval in the Senate of the resolutions. Certainly I do not relish opposing the views of many of the Senators with whom I sat for many days when the Committee on Foreign Relations and the Committee on Armed Services were sitting jointly and the resolutions were being considered. There is, however, no course left open to me than that of striving, as one American, to work for instruments and commitments which are far better and far more effective than are those which are before the Senate at this time.

There are three reasons because of which the junior Senator from Washington must oppose and would oppose the pending resolution, even though he had reason to believe that his voice would be the only one to register a dissent.

The first reason is that I cannot vote to support anything less than a joint resolution or a bill which would commit American forces in peacetime to an international army. Such a measure, when approved by Congress and signed by the President, becomes the law of the land. The pending resolution is merely an expression of opinion and of a pious hope by the Senate. The concurrent resolution on the Calendar is simply an expression of opinion and of a pious hope by Congress. In my opinion, neither of these resolutions is adequate to the task of establishing by Congress a policy authorizing the Executive to use American forces in peacetime. It is clear to me that this question must and can be decided only by Congress.

My second reason is this: I will not support any further implementation of the North Atlantic Pact until we have reason to believe that membership in the pact will shortly be opened to admit within the so-called North Atlantic community other European nations whose resources and manpower are required if we are to construct a reasonable and effective defense establishment, and whose determination is to work with the North Atlantic Pact nations if they are ever provided with an opportunity to do so.

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

Mr. CAIN. I am very pleased to yield.

Mr. BREWSTER. Has the attention of the Senator from Washington been called to the statement of Mr. Davies, the Under Secretary for Foreign Affairs of the British Parliament, in an address on the floor of the British House of Commons, in which he said, "England can defend Western Europe without the assistance of Spain"? Has that statement come to the attention of the Senator from Washington?

Mr. CAIN. I have been aware of the gentleman's statement. I can only say that from my own point of view it is not reasonable to think that it is possible to defend Western Europe, in the event of a large-scale war, without utilizing the resources of Spain. I think that in the event of a future war of any kind in that area, it would not be possible to protect freedom throughout the world without utilizing the courage, capacity, and resources of the entire Iberian Peninsula.

Mr. BREWSTER. Has the Senator ever heard any expression from any responsible military authority as to the profound significance of Spain in any military operations in Europe, with particular reference both to the Mediterranean and the location of the Pyrenees?

Mr. CAIN. I am privileged to be a member of the Committee on Armed Services, which sat with the Committee on Foreign Relations in taking testimony from the military authorities to whom the Senator from Maine has referred. Further along in my statement I hope to answer the Senator's question conclusively and affirmatively, because I think the RECORD ought to show once and for all what are the military judgments, particularly of our own military leaders, with reference to the question of the Iberian Peninsula.

Mr. BREWSTER. Do they always finally come to the conclusion that political factors are involved, regarding which, of course, they are not allowed to speak? Is that how our military friends finally release themselves from responsibility and advice?

Mr. CAIN. I think I ought to say that every military authority with whom I have had an opportunity to converse or to whom I have listened has instantaneously answered any question about Spain by saying that the sooner we can do business with that nation the better off this country and the world will be.

Mr. BREWSTER. Does the Senator's further discussion take account of apparently an official report yesterday that Spain was ready to supply troops for European defense if matériel were furnished?

Mr. CAIN. Yes, I intend to reflect on that statement as I have recently read it in the press and studied it. I shall gladly support any real collective effort throughout the North Atlantic community, but neither now nor in the future will I vote for anything which does not contemplate utilizing every ounce of determination, courage, and power which is available within the North Atlantic community. There is no reason today to believe that the excluded nations are any closer to being admitted to the North Atlantic Pact than was the case in April 1949, when the North Atlantic Pact was signed by representatives of the member nations.

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

Mr. CAIN. I am pleased to yield.

Mr. KEM. I should like to ask the Senator from Washington if he has directed his attention to the fact that the

members of the North Atlantic community are supplying Russia, her satellites, and Communist China with war matériel and war goods?

Mr. CAIN. I have been so told. That appears to be the common understanding.

Mr. KEM. Does the Senator feel that such is a proper course to follow under the circumstances?

Mr. CAIN. I think it is a course which, if it is being followed now, and continues to be followed, will lead to the suicide of freedom. Presently, to the extent to which it is being done, it has already resulted in needless deaths of American young men and of young men of our allies in Korea.

Mr. KEM. Evidence has been offered on the floor of the Senate to that effect by the Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND], the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY], and the Senator from Missouri. So far as I know, the evidence has never been controverted and the statements have never been denied. Has the Senator from Washington learned of any contradictions of such statements or evidence at any time from official sources?

Mr. CAIN. I have never heard any contradiction from an authoritative source. Mr. President, permit me to say that the junior Senator from Washington has put together a statement which will probably take an hour or more to deliver. He thinks it is the most proper thing in the world to take as much time as may be required to make the statement, while yielding at any time to any other Senator for any question concerning the pending issue. A very distinguished Member of this body said to me this morning—and I do not know that he shares my view entirely—"Senator, we are presently engaged in the greatest battle of this century." I very strongly share his view.

There may be Senators, with far greater knowledge than I have, who have reason to disagree. If so, I hope they will rise and disagree with me. In that way a record will go to the American people of what they have not yet had out of this debate. They will have before them all the facts of this tremendously difficult, complicated, and fundamental question which presents itself at this time.

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

Mr. CAIN. I am pleased to yield to the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. WHERRY. Does not the distinguished Senator from Washington feel that many questions have been asked on the floor of the Senate in the past 3 or 4 days of debate which have not been answered and have not been clarified relative to the meaning of terms and provisions contained in both resolutions? I refer specifically to paragraph—

Mr. CAIN. I believe the Senator has reference to section 6.

Mr. WHERRY. No. I refer to paragraph 5. The question was raised yesterday afternoon. I do not wish to interrupt the continuity of the Senator's address. I agree that we are engaged in a historic debate. We are about to adopt a resolution which morally, at

least, states the sense of the Senate. Article 5 provides:

5. The Senate herewith approves the understanding that the major contribution to the ground forces under General Eisenhower's command should be made by the European members of the North Atlantic Treaty—

And so forth. I ask the distinguished Senator from Washington what understanding is there referred to? Is it the understanding reached at Brussels? If so, where is that understanding? If it is an understanding which came from the Security Council under article 9, what are the recommendations? The Senator from Washington is a member of the Armed Services Committee.

I mention one question which has been raised. It was debated for nearly an hour yesterday afternoon. There was no answer to that question, and no proponent of the resolution stood on his feet and attempted to define what the understanding was. It may be a very simple matter to clarify; but, so far as I am concerned, if there has been an understanding or agreement reached by the Department of State at the Brussels Conference, I think such agreement ought to be available for the consideration of the Senate. We ought to know what the understanding is, what we are going to do, what they are going to do, and so forth.

I ask the distinguished Senator from Washington that question because of the observation which he made that someone had stopped him and said, "This is a historic debate." To me it is a historic debate. We want to be sure what we are doing. If there are any understandings, we ought to have them before us so that we may consider them.

Mr. CAIN. Permit me to answer the question as best I can. I recall that a similar question was posed to General Eisenhower when he made his own observations and findings available to the Congress and to committees of the Senate. General Eisenhower said—and I am satisfied in my own mind that he meant what he said, if in due time he has the authority to carry out his own wishes—that, so far as he was concerned, and he thought the European nations were in accord with his views, the European nations would contribute the bulk or the major share of the land forces of the international army.

General Eisenhower is both frank and honest. He went on to say: "If you gentlemen will encourage and permit me to return in about 6 months, I hope then to do what I cannot do today, namely, answer your questions."

I can only conclude, not having seen any documents to the contrary, that any such understandings thus far referred to are mere generalities, and that they have yet to take on substance and form.

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

Mr. CAIN. I yield.

Mr. BREWSTER. Does the Senator feel that under our constitutional processes no commitment could be made regarding that matter by the President, which would be binding upon the Congress or the country?

Mr. CAIN. The President, the Secretary of State, and the Secretary of Defense have told us, as I understand their position, that no commitments have been made. I believe that a generality is not a commitment. I think there has thus far been much conversation which has not been translated into any concrete plan or commitment. I must feel that way, because to feel otherwise would be to doubt the words of the responsible public agents who have already told us that no commitments have been made. For my part, I think it is necessary to accept their words at face value.

Mr. BREWSTER. Does the Senator's statement apply to the so-called Brussels agreement? Does he consider that it was anything more than a loose discussion?

Mr. CAIN. Never having seen the results of the Brussels Conference committed to paper, I can only assume, for the reason I have just stated, that it consisted of a group of men sitting around and saying, in effect, "These are the plans we ought to think about and agree to at a later date."

Mr. BREWSTER. Does the Senator from Washington distinguish between the Presidential powers in time of active war and in time of so-called peace, to effectuate binding agreements?

Mr. CAIN. The Senator from Washington can only state his own point of view. The Senator from Washington is opposing the pending resolution for several reasons. The first reason, and the fundamental reason, is that the Senator from Washington thinks the policy involved must be determined by the Congress. Bear in mind that the President had nothing to do with getting this resolution before us. By his conduct up to this time he has publicly indicated that though it is nice to give the Senate any opportunity it may wish to consider this question, he believes that he has within his own power all the authority required to implement the Atlantic Pact by contributing American forces to an international army in peacetime.

I shall spend a fair part of this afternoon not only in disagreeing with the Executive, but in doing the best I can to prove that, however well-intentioned the President may have been, he was totally and injuriously wrong so far as the future welfare and security of America are concerned.

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

Mr. CAIN. I am pleased to yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. If that is the way the Senator feels about the proposal now before the Senate, is not the only way to give the consent of the Congress by a joint resolution?

Mr. CAIN. The Senator from Michigan was not present a few minutes ago when the Senator from Washington expressed as his own view that he could support only a joint resolution or a bill, because in the opinion of the junior Senator from Washington, however strongly worded a Senate resolution or concurrent resolution may be, it actually constitutes nothing more than an expression of hope.

Mr. FERGUSON. So when the resolution declares that the approval of Con-

gress should be obtained, the Senator believes, does he not, that those words mean a joint resolution or a bill passed by both Houses?

Mr. CAIN. From my point of view we are faced with a policy decision. After that decision has been made, the Congress must authorize the executive branch of the Government to take a given course of action.

Mr. FERGUSON. I should like to ask another question, if the Senator will yield.

Mr. CAIN. I am glad to yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. From the standpoint of parliamentary procedure, a bill is the same as a joint resolution. A bill and a joint resolution are one and the same thing, under different names. We find that they must be read three times in the Senate, and then passed according to the parliamentary rules.

Mr. CAIN. So I understand.

Mr. FERGUSON. They can be amended in any way. There are no rules of relevancy so far as amendments are concerned. Does the Senator appreciate that when a concurrent resolution comes from a committee, it cannot be amended so as to make it a joint resolution?

Mr. CAIN. I understand that. The junior Senator from Washington took up that very question with the Parliamentarian. The Parliamentarian stated that in that sense the resolution was not subject to amendment, which is to say that we could not make a joint resolution or a bill out of a Senate resolution or a concurrent resolution which had been reported to the Senate by the appropriate committee.

Mr. FERGUSON. So when the members of the two committees, sitting jointly and acting as legislative committees, did not vote to report to the Senate a joint resolution, they took from the Senate the right to consider either of these resolutions as a joint resolution or a bill.

Mr. CAIN. What happened, as I understand, was that the action of the committees gave to the Senate only the right to have offered on the floor a joint resolution, and begin all over again.

Mr. FERGUSON. While a joint resolution can be amended, a concurrent resolution cannot be changed into a law at all.

Mr. CAIN. That is my understanding, sir.

Mr. WHERRY. Will the Senator yield to me further at that point?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HOEY in the chair). Does the Senator from Washington yield to the Senator from Nebraska?

Mr. CAIN. I will yield to the Senator from Nebraska at any time he rises and asks that I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. As I understand what the distinguished Senator from Washington is now saying, and also what the distinguished Senator from Michigan is now saying, is that the adoption of Senate Resolution 99, which we call a simple Senate resolution, or the adoption of a concurrent resolution, will not be the adoption of a measure having the force and legal effect of law. In order to enact

a law, it is necessary that Congress pass a bill or joint resolution.

Mr. CAIN. That is my understanding.

Mr. WHERRY. Only a moral obligation would be created by the Senate by the adoption of Senate Resolution 99 and by the Congress, by the adoption of the concurrent resolution by both Houses. Is that correct?

Mr. CAIN. The Senator is quite correct.

Mr. WHERRY. Does the Senator feel it would be better to adopt the concurrent resolution, so that both Houses then would be partners in this moral commitment, rather than to adopt merely the Senate resolution, which would be only an expression of the feeling of the Senate, and binding only to that extent?

Mr. CAIN. My feeling has two aspects. The only possible way that Congress will have to express itself on this issue is through the concurrent resolution. The junior Senator from Washington is going to vote against the concurrent resolution, but certainly he hopes that a majority of the Members of the Senate, if they are going to vote affirmatively for our participation in a peacetime European army, will vote for the concurrent resolution, because I agree with the Senator from Texas and with various other Senators that the concurrent resolution has within it the strength of public opinion. That public opinion is not, nor can it ever be, binding on the executive branch of the Government. For that reason I must vote against it. But I am perfectly willing to say, as the Senator from Texas has said, that it has some virtue which the Senate resolution, in my opinion, does not possess.

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

Mr. CAIN. Yes.

Mr. WHERRY. Paragraph 6 of Senate Resolution 99 provides:

It is the sense of the Senate that, in the interests of sound constitutional processes, and of national unity and understanding, congressional approval should be obtained of any policy—

Is it not the Senator's interpretation that even if the Senate resolution shall be adopted, before the policy can be said to have received congressional approval both Houses of Congress must give their approval to the policy by acting on a joint measure?

Mr. CAIN. That is my view. If the concurrent resolution is adopted it will say, "Before further involvements are agreed to in Europe, insofar as a change of policy is concerned, the Executive should confer with the Congress." The President will exercise his own judgment, irrespective of the concurrent resolution, as to whether he wants to confer with the Congress or does not want to do so.

The junior Senator from Washington feels that, in view of the policy question now confronting us, the Executive—and I say this with no reference to the present occupant of the White House, for I would feel as deeply about the matter were the President a Republican—must be authorized to do what he wishes to do, or in the absence of such authorization, he has no right to do anything in that connection at all.

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

Mr. CAIN. I yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. The Senator has indicated that he agrees with the Senator from Texas that the concurrent resolution is an expression of public opinion, but has no binding or legal effect upon the President.

Mr. CAIN. That is my theory.

Mr. FERGUSON. But there is a way to express public opinion with legal effect, and that is by the passage of a bill or a joint resolution.

Mr. CAIN. We are in complete agreement.

Mr. President, I have previously stated two of the three reasons why I will not feel able to support the pending resolution. My third reason is this. I will not vote for a further involvement in Western Europe until the United Nations has decided on a course of action in Korea which the American people can understand and approve. Until the fire of aggression in Korea has been stamped out, there is little point, as I see it, in committing American forces to Europe. One thing we ought to understand is that war is not likely in Europe in the immediate or near future. If war comes to Europe in this period, what can we, as presently prepared, do about it? One thing we know is that at this moment America and other friendly nations are heavily engaged in a bloody and difficult war in Korea. There is no reason for us to spend America's energy and strength in Europe until we victoriously prove our energy and strength in Korea in concert with other allied friends. The challenge to freedom lies today in Korea, not in Western Europe.

Eighty-two Senators voted to ratify the North Atlantic Treaty. The act of ratification took place on July 21, 1949. The junior Senator from Washington was among those Senators who voted for that treaty. Despite my feeling then that it was extremely unwise to provide that all 12 member nations must vote affirmatively to take in a new member, and despite my conviction that Spain, Turkey, and Greece ought to have been parties to the pact from the beginning, I voted for the treaty because I believed it to be a strong step in the direction of peace. I was impressed in those days, not so long ago, by the assurances given so strongly by the administration that the defects of the treaty were recognized, and that answers would soon be found for its weaknesses. I was impressed by what the President said in his letter of transmittal when he forwarded the North Atlantic Treaty to the Senate for consideration. The President stated:

Together, our joint strength is of tremendous significance to the future of freemen in every part of the world. For this treaty is clear evidence that differences in language and economic and political systems are no real bar to the effective association of nations devoted to the great principles of human freedom and justice.

I could only believe that language to mean that American leadership would soon demand participation in the pact by European or North Atlantic community nations which were not offered membership at the outset.

The President's message was read to us in the Senate on April 7, 1949, just 2 years ago. The Secretary of State transmitted the North Atlantic Treaty to the President of the United States on that day in April of 1949 when the President sent the treaty to the Senate. In his letter to the President, the Secretary of State said:

It is clear that a collective defense arrangement of this matter, in order to be fully effective, should be participated in by as many countries as are in a position to further the democratic principles upon which the treaty is based and to contribute to the security of the North Atlantic area and as are prepared to undertake the necessary responsibilities.

That letter was written 2 years ago.

Here, too, a responsible American executive agent assured the Senate and the Nation that the Atlantic Pact members would soon look for help and participation from any North Atlantic community nations which were able and willing to offer and to contribute such help.

Mr. President, that declaration was made 2 years ago. I am partly in opposition to these pending resolutions because, however difficult the political situations have been, how tragic it is that so little progress has been made, as against those glowing and promising words.

Since the treaty was signed and ratified in 1949, conditions have become more serious throughout the world. War has been going on in Korea for almost 9 months. Aggression threatens to break out in any number of places throughout the world. One would have thought that every effort would have been made in these past 2 years to consolidate and coordinate the strength which is so obviously possessed by the free nations in Europe and elsewhere. In the last 2 years, brave and noble words have been spoken, conferences have been held on hundreds of occasions in a great many places; but I say to you, Mr. President, that very little has been accomplished. There were 12 nations in the Atlantic Pact in April of 1949—2 years ago. There are 12 nations in that pact in April of 1951. What the free world has suffered from during the past several years has been a dismal lack of leadership. That is true not merely in America, but among the other free nations of the world; and much of the guilt must be borne by my own country.

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

Mr. CAIN. Certainly.

Mr. WHERRY. I know that since the ratification of the North Atlantic Treaty, the distinguished Senator from Washington has made a rather intensive study and research in regard to the possibilities of achieving the admittance into the North Atlantic community of nations of other countries, such as Spain, Greece, and Turkey.

I do not know what is in the mind of the distinguished Senator from Washington or what he intends to cover in his speech. However, in view of the fact that I was one who voted against the North Atlantic Treaty—and I did so on the very premise the distinguished Senator from Washington now states—I should like to ask him whether, in view of the knowledge he now has of the

situation and of the conditions in Spain and the other countries which have not been admitted to the North Atlantic community of nations, he believes that it is absolutely necessary to a proper defense of Western Europe that those countries be admitted as members of the North Atlantic community under the pact entered into for the purpose of defending that area.

Mr. CAIN. The second reason I stated for finding myself required to be in opposition to the pending resolution was that I could not vote to further implement the Atlantic Pact until that pact had been opened to the excluded nations which have so much to offer, in order that you and I and our children may have a better chance to live in the world of tomorrow.

Mr. WHERRY. I appreciate the answer. What I wished to know is this: Does the Senator have in mind any facts or any observations which he could give in regard to some of those countries, for instance, Spain?

The statement has been made time and time again on the floor of the Senate that Spain has more than 500,000 men available for armed service, and the statement has also been made that all they need is additional equipment. I am not sure that is the correct number, but I believe it has been stated on this floor. I should like to know what the Senator from Washington thinks about obtaining the additional manpower of Spain and other countries by helping to bring them into the North Atlantic community, for the defense of that area. Thus we would obtain manpower that now is available; and such a move would not deplete our own manpower so seriously, if we are going to proceed to arm and prepare for defense, as is indicated by the proponents of the resolution.

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, I have given considerable thought to the question the Senator has raised, and I expect to answer it later in my remarks. If I do not answer it, I hope the Senator will please address the question to me again.

Mr. WHERRY. Very well. I thank the Senator.

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, to my mind, the North Atlantic Treaty constituted a declaration of faith and determination and intelligence among 12 nations. These nations said, in article 3, that they would, by means of continuous and effective self-help and mutual aid, maintain and develop their individual and collective capacity to resist armed attack. These nations said in article 5 that an armed attack on one or more of the parties is deemed to include an armed attack on the territory of any of the parties in Europe or North America. These nations established a council, on which each of them is represented, to consider matters concerning the implementation of the treaty. These nations agreed that the provisions of the treaty were to be carried out by the parties in accordance with their respective constitutional processes.

Mr. President, my guess about the potential Communist aggressor who gives us such concern these days is just as good as anybody else's guess. All of us are guessing, are we not? I think the

Communist aggressor and its satellites are frightened only of the potential unified defense force which the free nations of the world can construct if only they will. This aggressor knows, with a greater certainty than any Member who sits in this body, that the free nations of the world are not unified today. This aggressor knows, with reference to the North Atlantic community, that there is much strength, and probably a greater will to resist, outside of the Atlantic Pact than there is within it. When the North Atlantic community is completely unified, I believe peace will fairly well be "permanitized" in that area of the world. To my mind, there is no doubt of it. If the aggressor knew that without question the resources of all other nations, not merely some nations, were joined in a common concert of determination to fight to the finish, then, unless the aggressor wished himself to commit suicide and destroy civilization, he would say to himself, "There is no point in fighting against so large a group of nations who are determined to resist me to their utmost."

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

Mr. CAIN. Certainly.

Mr. CORDON. Is it not seeking the ideal, the millennium, to ask for that kind of continuous solidarity among any group of nations?

Mr. CAIN. No; I do not think it is. I should say that the administration and many persons—perhaps including myself—feel that the free world is in peril. If that be so, I think it necessarily follows that all freemen can, if they will, with proper political leadership, join hands in building against any aggressor, anywhere, any time, a consolidated defense line which to my mind will be successful.

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

Mr. CAIN. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. If that is so—I do not say that it is—does not that raise quite a question as to what we should do in case of the countries which now are requesting aid?

Mr. CAIN. That is quite correct.

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for another question?

Mr. CAIN. I yield.

Mr. CORDON. I am somewhat concerned about the statement and the answer just made.

Mr. CAIN. I should like to clear up the matter, if possible.

Mr. CORDON. Can the Senator recall any instance in the history of the world where there has been, by virtue of a pact or agreement similar to the Atlantic Pact, the maintenance by any group of nations of a cooperative continuity of defense effort for any long period of time, extending into years?

Mr. CAIN. So far as I know, no concert of nations has ever maintained its unity for an extended period. However, when we contemplate the future, I think we can say with correctness that no period of civilization has ever been so threatened by the possibility of liquidation as has the period in which we now live. That is why I think reasonable men, who, up to this date, have been

completely unreasonable in terms of world leadership, can, for the common good, reach an agreement which will preserve civilization, rather than destroy it from the earth. For, so long as prejudice, greed, jealousy, and self-interest keep the North Atlantic community from becoming unified, there will continue to be the threat of aggression from the east. Until the North Atlantic community is unified, I deny that there is anything America can do to help in creating an effective defense establishment for Western Europe.

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

Mr. CAIN. I yield.

Mr. CORDON. Is that not tantamount to saying that humanity must purge itself of greed, jealousy, and self-interest before there can be the union of which the Senator speaks?

Mr. CAIN. I agree; and the only possibility of the nations purging themselves of these sins is the threat of annihilation. I think that threat is sufficiently menacing at this time to bring about the unity for which we pray.

On July 25, 1949, the President recommended to the Congress the authorization of a military-assistance program. On October 6, 1949, the Mutual Defense Assistance Act of 1949, Public Law 329, Eighty-first Congress, was signed by the President. The appropriations for it were approved by the President on October 28, 1949.

Here we have the first step required to implement the North Atlantic Treaty. The President made a recommendation, the Congress considered it, and then approved the recommendation. When the question of arms implementation was before the Congress, no one suggested that the Chief Executive could implement the pact on his own initiative. No one, to my knowledge, has ever claimed that the North Atlantic Treaty is self-implementing.

On September 9, 1950, the President declared it to be his intention to further implement the North Atlantic Treaty by committing American forces abroad. He stated that authority from or approval by the Congress was not required. In thinking the President to have been totally wrong in his assumption that he had the right to implement the treaty within his own authority, I am convinced that if the President has now, or may have at any time in the future, the power to commit American forces to an international army in peacetime, he can in the future do anything, anywhere, at any time he so desires.

During the debate on the North Atlantic Treaty, considered thought and expression were given to the question of implementing the treaty. Reservations were offered by Senators to make certain that authority to implement the treaty would come from the Congress. The reservations were defeated, not because they were beaten down but because those who spoke for the administration, men of high principle, men whose word had never been doubted, gave every conceivable assurance that it was the responsibility, the obligation, and the right of the Congress to implement the treaty.

When we insist that the President has

no authority to implement the treaty by committing American forces to a peacetime international army, we are not interfering with the rights or the power which flow through the President as Commander in Chief of the Armed Services. We are passing upon a question of policy as to whether America in peacetime should implement a treaty by committing American forces. If the Congress authorizes the commitment, then the President, in his capacity as Commander in Chief, can deploy the forces as he will.

I have included in my statement page after page of the assurances given during the North Atlantic Treaty debate. I shall make reference to some of them, and will ask that the others be made a part of my remarks. These assurances will clearly make no impression upon those who gave them, but they will, I hope, make an impression upon the average American whose future is involved.

Before addressing myself to any of these assurances, I intend, because I want to do it, to compliment a Member of this body. Had it not have been for the good common sense and awareness of the junior Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY] we should not presently have before us either of the innocuous and almost powerless resolutions which are pending. The President of the United States sought neither advice, counsel, nor authority from the Congress. He was willing and determined to ignore and bypass the legislative process. The Senator from Nebraska was the single individual who reminded his Nation that the Congress had the right and responsibility of determining the policy as to whether America should or should not commit American forces, in peacetime, to an international army. The Senator from Nebraska probably believes that America should not commit ground forces on the Continent of Europe. I hold a contrary view, for I believe that if there were an adequate defense structure in Europe we ought to supplement it and be a part of it; but this is entirely beside the point at issue. The Senator from Nebraska has made it clear that the Congress, if it seeks to save and preserve our republican form of government, must decide the policy question which confronts us. The Senator from Nebraska has enjoyed, and suffered, from his fair share of successes and failures in public life. He will experience ups and downs in the future; but never, should he live for another hundred years, will he have so contributed again to the good of his Nation. Because the Wherry resolution was subject to criticism and improvement, as every resolution is, its author has been maligned, criticized, and abused by certain of his colleagues. I have been sitting nearby on occasion, listening to him as he took it. But in spite of all the venom cast upon him, the Senator from Nebraska has stood firm in his faith. He loves and respects the Congress of the United States, and he appreciates what its authority ought to be.

Mr. President, imagine, if you please, where we would be now, had it not been for the resolution offered by the Senator from Nebraska? The President would

have implemented the pact in any way he saw fit. Had the President been able to do that, without action of any kind on the part of the Congress, the Congress would never again have had a chance to discuss how the treaty ought to be implemented. The only Member of either House who moved in the direction of obtaining action of any kind whatever was the Senator from Nebraska. Were it not for the Senator from Nebraska, our role in the future would simply be that of making appropriations available with which to carry out any foreign commitment which the Chief Executive might see fit to make at any time.

Mr. President, for the next few moments I wish to reflect upon certain of the assurances which were made by responsible American leaders less than two short years ago. In recent days, I have not heard further about the condition of the distinguished senior Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG]. I hope that unless he is very well there will not be called to his attention portions of the debate which has been going on in the Senate for some little time. When the Senate was debating the Atlantic Pact, the Senator from Michigan was one among our great leaders who rose and said, "We do not wish to have reservations attached to this treaty, because they may be misunderstood abroad. Have no fear that when the times comes to implement the treaty, if now we ratify it, the responsibility for that course of action belongs undeniably to the Congress of the United States."

Mr. President, I want the Senator from Michigan to know, if he is in a position to read and understand the record which is being built these days, that there are Members still in the Senate who will fight for the assurances which he gave to the Senate of the United States and to the Nation.

As appears in volume 95, part 7, pages 8894 and 8895 of the RECORD, he said this:

Just what is our obligation at this point? I take it no one would pretend that the ratification of the pact does not make some sort of alteration in the situation as it exists without the pact. Its articles are not meaningless. But the timing and the nature and extent of implementing legislation, in this or any other year, are, in my opinion, wide open to the free decision of all Senators as to what they believe the objectives of the pact and the national security require. The Secretary's statement is:

"The pact does not dictate the conclusion of honest judgment * * * it does preclude repudiation of the principle or of the obligation of making that honest judgment * * * there is an obligation to help, but the extent, the manner, and the timing is up to the honest judgment of the parties."

I shall feel free to argue with my colleagues on the merits of any such issues when they arise. But I shall never argue that their vote for the pact precludes free and honest judgment and independence in any such subsequent event.

On the same day the Senator from Michigan added this paragraph, which he called paragraph 7:

7. They provide that the treaty shall be ratified and its provisions carried out by the parties in accordance with their respective

constitutional processes. I emphasize the fact that this qualifying phrase refers not only to the process of ratification but to the process of implementation.

On July 11, because a good many Senators were still interested and curious about who was going to implement the pact if it was ratified, the Senator from Michigan said:

I have the following answer from the department, and with the indulgence of the Senator from New Jersey, if he will permit me, I should like to read it:

"Any future military-assistance programs involving Atlantic Pact countries will be prepared and submitted to the Congress on the basis of recommendations which will be made by the organization to be established under article 9 of the treaty."

That is the end of the quotation from the Secretary of State, who said, "Have no fear, Mr. VANDENBERG; be assured." The Senator from Michigan took those assurances, and with them he prevailed upon some of us who wanted reservations not to press for them, because the question of implementation belonged to us in the Congress of the United States. Then he went on to say:

But, so far as specific obligations under the treaty are concerned in respect to article 3, they arise only when ultimate recommendations based on multilateral recommendations are made under article 9 through the operation of the treaty itself. And at that point the only obligation upon any Member of the Senate is to determine whether or not the recommendations thus made impress him as being in line with the national security of the United States as a part of the North Atlantic community, and therefore the security of the community itself.

On July 21, when we were moving rapidly in the direction of a vote, the senior Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY], the chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, had this to say:

But it is said that under article 3 we are obligated to furnish arms. Mr. President, we are not specifically obligated to furnish anything. There is nothing in the treaty that says we shall give them tanks or bombs or arms. There is an obligation upon the United States—and I do not seek to avoid it—to consider what, in the view of our honest judgment and our sincerity, it would be desirable for us to do to bring about fulfillment of the objectives stated in article 3. In other words, after the treaty has been ratified, if the other nations request arms and point out their reasons and their situation and their inability to provide themselves with arms, then it would be for the people of the United States, through the Congress, to determine whether it was desirable or suitable, under article 3, to give or to furnish them arms.

Mr. President, I find it difficult to understand why it has become so easy to rationalize in the past several years what in July of 1949 was a matter of principle, apparently, and now has become a matter of expediency. Two short years ago we were told it was our function and our responsibility to implement the treaty. Today we are told that a handful of men, many of whom live thousands of miles across the sea, are better qualified to reach decisions without any reference of any kind, character, or description to the views of the American people and the Congress of the United States. Any man in or out of this body can go along with

this rationalization if he cares to; that is his business, of course; but the Senator from Washington is not willing to state one thing as a principle, and less than 2 years later repudiate the foundation upon which his life, in large part, is molded.

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

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Washington yield to the Senator from Indiana?

Mr. CAIN. I yield.

Mr. CAPEHART. I do not think that what the Senator has mentioned is bothering some of us very much, because we know how we are going to vote. Many of us feel that what has been going on for the past 2 or 3 weeks or 2 or 3 months has been a waste of time. Any Member of the Senate should have known how he was going to vote, because he took the oath of office as a Senator and sat through the speeches and the hearings from which the Senator from Washington has been reading to the Senate. So it seems to me that what we have been doing here for many weeks has been a waste of time.

The responsibility for what is done is that of the Congress of the United States, and the Congress ought to accept it. It should not even debate whether Congress has the responsibility or does not have it. It has the responsibility. As the Senator said, 2 years ago those who were advocating our joining the Atlantic Pact said that the Congress had the responsibility and should accept it. So I do not know why we should spend time and effort debating it. I congratulate the able Senator from Washington for bringing out the points he is elucidating, because they should be reviewed.

Mr. CAIN. If the Senator will permit me, I should like to say that I think this debate is exceedingly important. The American people do not have much information available. If it were not for this debate, they would have less information available to them. I agree with the Senator from Indiana that every Senator has already made up his mind as to how he is going to vote on the issue before the Senate, but I think the American people are entitled to have presented every facet of this struggle. Memories are short. Many people think today only of ARTHUR VANDENBERG being ill in a hospital in Michigan, and they have forgotten the assurances he gave two short years ago.

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

Mr. CAIN. Certainly.

Mr. CAPEHART. My point is that I do not think Senators should permit themselves to get into a frame of mind of questioning how they should vote. Their consciences ought to tell them how to vote. They should not permit themselves to get into such a frame of mind that they can have any question about it because most of them sat through the debate on the Atlantic Pact; they took their oath of office, and they know it is the responsibility of the Congress of the United States to declare war, to specify the number of troops, and to appropriate money for the defense of the country. They should not have a single thought at

any time of passing the responsibility on to the President of the United States, the Commander in Chief, or to anyone else.

Mr. CAIN. Perhaps if a few stubborn, obstinate men would hold firm in their faith in this body they might contribute a great deal to the situation.

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

Mr. CAIN. I yield.

Mr. KEM. I should like to ask the Senator from Washington if he is familiar with the doctrine which has been advanced that the power of Congress may fall into abeyance, and, therefore, be lost to the Congress.

Mr. CAIN. I do not know that I am familiar with that doctrine, but I would say that if Congress does not exercise a constant vigilance over its authority and rights, its authority and rights will dry up, wither, and be taken away by someone else. That is why some of us are presenting this issue at this time.

Mr. KEM. I invite the attention of the able Senator from Washington to a committee print entitled "Powers of the President To Send Armed Forces Outside the United States," dated February 20, 1951, in which there is a foreword signed by the senior Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY]. It is referred to as a careful review and analysis of the President's power from the executive point of view. I invite the Senator's attention to page 27 of the committee print in which this to me rather astounding sentence appears:

The use of the congressional power to declare war, for example, has fallen into abeyance, because wars are no longer declared in advance.

I ask the Senator whether he does not feel that if the power of Congress in this instance is not asserted it will not be long before we are told that this power, too, has fallen into abeyance, through failure of Congress to assert it, and by its disuse?

Mr. CAIN. I think I have previously stated as strongly as I could that in my judgment if the Executive is permitted to use the case before us and commit American forces in peacetime to an international army without first securing authority from Congress, in the future the Executive, regardless of what party he may belong to, will be able to do exactly as he wishes, and the right of Congress to grant authority to the President will be, if not destroyed, certainly weakened.

Mr. KEM. Or, to use the expressive language of the committee print, that power of the Congress will fall into abeyance?

Mr. CAIN. Yes. The Senator from Missouri would be interested to know that two appropriate committees, the Committee on Armed Services and the Committee on Foreign Relations, met and considered this proposal, and finally took action on it. A report was written by as able a staff as I know. That staff is led by Dr. Wilcox. I mention only him because he has been extremely fair and objective in working for all the members of the committee. However, it ought to be said that for natural reasons, a com-

mittee report very seldom reflects in any detail at all the differences of opinion which exist among members of the committee. In part I am speaking at length today because the report in many instances bears no similarity to what the junior Senator from Washington believes most deeply. It may turn out that many people believe that the committee report is right, and that they disagree with the views of the Senator from Washington. If the Senator from Washington, representing in part a sovereign State, and serving Americans generally, too, wishes to offer his point of view he must do so in his own right on the floor of the Senate, because his point of view will not be found in the committee report, ably though it was put together—and it was ably put together—because it leaves much unsaid, as I shall try to indicate in a very few minutes.

On July 21, the Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG], in one paragraph of his address said:

This pact establishes no automatic right anywhere to demand arms of us. It does establish a right to present a request, under article 9, and to have it considered by us in the light of this mutual responsibility and our own honest estimate of the need and of our capacity to respond. Period.

Mr. President, that was like ARTHUR VANDENBERG, was it not? When he said something which he wanted understood he tried to say it, as he always did, in language which was understandable. At the end of that paragraph he said "Period." There is no automatic right. He told us: "Whenever the subject of implementation comes up, you gentlemen in Congress will have the right to consider it. So why worry about it?" It was the Senator from Michigan who used to say, shortly before he went away, that he was becoming increasingly tired of being brought in on the crash landings, but not on the take-offs. It is not unreasonable to say that it was because of a great American, ARTHUR VANDENBERG, that many Senators on both sides of the aisle supported the Atlantic Pact without reservations because of his assurance that no such reservations were required.

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

Mr. CAIN. Certainly.

Mr. WILEY. I have listened with a great deal of interest to my good friend from Washington. I should like to ascertain whether I understand his position correctly. First he would like to see the resolutions defeated. Is that correct?

Mr. CAIN. In answering that question I would have the RECORD show the reason for my position. I want the resolutions defeated, not because of what they attempt to do, but because of what they do not do and do not cover. Many Members of Congress would have a freedom of choice to vote for either a joint resolution or a bill. There are those of us who now have no such freedom of choice.

Mr. WILEY. I think I understand that the answer would be "Yes." The Senator says that he has no freedom of choice. I would suggest that that is not

quite correct. Any bill may be taken from the calendar, by amendment converted into a joint resolution, and a vote had on it. The Senator can move to do that here. As he knows, in committee we tried to have a joint resolution reported, but we could not do it.

Mr. CAIN. That is correct.

Mr. WILEY. Now I come to my next question. The Senator apparently is proceeding on the assumption that the pending resolution has no effect. We heard the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] say that it was a constitutional process. I should like to call attention to paragraph 6, which has been so much discussed on the floor of the Senate. The high military leaders of this country, pursuant to the direction of the President, appeared before a congressional committee and submitted to us, as was done when the request for arms was made, the recommendations of the Chief of Staff and of the President, namely, that four additional ground divisions be sent to Europe. I invite attention to the end of paragraph 6 of the concurrent resolution whereby we approve such action. We approve. I understand the Senator's position. He feels that that is not dignified enough; that it must be by way of a joint resolution. Am I correct?

Mr. CAIN. By no means. We are not interested in dignity. We are interested in any instrument which will authorize the President of the United States to take a course of action, and not approve what he has already done.

Mr. WILEY. Very well. I understand the Senator to say that the language does not authorize. The Senator would strike out the word "approve" and substitute the word "authorize"?

Mr. CAIN. In the case of a bill or joint resolution the President must either sign or veto it.

Mr. WILEY. If it looks as though we cannot get a joint resolution, what shall we do?

Mr. CAIN. I will tell the Senator what we can do. I thank the Senator for asking the question. We are getting something we know is wrong. Senators who 2 years ago were convinced we were wrong are rising to defend something that can only be rationalized. That is the basis of the whole argument.

Mr. WILEY. Then we find ourselves in the position that the President must either come to Congress or a joint resolution must be introduced and the ground gone over again. If conditions are so serious as the Senator from Washington says they are—and he has said they are very serious, very critical, and very threatening—nothing would be accomplished, and we do not know what the result would be.

I come now to the second point of my question. Paragraph 6 states:

6. It is the sense of the Congress that, in the interests of sound constitutional processes, and of national unity and understanding, congressional approval should be obtained of any policy—

There, in substance, we tell the President in no uncertain terms that after he has his four divisions we want him to come to us for congressional approval

of any subsequent policy under the North Atlantic Pact. Is not that true?

Mr. CAIN. Will my good friend tell me what we have told the President? I characterize the resolution to which he makes reference as being a pious hope. The Senator, who is a constitutional lawyer, has just confirmed the declaration that it is nothing but a pious hope. The Senator has stated that we are going to tell the President that we want him to confer with us. I am merely suggesting that unless we tell the President that he must confer with us, he has the discretion or judgment to do so or not, as he sees fit.

Mr. WILEY. It is more than a pious hope. The resolution confirms the statements of the Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG], the Secretary of State, Mr. Acheson, and myself.

I next come to the question which I previously asked. Would the Senator say that instead of congressional approval there should be congressional authorization? Should the resolution say that it is the sense of the Senate that the President must obtain congressional authorization?

Mr. CAIN. Yes; but the Senator from Wisconsin is referring to a Senate resolution, which in itself is but an expression of opinion. It never could be legally binding on the President in any sense of the term.

Mr. WILEY. Let us take the other resolution. Would the Senator from Washington have it read that it is the sense of the Congress that congressional authorization should be obtained?

Mr. CAIN. The sense of the Congress; but unless that sense is expressed in a law signed by the President, it continues to be nothing but a pious hope.

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

Mr. CAIN. I am pleased to yield.

Mr. WILEY. I shall be very happy to respond to the argument which I have heard today. As I stated in my opening argument, I fully agree that in view of what occurred at the time of ratification of the Atlantic Pact, as was so ably recited by the distinguished Senator from Washington today, as the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] says, there is at least a moral, if not a legal, responsibility upon the President to submit to the Congress what he wants in the nature of implementation of the pact. To that I agree. But I am satisfied that if the Senator will read recent history, which records that the President has sent more than 500 airplanes to the occupational forces, has authorized the construction of airfields, and has sent 100,000 or more men into the occupation forces, the Senator will soon see that we reach a situation in which the constitutional powers of the Commander in Chief may come into direct conflict with his possible actions under the Atlantic Pact, if he arrives at the conclusion that defense of the United States needs action.

I agree that there should be implementation by congressional action but I do not agree that we are accomplishing anything by stalemating the entire program and creating a further crisis in

Europe if we defeat these resolutions. As the Senator knows, they are the best we could get from the two committees. We tried week after week to get something better, and the Senator himself voted to report the resolutions. Now, if we kill the goose that laid the golden egg—and I presume this is a golden egg—where will we be?

Mr. CAIN. The Senator from Wisconsin will speak in his own right at a later time. All I can do is to thank him for the questions which he has raised.

I disagree with what the Senator from Wisconsin has just said, because if I correctly understand his statement—and I think I do—he stated that we worked for weeks trying to get an adequate instrument which would be binding upon the President; that we could not get it, and therefore we must take what we can get. That happens to be the trouble with America in recent years. We are accepting a great deal of mediocrity, with serious consequences. That is the nature of the document which is before us.

Mr. WILEY. We tried to get the best we could. The Senator feels, does he not, that that would have been a joint resolution?

Mr. CAIN. I do.

Mr. WILEY. The vital question is whether or not we can bind the President of the United States. If there were any way to get the question into the courts, we could obtain a decision. But once the President decides to take action in the field of national defense, there is no authority under heaven that can question his constitutional discretion. That is the point which is involved.

What I am saying is that in the interest of unity between the two branches of Government, the Congress and the President, in view of the critical situation which the Senator has so well delineated, we should bump our heads together and bring forth the best measure possible, so as effectively to safeguard the national security and prevent the threatening situation from becoming worse.

I thank the Senator.

Mr. FLANDERS and Mr. HUMPHREY addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Washington yield; and if so, to whom?

Mr. CAIN. I shall be glad to yield in a moment. The Senator from Wisconsin is to speak later. We want him to clear up our uncertainties.

Mr. FLANDERS. Mr. President, I have an interesting proposal to make, which will take not more than 30 seconds.

Mr. CAIN. We shall come to that point in a moment. I shall try to respond to the Senator from Wisconsin by telling him what he told us on July 21, 1949. That should follow his remarks.

In that connection, the Senator from Wisconsin has publicly stated to the country, "I do not like the concurrent resolution, but because we could not get anything better, we are going to take that which, from my point of view, is not implementation of the North Atlantic Pact by the Congress."

Nonetheless, on July 21, 1949, the Senator from Wisconsin said this:

First. It does not in any way delimit the right of Congress to say what the implementation shall be, if any, under the pact.

Second. This, to me, is particularly clear because under article 9 there is the specific provision that the Council can only recommend the measures for implementation under 3 and 5. Recommend to whom? Answer: To the signers of the pact.

I hold that the international conditions or circumstances, as they develop, will determine the character and need of the implementation, and then the Congress will determine how this Nation shall meet that need. Of course, as a practical matter, if an emergency arises, the President, under his powers, would act. That power to act can be delimited neither by treaty nor by act of Congress.

I quote those words to indicate how rapidly we have deviated from a principle with respect to which we were in unanimous agreement a year and a half ago.

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

Mr. CAIN. I yield.

Mr. FLANDERS. I have a suggestion to make, namely, that we amend Senate Concurrent Resolution 18 by changing its title to Senate Joint Resolution 18.

Mr. CAIN. I wish that might be done; but, according to advice from the Parliamentarian, we cannot change the concurrent resolution into a joint resolution or bill.

Mr. FLANDERS. Has the Senator investigated that question?

Mr. CAIN. A number of Senators, I being one of them, have done so.

Mr. FLANDERS. If we put it in the form of a joint resolution, must it go back to committee?

Mr. CAIN. We are so advised. But there are a number of bills on the calendar which have been passed by the House, any one of which could be brought up by unanimous consent or on motion. All after the enacting clause could be stricken out and the substance of the concurrent resolution could be offered as an amendment. If there were sufficient votes for it, it would become the law after going to conference and to the President for signature.

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

Mr. CAIN. Certainly.

Mr. WILEY. In my humble opinion, the statement which I previously made is not contradicted at all by what I have said today. I stand by the statement. I simply say that even a Senator or the Senate cannot in the slightest degree interfere with the constitutional powers of the President. Thank God we still have a government of separated powers.

Mr. CAIN. Will the Senator tell us why, in his opinion, we are seeking to do so?

Mr. WILEY. We are not doing it. We cannot do it. I say that we have no power to do it. What we are trying to do here—and I trust that it can be done—is to express the sense of the Senate and the Congress. I believe that the Senator from Washington voted to report this resolution.

Mr. CAIN. Is the Senator referring to the Senate resolution?

Mr. WILEY. The Senator voted in favor of the Senate resolution, did he not? Would the Senator now vote for the Senate resolution?

Mr. CAIN. I voted against the Senate resolution and in favor of the concurrent resolution as the best opportunity that could be offered to the Senate, reserving the complete right, as I said to the chairman, to oppose it when it reached the floor.

Mr. WILEY. Every Senator has that right, no matter how he votes in committee. Any Senator has the right to change his vote. I suppose the Senator voted to report it to the Senate so as not to obstruct the wish of the majority. Perhaps the Senator did so because he thought there was some merit to such a measure; at least that the people of the country should see that there was some kind of unity between the executive and the legislative branches as we endeavor to meet head-on the challenge which now comes to us from abroad.

Mr. CAIN. The Senator from Wisconsin knows that there were two instruments before the committees sitting jointly. One was a simple Senate resolution, and one was a Senate concurrent resolution. An effort to have a joint resolution reported had been defeated. The simple resolution prevailed. The concurrent resolution also prevailed, by a vote, as I recall, of 16 to 8, which meant that a number of members of the committees did not want either a joint or a concurrent resolution. They wanted this great problem solved by the process of a simple expression by the Senate in a Senate resolution.

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

Mr. CAIN. I yield.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Obviously we are all interested in unanimity of sentiment between the executive and the legislative branches, if it can be obtained. But there is a consideration which is even more important, namely, the recognition of the public; I am addressing myself in part to my friend, the Senator from Wisconsin. The mail is coming in now. People write and say, "Do not permit troops to be sent to Europe without the approval of Congress." As a matter of fact, I think we are beginning to plant in the public mind the belief that there is legislative effect in the measure which is now before the Senate. Certainly when we lead people onto that high mountain and they suddenly discover that the proposal would have no binding effect, there is going to be a frustration such as we have never seen before in this country. Does the Senator agree?

Mr. CAIN. I do, sir.

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

Mr. CAIN. I yield.

Mr. FLANDERS. I feel that the points being raised by the Senator from Washington are as important as any question raised in the present session of Congress so far. I should like to make a suggestion to him—and I would be glad to join him if he wishes, or he can take the action on his own, and I will support it to the best of my ability—that

he offer an amendment to the concurrent resolution changing the title to read "joint resolution," and if that is overruled by the Chair, try to see whether we can establish a new ruling. It seems absurd on the face of it that we can preserve the title to a bill, a resolution or what have you, and completely change the subject matter, but that we cannot preserve the subject matter and change the title. That seems to me to be an astonishing parliamentary situation.

Mr. CAIN. It seems to me that the Senator from Vermont has made a very reasonable suggestion. Certainly I would wish to associate myself with him in his desire to determine if we can change a concurrent resolution into a joint resolution without unnecessarily delaying the operation of the Congress.

Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator will state it.

Mr. CAIN. Would it be possible, sir, by any means whatsoever, to change the concurrent resolution which is pending, Senate Concurrent Resolution 18, to a joint resolution?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Only by unanimous consent, the Chair is advised by the Parliamentarian.

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

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, I do not yield for that purpose.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Washington declines to yield for that purpose.

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, the Senator from Wisconsin made reference to the senior Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE]. I wish to offer only one comment on what the Senator from Georgia said to the Senate on July 21, 1949. As I read the treaty, it seems to me to be very simple. Taking the treaty as a whole, and giving effect to all its parts, especially articles 3, 5, 9, and 11, it seems to me that there does arise an obligation of mutual aid and assistance. What that aid is to be, when it is to be extended, how much aid is to be given, upon what terms or conditions the aid is to be extended, are all matters reserved to the Congress. That is necessarily so. From the express language of the treaty it is so.

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

Mr. CAIN. I yield.

Mr. WATKINS. Does the Senator recall that during the debate on the North Atlantic Pact a reservation was offered to article 3 reserving the right of the Congress, or reserving the right of the United States to pass at a future time on whether we would give arms of any kind, including atomic bombs?

Mr. CAIN. I think I do so remember, sir.

Mr. WATKINS. Does the Senator also recall that at that stage of the proceedings there was not the slightest suggestion that article 3 bound us in any way to send troops to Europe, or that it had anything to do with troops?

Mr. CAIN. I do not believe the question of troops came up, but it might very well have.

Mr. WATKINS. I recall the debate, and I collaborated with my colleagues in it, and I believe a reservation finally was voted on with reference to article 3. In view of the statement made by the Secretary of State and by General Marshall and others it was never considered at any moment that article 3 had reference to troops. For that reason there was nothing put into the reservation with reference to troops, but only with reference to armament.

Mr. CAIN. No, but what was put into the legislative background of the treaty as ratified were the assurances of the distinguished Americans whose contributions I have just offered to the Senate, that there was not any reason for arguing the point that when the time came to implement the treaty—whether we send troops or whether we send arms it is an act of implementation—the authority to decide what ought to be done would vest in the Congress.

Mr. WATKINS. I think the Senator is definitely correct in that statement. I did want to point out that a considerable study was made of article 3, and with respect to what it meant, and in view of the legislative history, the hearings, the statement of Secretary Acheson, and the statements of others with respect to that particular subject, there was no idea of sending any troops under article 3 to guard or defend Europe. That was, by construction at least, by interpretation, stated to those opposing the treaty to be completely out of the picture. Article 5 was the only article that had anything to do with sending troops to Europe. I call that to the Senator's attention because that is my recollection of what occurred. I made a considerable study of the matter, because I was trying to determine what the treaty meant, and what we ought to do to protect the right of Congress in the future to speak in behalf of the American people.

Mr. CAIN. I appreciate the observation the Senator from Utah has just made. I know the RECORD will benefit from it. I would be so bold as to suggest that he consolidate the study he made and offer it during the course of the present debate, in order that all of us may become as familiar with an important facet as is the Senator from Utah today.

Mr. WATKINS. I have a copy of the speech I made at that time which I shall be glad to send to the Senator. I am quite sure many Senators would not be present on the floor when and if such a speech were again made by me. I do not think many were present when it was made originally, and I believe it would be love's labor lost to make it over again.

Mr. CAIN. If the Senator will be kind enough to send it to me I shall read the speech, and offer it for the RECORD, so anyone in or out of the Senate can read it if he wishes.

Mr. WATKINS. I thank the Senator.

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, there were other bits of testimony from the debate on the Atlantic Pact ratification two years ago which at my request were assembled by the Library of Congress. I ask unanimous consent that they may

be made a part of my remarks at this point.

There being no objection, the matters referred to were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. WILEY, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 95, part 7, page 9022:

"Article 9 of the pact establishes a council to consider matters concerning the implementation of the treaty. The council will consider. It has no authority. A council is a body which makes recommendations, a group of men, including at least one named from among our own people, to represent us in consulting with representatives of the other nations. They will consult together. If it should happen that we do not penetrate Russia, if the hand of death does not change the consuls of the Russian Empire, if conditions become more and more challenging, of course the question of implementation will be thrown into our laps. It may be thrown into our laps anyway. But at this time, under the conditions which now exist, there is no obligation upon us to vote for an implementation, because there is no attack. But let it be understood that if we ratify this treaty, we shall be making with our associates an international compact and a deal under which we mean just what the treaty says."

Mr. Dulles, July 12, 1949, page 9277:

"It is conceivable that, in the future, some of the parties to the North Atlantic Treaty might seek to pervert it by building up great military establishments and bringing about an armament race. If that happened it would, in my opinion, be a grievous distortion of the intent and purpose of the pact. But—and this is vital—that cannot occur under the treaty without our consent, and the Congress has that situation under its control."

Mr. Dulles, July 12, 1949, page 9279:

"In my opinion, the pact commits the United States to a joint effort to devise a program of collective defense. When that program is submitted it will contain many elements. Presumably there will be provisions for bases, and for armaments here and there. The implementation of the treaty will come before the Congress in some form, and at that time Congress will pass judgment upon whether or not that is an advantageous thing to do, in harmony with the spirit and purpose of the treaty."

Mr. CONNALLY and Mr. WATKINS, July 14, 1949, page 9459:

"Mr. CONNALLY. No, Mr. President; there is no obligation to furnish arms. How does the United States obligate itself? It obligates itself by a vote of the Senate on the treaty, or by the passage of a law. There is no man in the Government, even the President of the United States, who can obligate this Nation on this, that, and the other thing. The Constitution provides the way.

"Let me say to the Senator from Nebraska and to any other Senators who entertain his views, which are quite extensive on this subject, suppose we ratify the treaty—I see a sneer upon the face of the Senator from Utah [Mr. WATKINS], but that is all right. It is very becoming to the Senator.

"Mr. WATKINS. I was just on the verge of laughing, I thought it was very humorous.

"Mr. CONNALLY. The Senator is perfectly free to laugh. Many people laugh every time they look at the Senator from Utah. Of course, that is meant in all good humor. I could tell that the Senator was getting ready to laugh.

"But, Mr. President, suppose we ratify the treaty and some of the nations say they want arms, who is to say how much in the way of arms they should receive? Who is to say when we will give them the arms they want?

"Something has been said regarding the council. The council has no authority to

bind any nation. We are all in a common enterprise, we all have the same objective. I think we should get together and talk over the situation, and after we shall have done so, it is up to us and to the other nations to determine for ourselves what the immediate situation requires. If we feel the situation requires the furnishing of arms, we will probably furnish some arms. But, after all, it is up to the Congress. It is up to the minority leader as well as other Senators."

Mr. WHERRY, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 95, part 8, page 9883:

"Such freedom of action must be preserved, Mr. President. We have no right to bind the membership of future Congresses to a limited freedom of action. Under no circumstances should we do that. At all times we should have a right, without any moral obligation, to consider the proposals for arms under article 9 which might be submitted by the Defense Council. We should have the right, without a limitation of any kind, to consider what those proposals are, and, in the light of our fiscal policy and the need of our own defense, we should then consider such proposals."

Mr. GEORGE, July 21, 1949, page 9898:

"As I read the treaty, Mr. President, it seems to me to be very simple. Taking the treaty as a whole and giving effect to all its parts, especially article 3, article 5, article 9, and article 11, it seems to me that there does arise an obligation of mutual aid and assistance. What that aid is to be, when it is to be extended, how much aid is to be given, upon what terms or conditions the aid is to be extended, are all matters reserved to the Congress. That is necessarily so. In the express language of the treaty it is so."

Mr. AIKEN, July 21, 1949, page 9913:

"The Atlantic Pact and the military-aid program, although possibly dependent upon each other, are each separate and distinct. Their joining together is entirely dependent on the will of the Congress. The two may meet. But it is for the Congress of the United States, exercising its sovereign constitutional right, to determine the time and the conditions for such a meeting, and even whether this meeting should take place at all. It is with this understanding, confirmed by the distinguished senior Senators from Michigan and Texas as well as by the State Department, that I intend to vote for the pact."

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, earlier I said, as my second reason for opposing the resolution, that I would not support any further implementation of the Atlantic Pact until we have reason to believe that excluded North Atlantic community nations will be offered membership. I could not possibly speak more seriously on this question, because I believe that my position is not only sound, but that it will give more people a better chance to live in the perilous world of tomorrow. I mean that, sir, not merely because I believe in this position, but because almost every qualified witness I have listened to has maintained that a true collective defense establishment for the North Atlantic community can only be brought about by including the resources of nonmember European nations.

In offering the administration's views on Monday, the senior Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY], who is the chairman of the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations, said this, among other things:

Let us look at the record. In support of the proposition that the security of the United States is inexorably bound to the security of Europe and that it is in our

interest to help defend the free world, the committee heard from General Eisenhower, Secretary Marshall, General Bradley, General Collins, Admiral Sherman, General Vandenberg, General Clay, and General LeMay. This is a formidable array of military brain power. These witnesses, to a man, agreed that the United States should send additional American troops to Europe to serve as a part of the North Atlantic Command, and that such a move was in our national interest.

Mr. President, the Senator from Texas has given us from the record but a part of the record. The generals to whom the Senator from Texas referred said what he credited to them, but they went on to say a great deal more. The Senator from Texas did not bother to tell us what these distinguished Americans fully said, nor do I think he intends to do so. From what the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee stated on last Monday, one could assume that our military leaders in general had agreed that the collective and integrated defense included within the North Atlantic Pact nations was adequate to the future. I am convinced that not a single one of them maintains this view.

Every single one of these great Americans has said that the strength of our collective security effort will be immeasurably increased if presently excluded European nations are brought within the Atlantic Pact membership.

Mr. President, to my mind, in these days, the administration is using our military leaders as cat's-paws. The administration uses the portion of the testimony coming from military leaders which will best serve the administration's purposes. The administration would have the American people believe that our military leaders are practically responsible for designing the Atlantic Pact security system. I believe, Mr. President, that nothing could be further from the truth.

The military will do the best they can with a system put together by politicians, which is precisely what the Atlantic Pact is at this time.

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

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Washington yield to the Senator from Utah?

Mr. CAIN. Certainly.

Mr. WATKINS. Can the Senator from Washington give us any evidence in support of the statement he has just made?

Mr. CAIN. I expect to provide quite a great deal of evidence before I conclude.

Mr. WATKINS. I thank the Senator.

Mr. CAIN. Let me say to the Senator from Utah that if one of us prepares for a fight here, he prepares to answer questions, using the equipment that is available.

Mr. WATKINS. Let me observe that I have suspected that what the Senator has just said is the truth. I have heard the charge made that it is true, but to date no one has brought forth the witnesses who could testify regarding it. I understand that probably all of them are gagged, and that probably the Senator from Washington could not get any evidence.

Mr. CAIN. No, we have much evidence which came through normal procedure and fashion; but that evidence is not known to the American people generally.

Mr. WATKINS. Does the Senator from Washington intend to enlighten us on that point?

Mr. CAIN. If the Senator will have patience, I shall do so. However, if the Senator runs out of patience, if he will refer to the RECORD tomorrow, he will get precisely an answer on this point.

Mr. WATKINS. I am very curious on this point, but I shall exercise patience.

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

Mr. CAIN. I yield.

Mr. WILEY. I am interested in the Senator's statement, because if a fighting man is preparing for a fight, he generally does everything he can to get ready for it. I should like to ask this question: How can we get ready for a fight with Joe Stalin unless we really prepare for it?

Mr. CAIN. I am going to answer that question; and it seems to me that the proper answer involves a presentation of the important things the generals—the military witnesses—have said, and not merely some of the things they went on to say.

Mr. President, I wish I had an opportunity to say to the world with a voice which had some effect that I am convinced that we are getting ready to fight in Western Europe without being prepared to use the instruments which are available to us. We are building in Western Europe a defense establishment which is the counterpart of a man with only one arm. I shall tell the Senator from Wisconsin and other Senators what they already know, namely, that 2 weeks of hard-headed, demanding, political leadership—not military leadership—could add 1,000,000 fighting soldiers to the instrument called the Atlantic Pact. I shall document that statement as best I can, and I shall challenge anyone to prove I am wrong.

If the junior Senator from Washington speaks only the truth, and if he could convince others of it—namely, that 1,000,000 men are being excluded only because of national prejudices and self-interest—would not it be in the best interest of the free world to tear out by the roots some of those prejudices, and bring together some of the great nations which want to fight for freedom? Then we would have no need to fight the Russian, because his political leaders would not dare fight us.

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

Mr. CAIN. Certainly.

Mr. WATKINS. Will the Senator tell us from which countries the 1,000,000 men are to come?

Mr. CAIN. I shall do so in not more than 60 seconds.

Mr. WATKINS. Do any of them come from Italy, the country which now has both its hands tied behind its back by reason of the Italian peace treaty?

Mr. CAIN. The answer is "no," because Italy is a member of the Atlantic Pact.

Mr. WATKINS. Did the Senator ever take into consideration what forces we might get from the Italians if we untied their hands by getting rid of that treaty?

Mr. CAIN. I was one of the Senators who voted for the Italian peace treaty. Since its ratification, I have learned to my sorrow that as an American I made a mistake in voting for something which I thought would accomplish one purpose, but has done precisely the opposite. The sooner we undo that peace treaty and permit the Italians to work in full concert with the other nations of the so-called, but misnamed, North Atlantic community, the better off freemen are going to be.

Mr. WATKINS. Is the Senator aware of the fact that during World War II the Italians had nearly 2,000,000 men under arms and about 6,000,000 men in reserve, ready to bear arms?

Mr. CAIN. I spent 5 or 6 months, as I now recall, in the Italian campaign, but that was at a time when the Italians had become cobelligerents. Probably I should not say this, but I am reminded of it—

Mr. WATKINS. I point out to the Senator that the figures show that during World War II the Italians had about 8,000,000 men in their reserves and in their armed forces.

Mr. CAIN. Certainly they had a great many men in uniform.

Mr. WATKINS. However, under the Italian Peace Treaty, the Italians cannot have in uniform more than 250,000 men, at the outside—which is not a sufficient number to police that country against any possible uprising of Communists.

Mr. CAIN. I have learned to believe that the Italian Peace Treaty was a mistake.

Mr. WATKINS. Italy has been taken into the Atlantic Pact for the purpose of helping defend a part of the territory we are supposed to help defend, and yet the Italians are handcuffed and cannot defend even themselves.

That is one more of the blunders of the administration's foreign policy which has put us in the position we are in today.

Mr. CAIN. It is a great difficulty, and I hope that question will be reopened in connection with the reopening of the Italian Peace Treaty.

The Senator's question recalled to my mind the situation which existed in Italy shortly after the landing at Salerno, where I, together with most of the Americans who landed there, had not been before, and we had been out of circulation and away from communications, and we did not quite appreciate what the status of the Italian military forces was. As I recall—and I may be in error—during the time it took for the ships to go from North Africa to Salerno, the Italians had become cobelligerents, of which we were advised upon landing, but which we did not fully understand. We spent a considerable amount of time, during the first few weeks, in capturing people who turned out to be our friends, which led to quite a number of unnecessary arguments.

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me to make one further observation?

Mr. CAIN. I yield.

Mr. WATKINS. I greatly appreciate the fact that the Senator has come around to the point of view of the 10 Senators who voted against ratification of the Italian Treaty. As one member of the group, I am glad to welcome him to the ranks of those who think the Italian Treaty was a mistake.

Mr. CAIN. Every Senator, of course, is perfectly free to vote according to his best judgment on every issue. On certain occasions, of which I certainly would characterize the occasion of the consideration of the Italian peace treaty as one, I made an error in casting my vote, though at the time I thought I was right. I may say that, under the leadership of the Senator from Utah, who has a primary interest in this matter, I shall certainly work with him and anyone else in endeavoring to undo the damage which we did in that respect several years ago.

Mr. WATKINS. I thank the Senator sincerely for that statement.

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

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Washington yield to the Senator from Colorado?

Mr. CAIN. I am glad to yield.

Mr. MILLIKIN. I regret that I missed the opening portion of the Senator's address. However, during the time I have been present I have gathered that he is documenting the assurances which were given that Congress would have control of the implementation of the North Atlantic Pact. Am I correct in that understanding?

Mr. CAIN. That is correct. I have done that.

Mr. MILLIKIN. I may say, if permitted to sound a personal note, I voted for the North Atlantic Treaty on the basis of those assurances. What has been offered to rebut what I considered to be the moving value of those assurances?

Mr. CAIN. Until this moment, I do not think any considered judgment has been offered to Senators generally in justification of avoiding or ignoring those assurances. The Senator from Wisconsin, whom I do not wish to involve in this argument, was among those who joined in such assurances 2 years ago, and quite sincerely, but now, because we cannot get a satisfactory joint resolution or bill, he contends we should support the concurrent resolution, which, from my point of view, would destroy the effectiveness of the assurances.

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

Mr. CAIN. I am glad to yield.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Does anyone attempt to avoid the effect of those assurances; and if so, what is the reasoning behind it?

Mr. CAIN. During the time I have been on the floor, and supplementing that by a reading of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, within the past few days, I have neither heard nor read any comments by Senators as to why these assurances are being overlooked.

Mr. MILLIKIN. I thank the Senator very much.

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, the Senator from Texas told the Senate on Monday that the full membership of the committees on Foreign Relations and Armed Services completed 11 days of continuous hearings on the Wherry resolution and questions arising from it. He added that during those hearings the committees closely questioned the leading military authorities of the United States, outstanding public servants of the past and present, members of the American public, and, last but not least, members of the United States Senate. This, I think, leads to the answer to questions raised but recently by the Senator from Utah. What these witnesses said has provided me with a valid reason for opposing Senate Resolution 99.

All the Senator from Texas said with reference to these witnesses is true. But why have not the Senator from Texas and other spokesmen for the administration emphasized what these outstanding Americans had to say concerning the European nations which are not members of the Atlantic Pact? What the witnesses said is important to the Senator from Washington, as it should be to every other American citizen. What they related ought to be impressed upon the mind of the American public.

For reasons which were impelling, the report of the committees included a section entitled "The Place of Greece, Turkey, Spain and Yugoslavia." I said a few moments ago that two weeks of hard-headed political work might provide an additional 1,000,000 men under arms for the North Atlantic Pact; and the Senator from Utah asked, "What is the nature of the Senator's authority?" I give it now, as coming from the report of the two Senate committees which sat jointly. This is what the committees say by way of advice to the American people and to the executive branch of the Government. From page 19, continuing on page 20, of the report, I read:

17. THE PLACE OF GREECE, TURKEY, SPAIN, AND YUGOSLAVIA

In developing the capabilities of Western Europe to resist Communist aggression, the committee believes that, insofar as possible, full use of all available assistance to the North Atlantic Treaty Organization should be sought. To this end Spain, Yugoslavia, Greece, and Turkey are important. Turkey has a national will to resist aggression and a very effective ground army. The Turkish contingent in Korea has distinguished itself for its fighting ability. The Greek Army has been engaged in war and has demonstrated its combat worthiness. The Yugoslav Army, while lacking modern equipment, is substantial and would add considerable strength to the military forces of Western Europe. While the present fighting qualities of the Spanish Army are not known, it would constitute a potential resource and the geographic location of Spain would be most helpful. Spain has 350,000 men under arms; Yugoslavia, 330,000; and Greece, 150,000. Reliable estimates are not available as to the present size of the Turkish Army.

It is, however, fair to say that the addition of over a million armed men, who would fight for their freedom, would contribute immeasurably to the security of Western Europe and be an additional deterrent to

Soviet aggression. Yugoslavia, Greece, and Turkey would lie on the flanks of any Soviet attack to the west. Almost without exception the witnesses agreed that it would be desirable to include the forces of the four states in the forces available to oppose Communist aggression.

That terrific statement came, not from the administration, whence it should have come, but from the two committees of the Senate. Mr. President, why do you think that section is included in the committee report? Do you think it is there because the administration witnesses, including the Secretary of State and the Secretary of Defense, addressed themselves to the need for utilizing the resources of these four nations? Section 17 is in the report for no such reason.

To me it is both incredible and amazing but nonetheless true that not a single solitary administration witness had a word to say about Greece, Turkey, Spain, or Yugoslavia in their prepared statements. Every reference to these nations came as a result of questions directed at witnesses by members of the committee. Again I compliment the senior Senator from Nebraska because he was responsible for the hearings. Had it not been for him there would not have been any report and no consideration would have been given to these excluded nations who could make available to the Atlantic Pact today a million men under arms. How unrealistic can the administration become?

A few moments ago, the Senator from Wisconsin asked me, in all seriousness, "What can we do to stop the threat of Communist aggression, if we do not rush four divisions to General Eisenhower's army?" The only response I can make is, let the Nation face reality. If the two committees know what they are talking about—and I think I can establish it as a fact that they do—why do we not press for the admission into our collective security system of certain nations who have something with which to fight, and the greatest asset and the greatest virtue of all, which they can give to us for nothing, namely, the determination to resist aggression.

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

Mr. CAIN. I am glad to yield.

Mr. CASE. The point made in the general thesis of the Senator from Washington is one which certainly ought to be thoroughly considered in the debate upon this measure. The suggestion which the Senator is making is in harmony with article 10 of the North Atlantic Pact. Was the Senator expecting to bring into the discussion that particular article? If not, with his permission, I should like at this point to read it.

Mr. CAIN. I shall appreciate it, if the Senator from South Dakota will read it.

Mr. CASE. From the North Atlantic Treaty, I read:

ARTICLE 10—NEW MEMBERS

The parties may, by unanimous agreement, invite any other European state in a position to further the principles of this treaty and to contribute to the security of the North Atlantic area to accede to this treaty. Any state so invited may become a party to the treaty by depositing its instrument of

accession with the Government of the United States of America. The Government of the United States of America will inform each of the parties of the deposit of each such instrument of accession.

So, in the North Atlantic Treaty itself, there is the definite provision that the parties might by unanimous agreement invite participation by other European states who were in a position to further the principles of the treaty and to contribute to its purposes. Was there in the hearings any suggestion that the State Department or that the Government of the United States had made any attempt to invite other nations, or to secure the agreement and consent of other nations who are at present parties to the North Atlantic Pact to accede to the invitation?

Mr. CAIN. If the Senator will wait for a very few moments, I should like to state, not my own views on the matter, but the testimony offered to the two committees, sitting jointly, by the Secretary of State, from which the Senator from South Dakota may judge for himself.

Like most other Senators, I have worried for years about the ever-diminishing purchasing power of the American dollar. I am not less concerned by our depreciated American political leadership. When that leadership talks from prepared statements about collective security without making reference to the nations which could add strength to that security, then we have solid reasons to worry about its character and intelligence. When that leadership tells us that the free world is in peril, that the need for stimulating morale in Europe is urgent, that unless we commit to Western Europe four American divisions overnight, the whole house of cards will fall down around our heads, and, at the same time, fails to make us aware of where large numbers of troops and a full measure of courage are immediately available, then we have a right to doubt both the effectiveness and the intelligence of our leadership. We ought to do more. We ought to denounce such leadership and get rid of it.

Our only excuse for committing American forces to Europe is that we seek to offer such a solid and unified defense line to an enemy that he would not dare to attack it, or to win the resulting war if he should attack it. No military man alive would ignore the availability and strength which can be found today in Greece, Turkey, Spain, and Yugoslavia.

If there is any urgency about the day in which we live, and I think there is, then the sooner we do business with everybody who wants to do business with us, the better off all of us and the North Atlantic community will be. I cannot support a proposition which would make it less likely for us to do business with the excluded nations. If it be true that some Atlantic Pact nations are not interested in cooperating with the excluded nations, we shall only, by sending American forces, make it easier for such Atlantic Pact nations to continue their resistance to the admission of the excluded nations. If this

does not make logic and sense, I do not know what does. I shall not support any longer any half-measures or measures which have so little rhyme or reason to them.

It is hard work for any Senator on any day to speak at length, but we fight for what we think is right.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CAIN. I yield.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I should like to make an observation, and in making it I wish to make it clear that I am one of the Senators who favored the very position which the Senator from Washington is now taking. I agree with the Senator entirely on his point. There are some questions, Mr. President, which I think we should consider—

Mr. CAIN. I wish the Senator would put them into the RECORD.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. They are in the pact itself. Article 6 contains this language:

For the purpose of article 5, an armed attack on one or more of the parties is deemed to include an armed attack on the territory of any of the parties in Europe or North America, on the Algerian departments of France, on the occupation forces of any party in Europe, on the islands under the jurisdiction of any party in the North Atlantic area north of the Tropic of Cancer, or on the vessels or aircraft in this area of any of the parties.

The report on the North Atlantic Treaty has this to say:

Article 6 specifies the area within which an armed attack would bring the provisions of article 5 into operation.

Thus, the obligations under article 5 are strictly limited to the area described.

Agreeing with the position which the Senator from Washington is taking, that would have broadened the responsibility of the whole group.

Mr. CAIN. That is correct.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. An attack on one is an attack on all. We enlarged the whole area of responsibility as well as the area of strength.

Mr. CAIN. That is correct. I have known for a long time that the Senator from New Jersey and the Senator from Washington were as one in hoping to bring together the collective strength of the so-called North Atlantic community, which would include nations now excluded.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. It is defined as the North Atlantic community, which would include all the nations which have asked to join with us for collective security. It might require a renegotiation with the other countries parties to the treaty.

Mr. CAIN. Yes, it would. In my opinion, the North Atlantic area is a misnomer. As I understand, when the North Atlantic Pact was first under consideration we did not, for example, include Italy.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. That is correct.

Mr. CAIN. From the moment we included Italy we no longer, in a technical sense, could refer to the result as being the North Atlantic area.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I agree with the Senate entirely on that point.

Mr. CAIN. We have continued to use a wrong name, but it is the only one we have for the moment.

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

Mr. CAIN. I yield.

Mr. CASE. The observation of the Senator from Washington it seems to me, is clearly in point, for in article 6 reference is made to the Algerian departments of France, which, of course, technically speaking, are just beyond the North Atlantic.

Mr. CAIN. Yes.

Mr. CASE. But even though article 6 does refer to the present parties as members of the pact, article 10, to which I have previously referred, definitely contemplated that the membership might be expanded. It did not use the phrase "the territory in the North Atlantic area," which is under the jurisdiction of the present members of the pact, but used the phrase "and to contribute to the security of the North Atlantic area." That is a broad area. From the standpoint of security there are other areas which are involved. If we include French Algeria we immediately think of certain areas in Africa. But, in harmony with the Senator's principal position, certainly article 10 definitely contemplated that there would be an attempt to bring other nations into membership in the pact.

I certainly hope the Senator may be persuasive enough to get some kind of an answer as to why efforts have not been made, if they have not been made.

Mr. CAIN. The Senate of the United States can do anything it wants to do. It can rewrite its rules and change its procedure, and so forth. We can do the same thing with reference to the North Atlantic Pact. The pact itself permits 12 nations, at any time they want to do so, to open up the doors and to say, "Come on in." Continued refusal will be a great shock to some nations, because they are becoming tired of the delay. One nation I can think of, and I shall address myself precisely to it, has been knocking on the door of the Atlantic Pact since before the pact was ratified. The first excuse given as to why it would not be taken into membership was that it was in the Mediterranean. Lo and behold, to its amazement and surprise, when the pact was ratified it included Italy. The admission of Italy destroyed the substance of the first excuse given. There have been a number of other excuses given.

Mr. WILEY rose.

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

Mr. CAIN. I yield, first, to the Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I suggest to the distinguished Senator from Washington that he might very well take the matter up with the State Department and the advisers of the State Department who were in that area, to find out what has been done. The 96 Senators do not seem to agree very well on what is meant by simple language. In the Atlantic Pact there are 10 or 12 nations. Senators know that a decision must be unanimous. A nation outside

the pact may be taken in only by the unanimous vote of the member nations. The only part of the Senator's statement as to which I should like to have him get more information is with respect to the fact that our Government has been working on the problem, and has made Greece an ally and Turkey an ally. Turkey will fight. Greece will fight. Whether they can be incorporated into the pact will depend entirely upon all the members of the pact, as the distinguished Senator knows.

My hope is that this debate will not build a great iron curtain so that we cannot even see the objective which all of us are trying to reach. Everyone agrees that, if we could get unity and get the nations which the Senator has mentioned into the field in support of America, we would be much stronger. We will have the Turkish Army if we can give them munitions and the proper training. We will have the Greek Army. They are fighters. There is no question that Tito will fight with us if Tito's land is invaded. We have with us the major number of nations the Senator mentioned. Spain is the other one, and so far as America is concerned, we have already stated that we want Spain.

Mr. CAIN. Who has stated in this country that we want Spain?

Mr. WILEY. I suggest the Senator go to the State Department and find out.

Mr. CAIN. I will have something to say on that subject in a few minutes.

Mr. WILEY. Just as we cannot agree on the issue, we cannot even agree as to what the attitude of the Government has been in recent months on that question. Those of us who sat in the committee hearings know what the attitude with respect to Spain has been, and we know which member of the pact has stopped Spain. The point I am making—and I hold no brief for the State Department—is that with the fine statement which the Senator is making today, I hope he will not make the situation more confused, so that our people will not know where we are: One further question: If we defeat the resolutions, where do we go from here?

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

Mr. CAIN. I should like to answer the question of the Senator from Wisconsin. He asked me: "Where do we go from here?" He asked me: "Where do we go from here if we defeat the resolutions?" We would move, I hope, in the direction toward which we ought to be moving, namely, to have the President of the United States, under the provisions of the Atlantic Pact, for which the Senator from Wisconsin and the Senator from Washington, and many other Senators voted, make recommendations to Congress; let Congress do with those recommendations, through the same procedure, what it did with the President's recommendations to provide arms for Europe, and lay upon the President's desk a bill or joint resolution.

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

Mr. CAIN. Certainly.

Mr. CASE. Far from muddying the waters or confusing the issue, I desire to go on record as saying that this debate is making clear to the country what is involved in the resolutions. The country is entitled to know. That is why I want to join in what the Senator said a moment ago in commending the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY] for bringing the issue before the people. If it sounds confusing it is only because the original announcement of what was proposed to be done may have looked simple and thereby perhaps misled Senators.

Mr. CAIN. I think the Senator from Wisconsin used an unfortunate word. There has been nothing confusing this afternoon. What is confusing to the average American is why important assurances by great Americans should be given at one time and in less than 2 years the same Americans should advise the people of the United States to do something else. There is the confusion.

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

Mr. CAIN. I shall yield in a moment. First, I should like to say that I listened to every word of the distinguished American, the senior Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY], the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations, and the chairman of the two committees sitting jointly, when he made his presentation on Monday. A great deal of what the Senator from Washington has said this afternoon was developed from the hearings before those committees, but they were not mentioned by the Senator from Texas in his presentation. His choice of subjects and emphasis are obviously his own. The country wants to know what has not yet been said, so that the Nation will have a reasonable opportunity to obtain information. I wonder whether we are pursuing a wise course.

One paragraph more and I shall yield to the Senator from Nebraska. As I said, all of us are fighting for our Nation as best we know how. In the recent past the Senate passed a momentous manpower bill. It provided for great things. It provided for frightening things, too. It provided for drafting 18-year-olds, universal training for the youth of America, 2 years' service for every draftee, and a ceiling of 4,000,000 men. The Senator from Washington was in full support of the manpower bill. He did not, however—and I think this view deserves consideration—vote to draft 18-year-olds, to be committed to service in Europe, when the 18-year-olds and their older brothers in the excluded nations to which I have just made reference are not to be permitted to join in the defense of freedom in the North Atlantic community.

If we are to live and survive in the future it will be because every available nation is doing everything it can for the common good. Anything short of this character of collective effort will surely end in disaster for everyone. To take an example, in the last war Turkey did not fight. The President of the United States, the Foreign Minister of Great Britain, and the Chancellor of Germany

did all they could to make Turkey come in on his side. Certainly Mr. Churchill, with his personal visits to Turkey, did everything he could to have Turkey come in on the side of the Allies. Hitler worked as hard to get Turkey to come in on the other side. Turkey sat down. I want to suggest a possibility, and I think it is a true one. If war were to break out in Western Europe before the Atlantic Pact or the United States, through a unilateral arrangement had an agreement with Turkey, the chances are that we, the so-called free people, would not have available to us some of the finest fighting men the world has ever known of as of tonight, and who would like to join hands with America and the other Atlantic Pact nations.

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

Mr. CAIN. I gladly yield.

Mr. LONG. Is it the Senator's understanding that Turkey would be willing at this time to associate itself with the North Atlantic alliance if offered the opportunity to do so?

Mr. CAIN. I have a prepared statement, and as part of my statement I shall prove—or rather I should say I will establish something, because we are not interested in proving anything; we are trying to offer some information. I will tell the Senate the date when Turkey first asked for membership in the Atlantic Pact and why she did so. I am going to tell why Turkey was then refused, why Turkey has since been refused, and why Turkey, today, sits in hopeful anticipation, but little expectation, of being taken into the North Atlantic Pact. I hope it will constitute a valid contribution to the debate.

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

Mr. CAIN. I yield.

Mr. LONG. Is it the understanding of the Senator that Turkey, one of the finest fighting powers in Europe, has been ready and willing, and is ready and willing today, to join the North Atlantic alliance, but that if war broke out Turkey would sit it out unless she were a member of the North Atlantic alliance?

Mr. CAIN. First, partly because I have personally visited with practically every national leader in Turkey, aside from the President, I can say without fear of contradiction that Turkey not only wanted to be a member of the Atlantic Pact but still wants to be.

Secondly—and I can state only my own feeling—if we do not soon open the doors and treat Turkey as a first-class nation, we may find that there is a great deal of human nature among its citizens, too. In the event of trouble in Western Europe, there would be too great a likelihood, to suit my purpose, that Turkey might say, "We tried to get into that show for a long time, but they did not want us, and now we do not know who is going to win, so we had better sit tight and find out."

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

Mr. CAIN. I yield.

Mr. LONG. Can the Senator think of many nations in the North Atlantic alliance today which have as many assets

and as few liabilities to offer the alliance as does Turkey?

Mr. CAIN. Turkey has an asset which no other nation in Western Europe, in my opinion, has to such an extent. That asset is a total lack of fear and a determination to fight any aggressor who may pop up at any hour of the 24 hours of the day.

Some days ago when the Senator from Washington addressed himself to the Korean situation, he stated that what Korea really needs is more Turks, or people with the determination of the Turks. I knew that to be a fact when I said it, and it is still true.

Mr. CASE. And Turkey occupies a strategic position.

Mr. CAIN. Oh, yes, indeed.

If the Senator from Louisiana, who is a very close friend of mine, does not happen to be present when I reach the Turkish section of my address, I suggest that he may find something worth while in the RECORD.

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

Mr. CAIN. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. I should like to return to the statement made by the distinguished Senator from Washington in response to a question asked him by the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY], relative to clarifying the issues. Personally, I wish to thank the distinguished Senator from Washington for the high tribute paid the junior Senator from Nebraska earlier in his speech relative to bringing the issue before the people of the United States. I wish to say—and I am not doing it in the sense of "mule trading"—that I think there has not been a more valuable member of either committee than the Senator from Washington. I sat alongside him in hearing after hearing, as we listened to the testimony offered before the two committees. He certainly has brought before us today an address which shows the industry with which he worked on the joint committee. The issues which he has raised and the observations which he has made are most informative to Members of the Senate.

I am convinced in my own mind that as Senators went through the hearings each day somehow there infiltrated into the minds of all members of the committees the thought that, regardless of what constitutional power the President might have in time of peace to send troops here, there, and everywhere, the provisions of the treaty and the promises made by the explainers of the treaty, those who took part in the debate on the treaty revealed that the implementation of article 3, according to the provisions of the treaty, was a matter for the Congress to determine in connection with our policy of national defense. I am sure that the distinguished Senator from Washington will agree with that statement.

I know that the distinguished Senator from Washington has read the report of the committee with regard to the powers of the President to send armed forces outside the United States. On the second page of the report is a statement entitled "Foreword," by the senior Sen-

ator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY]. Senators can decide for themselves, according to their own judgment, whether the interpretation of the constitutional powers recommended by the committee is correct or otherwise.

I wish to point out to the distinguished Senator from Washington certain language on page 20 of the report. Before I ask him a question I should like to read this statement:

The power to send troops abroad is certainly one of the powers which the President may exercise in carrying out such a treaty as the North Atlantic Treaty or the United Nations Charter. Since it is a power which only he can exercise, provisions of these treaties which have to do with such measures of defense may certainly be deemed to be "addressed" to the President.

In the absence of a clear indication in a treaty as to the exact nature of the action required to carry it out, there arises the question as to which branch of the Government has the duty of interpreting the international obligation which it imposes. Is it the Congress or the President which must say whether or not the purposes and commitments of a treaty require the sending of troops abroad? Alexander Hamilton clearly expressed the view that it is up to the President to interpret the international obligations arising under a treaty. He wrote:

"The President is the constitutional executor of the laws. Our treaties, and the laws of nations, form a part of the law of the land. He, who is to execute the laws, must first judge for himself of their meaning. In order to the observance of that conduct which the laws of nations, combined with our treaties, prescribed to this country, in reference to the present war in Europe, it was necessary for the President to judge for himself, whether there was anything to our treaties, incompatible with an adherence to neutrality" (Corwin, op. cit., p. 237).

Certainly in the absence of congressional prohibitions the President is entitled to interpret the obligations of the treaty to meet the circumstances as they arise and to act upon his own interpretation to the extent that it is within his constitutional functions to do so.

I ask the Senator if in his opinion that interpretation in any way complies with the statements made by those who explained the treaty when they came before the Senate and, in answer to the question, "Does this include the sending of manpower?" said over and over again, "No; when any further implementation of the Atlantic Treaty under article 3 is needed, it will be for the Congress of the United States to determine the policy. Congress will determine the character of mutual aid."

I should like to ask the distinguished Senator if that is not exactly the opposite of what we are told today. Is not the interpretation of the treaty explainers, when they were seeking votes on the floor of the Senate during the debate on the North Atlantic Treaty, exactly the opposite of what we are told today?

Mr. CAIN. I can rely only on what responsible American public officials have told us, and what they told the Nation 2 years ago when the pact was before the Senate for ratification. Those leaders prevailed upon the Senate to ratify the pact, because of their assurances that its implementation was the prerogative of the Congress. I can speak for no other man; but the Senator from Wash-

ington feels positive that, with the possible exception of four or five, not a single Member of the Senate would have voted 2 years ago for the North Atlantic Pact if they had been told that the Executive had complete authority to implement the treaty by sending American forces to an international command in peacetime.

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

Mr. CAIN. Certainly.

Mr. WHERRY. Does the Senator recall that when the junior Senator from Nebraska concluded his statement before the two committees he was cross-examined by the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE]?

Mr. CAIN. I so recall.

Mr. WHERRY. I will ask the Senator if he recalls this statement, from page 689 of the hearings on Senate Concurrent Resolution 8:

Senator GEORGE. Then, looking at article 11 of the treaty, Senator WHERRY:

"This treaty shall be ratified and its provisions carried out by the parties in accordance with their respective constitutional processes."

"Its processes" means all of its processes, does it not?

Senator WHERRY. Yes, sir.

Senator GEORGE. It was so interpreted by the Secretary of State at the time this treaty was presented to us?

Senator WHERRY. Yes, sir. I might stay with that point sufficiently long to say that I had extracted all of the colloquy between Senator GEORGE and Secretary Acheson, for use in my remarks, but because of the length of my statement decided to leave it out.

Senator GEORGE. Can there be any doubt in your mind that when the Senate ratified the North Atlantic Pact it was understood that each of the articles of the treaty was to be carried out by the "constitutional processes," whatever they were, of the country?

Senator WHERRY. That is right.

Senator GEORGE. That is the way I understood it. I recognize such a thing as public morality, and I do not think any government can long retain the complete confidence of the people if it is unwilling to abide by its own interpretation of a treaty when it submits it to the Congress.

I should like to ask the distinguished Senator from Washington if he does not agree completely with the observations made by the Senator from Georgia.

Mr. CAIN. I have brought my own documented case in support of the Senator from Georgia to the floor this afternoon. I wish to say that I apparently share the view held by the Senator from Georgia in this instance, that I hold the view held by the Senator from Nebraska in this instance, and that other Senators share my view. There is no conceivable doubt in our minds that there was no intention, less than 2 years ago, to implement the treaty in any way, shape, or form without recourse to the Congress of the United States.

Mr. WHERRY. Will the Senator yield for a final question?

Mr. CAIN. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. Then I ask, Who is confusing the issue? Who is muddying the waters? I ask the Senator if it is not true that all the resolution does is to say that the President of the United States shall comply with the provisions of the North Atlantic Treaty in imple-

menting the treaty according to article 3 before an attack has occurred, and according to section 5 after an attack has occurred. Is it not a fact that the debate which has taken place and the action which has taken place have been in an effort to clear the issue, rather than to permit it to become confused, to the effect that the President of the United States shall alone implement the treaty under such powers as are discussed in the article, Powers of the President To Send the Armed Forces Outside the United States?

Mr. CAIN. I believe the Senator from Nebraska to be conclusively correct in that comment.

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

Mr. CAIN. I yield.

Mr. BRICKER. The Senator from Washington has been discussing the exclusion of Spain, Turkey, and other powers from the North Atlantic Defense Pact. I agree with the Senator that the North Atlantic Pact could not possibly have been adopted by the Senate had it not been for the assurance of the Secretary of State, the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee, and the distinguished Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] on our side of the aisle, to the effect that any proposal for implementation by arms or by troops or otherwise would have to come to the Congress of the United States for approval; that it must be done under the power of the Congress and under a law enacted by the Congress.

A moment ago the Senator was discussing the exclusion of important countries of Europe interested in defense and interested in attacking communism on every front, and defending against its encroachment. While he was discussing that subject he mentioned the Manpower Act passed last week by the Senate of the United States, which contains provisions which are, as I think the Senator described, terrifying in their implication, disturbing to our whole social structure, upsetting to our whole educational program and community life. Does the Senator know of any country participant in the Atlantic Pact, which was ratified by the Senate, which has as rigid a manpower act as was passed by the Senate, containing, as it did, the universal draft feature, the age limit of 18, and the tenure of service in the Army?

Mr. CAIN. The answer to my friend, the Senator from Ohio, is that there is no nation in Europe which presently has felt it necessary to move as far in the direction of the manpower question as has the United States through the recent action taken by the Senate.

Mr. BRICKER. Does the Senator from Washington agree with the Senator from Ohio that at the present time the United States is furnishing money and materials representing more than 50 percent of all the efforts of the Atlantic Pact nations in their rearmament program?

Mr. CAIN. I only know that we are furnishing a tremendous amount of the things which are needed by those countries in order to put themselves in a stronger military posture. Whether

that represents 50 percent of their own capacity or their own contribution I do not know.

Mr. BRICKER. I think proper figuring will show that in the war effort alone the contribution of the United States, in money and materials, already is above 50 percent. And now, by the so-called Manpower Act, we are moving to the point where, if war should come in Europe, we will have to furnish a majority of the manpower likewise to defend European countries against Russian aggression.

Mr. CAIN. That is correct. The Senator from Ohio and the Senator from Washington differed in their views on the manpower bill.

Mr. BRICKER. That is, on the UMT provisions of the bill.

Mr. CAIN. Yes. I supported it in its entirety, because I think we live in a critical period, and the sooner we get out of it the better. It was my hope, in supporting the bill, that it would be an evidence of leadership to other countries elsewhere with whom we are allied in one way or another, and that they would the more rapidly keep pace with us so that jointly and collectively, severally and individually, we might present a united determination to resist an aggressor, any possible enemy, and find a solution at the counsel table.

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

Mr. CAIN. I yield.

Mr. BRICKER. The Senator from Ohio was of the opinion that the universal military training measure, as drafted, with the unlimited power of the President to put it into effect when, as, and if, he deems desirable, and with the power to use American boys in any way he cares to use them, and set up for them any kind of training, was a step toward destruction of our own economy and our own social institutions in America, and would far offset any advantages we might gain by encouragement of Europe, through the Marshall plan aid, for which the Senator from Ohio voted in the hope that it would give encouragement to the countries of Europe to build their own economies, to meet their own needs of the future.

We are presented here today with the same kind of a request, that we do something to encourage Europe. For one, as a Member of this body, I feel that unless they themselves generate their own courage and patriotism and determination, there is not sufficient money in America to buy that determination by any measure Congress might pass in the nature of a universal military training bill, or even in the draft bill which I supported. I feel that we will not by any such action give very much encouragement unless they have the self-determination which they alone can generate, and which cannot be bought with American dollars or American sacrifice, or with the lives of American boys.

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

Mr. CAIN. I will yield to the Senator from New York in a moment. I very generally agree with what my friend from Ohio has said with reference to

what is an undeniable fact, that the determination on the part of free peoples to resist an aggressor is going to decide whether there is to be peace in the future. I could not feel more strongly in support of Europe's progress in that direction. I hope it will increase in power.

Mr. BRICKER. The Senator has encouraged me to ask one more question. Does the Senator from Washington have much hope that the European nations will respond at this time to the act of the United States by implementing and strengthening their own position, which I feel is a necessity? Does the Senator feel that our act will encourage them to do so?

Mr. CAIN. That is a very difficult question to answer. I would rather approach the Senator's question from this point of view: I am absolutely convinced that if all the nations of the North Atlantic area would join themselves together, they could build a defense line in Western Europe adequate to the containment of communism.

Mr. BRICKER. I might say that I agree entirely with the Senator from Washington, but as one, I feel that that is a necessary prerequisite to this country sending troops to Europe. I shall express myself tomorrow on that point. I think I shall be in general agreement with the Senator from Washington.

Mr. CAIN. I think so. I am in favor of sending troops to Europe, to a unified defense structure.

Mr. BRICKER. After the program is planned, when we know what each country is going to do, the Congress of the United States will pass upon that question.

Mr. CAIN. I have no resistance such as some of my colleagues have; and I can understand their resistance, but I simply do not share it. I wish America to supplement the activities of our allies throughout the North Atlantic community; but if we are to have a fair chance to succeed if war is imposed upon us, we should begin to work at once with all our allies. I see nothing to be gained by saying again, as I and other Senators have said in years gone by, that although we do not like what is in front of us, although it is not adequate to the task, yet—inasmuch as we cannot get what we want—we shall vote for what is offered to us. In this issue I think the time has come for me to "leave the boat," so to speak; and from now on I will vote for those measures which impose, with reference to the rest of the world in which we live, conditions which are reasonable and understandable and which join all of the free world together, so that all the nations of the free world can share, and share alike, in the heavy responsibilities involved.

I am very much inclined to believe that if we send our four divisions to Western Europe right now—as obviously we are about to do—there will be no ensuing reason for the nations in the North Atlantic Pact to say that the time has come to offer admission to the North Atlantic Pact to those nations which thus far have been without the Pact. I am afraid that under these circumstances the other nations of the North Atlantic Pact will

be inclined to take that position because they will know that where four divisions have come from, more will be available.

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

Mr. CAIN. I yield.

Mr. BRICKER. So, instead of encouraging them, the sending of four of our divisions might well result in deterring Europe from meeting its responsibilities, because then the countries of Western Europe would very likely feel that inasmuch as Uncle Sam had helped them then, in the future Uncle Sam would move into the breach once more.

Mr. CAIN. That is my feeling.

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

Mr. CAIN. I yield.

Mr. LEHMAN. I have listened with surprise and disquiet to the colloquy between the distinguished Senator from Washington and the distinguished Senator from Ohio.

I wonder whether the Senator from Washington realizes the calamitous situation which would ensue if we abandoned Western Europe.

Mr. CAIN. I do not wish to abandon Western Europe; I desire the Senator from New York to know that.

Mr. LEHMAN. Certainly the impression which I and, I believe, other Senators now on the floor have received from the remarks of the distinguished Senator from Washington is that he wishes to have us do nothing until we are certain that Western Europe can defend itself against what a former distinguished President of the United States, Mr. Herbert Hoover, called the flood of the Red tide.

Of course, under present circumstances unless we give to the Western European countries some assurance, some degree of promise of support, as outlined by General Eisenhower, we simply cannot possibly expect them to stand up alone, having no certainty that the forces, the might, and the leadership—and I place great emphasis on the leadership—of the United States will be at their side. It seems to me that is what the Senator from Washington is advocating.

Mr. CAIN. Permit me to suggest—and I hope I can do so in such words that the Senator from New York and everyone else will understand it, that what I have been saying all afternoon is not that I want to abandon Europe. With reference to this recent portion of the debate, what I have been saying is that certain nations within the North Atlantic community, called the Atlantic Pact nations, are so motivated and guided by their prevailing prejudices and animosities of one kind or another—or perhaps they are thoughtless; I do not know—that they are not determined to take advantage of the great manpower resources which are available to them among the free nations existing in the North Atlantic area, but not members of the Atlantic Pact. I have said that I am not interested in these four divisions, as such. If there is a real determination in Europe to have a collective security system, I will vote—and rather gladly—

to commit, in supplementing that defense establishment, any number of American divisions.

However, the Senator from New York probably has seen something of war. I myself have seen too much of it.

Mr. LEHMAN. So have I.

Mr. CAIN. I appreciate that. The Senator from New York has seen it. He voted, as I did, for the manpower bill, which in peacetime will conscript our 18-year-olds. When those boys go abroad, wherever they go, the Senator from New York and I want them to have the best possible chance to live.

The Senator from New York is likely to say that war might break out in Western Europe 6 weeks from now or a year from now. If it does, and if the free peoples do not have available to them the resources of Turkey, Greece, and Spain—to mention but three examples—thousands and thousands of young Americans are going to die so needlessly. Therefore, I am no longer going to support any proposition which does not give the people I represent a fair chance to live. It is so needless.

Inasmuch as the Senator from New York has asked me the question, I wish he would give the Senate his interpretation of why, 2 years after the Atlantic Pact was ratified, now that the great and sovereign nation of Turkey, which is doing so much in Korea, has at least twice, and probably more times than that, applied for membership in the Atlantic Pact and an opportunity to offer all that Turkey has to offer to freedom everywhere, the nations of Western Europe have not responded to that offer?

Mr. LEHMAN. Let me say to the Senator from Washington that I have the greatest admiration for the fighting abilities and for the great heart of the people of Turkey and the people of Greece.

Mr. CAIN. Good.

Mr. LEHMAN. It may very well be that we may associate ourselves, in a common defense, with countries other than those which now are included in the Atlantic Pact. However, the resolution now before the Congress is an implementation of the Atlantic Pact.

Mr. CAIN. That is correct.

Mr. LEHMAN. I think the Senator from Washington may very well urge his views with regard to widening the field of the common defense; but I do not believe that the mere fact that Greece, Turkey, Spain, and other countries are not included in the Atlantic Pact is justification for the Senator's saying that he will vote against the resolution, the adoption of which is essential to implement the Atlantic Pact.

Mr. CAIN. Of course, that is simply one man's opinion. I might work against what I thought was the position of the Senator from New York, but I see little reason for saying that I see no justification for the Senator's vote. The Senator from New York is going to make up his mind in regard to how he will vote. He may be on sound ground in attacking my position, but not in attacking my vote.

Mr. LEHMAN. I have no intention of attacking the vote of the Senator from Washington, but I do not think I should

necessarily refrain from expressing my very definite views regarding the position taken by any other Member of the Senate.

Mr. CAIN. I am pleased to have the Senator from New York do so.

Mr. LEHMAN. That is not to question the good faith, sincerity, or patriotism of other Senators. I am simply expressing a deep sense of failure to understand their position, and disapproving of that position.

Mr. CAIN. The Senator from New York can probably help me out a little bit, if he will kindly give me his answer to this situation: We are this afternoon talking about the need of getting more friends. Everyone seems to be in favor of that position and supporting it. The Senator from New York has just stated that he thinks it would be a fine thing if we were to take up negotiations with Turkey as soon as possible. I think I understood the Senator to say that.

Mr. LEHMAN. And Greece.

Mr. CAIN. Certainly.

Mr. LEHMAN. And possibly other countries.

Mr. CAIN. When we have before the two committees of the Senate, sitting jointly, a resolution to determine what is best for us to do in the North Atlantic area, with no single political leader of our administration—and, believe me, this is not directed at the Democrats per se—but when no single authoritative leader of the administration appears before those committees of the Congress, as the representatives of the people, to utter even the word "Turkey," or "Spain," or "Greece," we would be led, as members of those committees, to believe that the countries in question simply do not exist. With all respect, I wish to say to my friend from New York that, to my way of thinking, it simply does not make sense. If our political leadership within the State Department and within the executive branch of the Government will not speak of those nations, whose assistance we shall need if we are to live in the future, members of the Congress are going to do it whenever an opportunity is offered. It is that simple.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, may I answer the distinguished Senator from Washington?

Mr. CAIN. Please do.

Mr. LEHMAN. I, of course, have no knowledge of the viewpoint or of what is in the minds of our leaders. I prefer not to say political leaders, because I really do not think it is a matter of politics at all.

Mr. CAIN. What is it, then, if I may ask?

Mr. LEHMAN. I think it is a matter of the survival of our country.

Mr. CAIN. That is a political question.

Mr. LEHMAN. The Senator from Washington looked toward this side of the aisle, and said, "Not referring particularly to Democratic leaders."

Mr. CAIN. No.

Mr. LEHMAN. I do not know the politics of General Marshall. I do not have the slightest idea as to the politics of General Eisenhower. I do not have the

least idea as to the politics of General Bradley, or of Admiral Sherman. I do not know. And I do not know what they think about association with the countries mentioned by the Senator.

Mr. CAIN. Would the Senator like to know?

Mr. LEHMAN. May I complete my reply?

Mr. CAIN. Yes.

Mr. LEHMAN. I do know that General Eisenhower, General Bradley, Admiral Sherman, other members of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, and the Secretary of State have appeared before appropriate committees of Congress and asked for favorable action on a resolution which would implement article 3 of the North Atlantic Pact. That seems to me to be what is before us today.

Mr. CAIN. I respectfully beg to differ with the distinguished Senator from New York on that opinion.

Mr. LONG and Mr. HUMPHREY addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Washington yield, and if so to whom?

Mr. CAIN. I will yield in a moment. What the Senator from New York has said is that he has not the faintest idea of what any of these military leaders think about Spain, Greece, Turkey, or Yugoslavia. Permit me to say again to the Senator from New York, I think it is about time he learned what they think about them. Not only did those leaders appear before the two committees of the Senate, sitting jointly, to urge adoption of this resolution, but each of those to whom the Senator has referred by name urged inclusion, at the earliest possible time, of the nations referred to within the collective defense system of Western Europe. Were it not that some of us feel so strongly on the question, the Senator would never be able to learn from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD what all these men think, for the subject has not been mentioned to date by the administration leaders.

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

Mr. CAIN. Permit me to yield first to the Senator from Louisiana; after which I shall be pleased to yield to the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. LONG. I am in agreement with most of the logic of the Senator's argument. I wonder somewhat whether I would agree with his conclusion. Would the Senator think it proper that, rather than defeating these resolutions, we amend them to state that American foreign policy should be directed toward the inclusion of Turkey, Spain, Greece, and the other countries the Senator has in mind, within the North Atlantic Alliance?

Mr. CAIN. I think it would be an improvement.

Mr. LONG. Would the Senator think it proper that, in sending troops overseas, certainly the number we are to send to help defend Western Europe should be conditioned, at least in some degree, upon how far those countries are willing to go in cooperating to build an effective defense bloc?

Mr. CAIN. I think there is much to be said for the position voiced by the Senator from Louisiana. It is one of the worth-while effects of this debate that we are beginning now to speak of a collective-security system for the future, a system ever so much stronger than the one we have at the present time. I am now pleased to yield to the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I believe the Senator from Louisiana has clarified partially the point of view I wished to express. I desire to say to the Senator from Washington that his emphasis upon the strategic military importance of Turkey, with the bravery and patriotism of its men and women, is very important in this debate. Likewise, it is important that the heroic efforts of the people of Greece to maintain their freedom should be emphasized, as well as the fact that in Spain there are several hundred thousand troops.

I think it ought also to be noted, so that there may be a complete record, that one of the reasons why Turkey is strong today is because a leader, who is now under criticism, came to the Congress in the year 1946 and asked that Turkey be made strong. I refer to the President of the United States; and I refer also to the present Secretary of Defense.

I think it should also be noted that one of the reasons why Greece is alive today as a free nation and can be spoken of as a potential partner in the North Atlantic Pact is that, again, there was that kind of leadership.

I should now like to point out that what we are dealing with is not what ought to be, but what is, if, as the Senator from Louisiana has well stated—and I should want to concur in his statement—it is entirely possible and perhaps appropriate to say that the policy of this country ought to be directed toward enlarging the scope of the pact, for which the Senator from Washington has very valiantly, and, let me say, ably argued this afternoon. But I also think it ought to be quite clear that, simply because the pact is not perfect is no reason for turning Europe over to the apostles of imperfection and of violence and of war, namely, international communism. Let us make it quite clear.

I have before me a copy of a newspaper. I am a bit provincial. Senators will pardon me for quoting the Minneapolis Morning Tribune of March 19. I refer to an Associated Press story. The Associated Press I am sure is supposed to have a reputation for veracity and objectivity in reporting the news. The article appears under the headline "Spain hints troop deal for United States aid."

The Senator from Washington wants our leaders to do something about Spain. Well, we find it here. We find that—

American Ambassador Stanton Griffis sounded out the Franco government, they said, shortly after arriving in Madrid earlier this month to end a 5-year diplomatic snubbing of Spain.

The Spanish foreign office apparently made these points in talking to Griffis:

1. Under present conditions, Spain could not move any Spanish troops beyond the

Pyrenees Mountains to help defend West Europe. Spain's Army is reported badly in need of modern weapons and parts.

2. If the United States sends military supplies to Spain, Spain would be willing to contribute to West European defense, even by moving troops beyond the Pyrenees Mountains if desired.

Mr. CAIN. I believe that to be so.

Mr. HUMPHREY. All I want to say is that there is something going on. Secretary Finletter did not go over there to see if his plane would fly that far; he went over there to talk about military problems.

There seem to be two problems here, one to implement the pact, and the other to make the pact we already have, work. There are always persons who want everything to be perfect before it starts. That is the trouble with price control. In World War II we did not have as allies Spain, nor did we have Turkey, but apparently that did not stop the Congress of the United States from declaring war. We confronted a practical problem. I submit that we have exactly the same sort of a situation now before us, that of preventing war and increasing the scope of our strength. For that reason I want to thank the Senator for the point which he has brought up.

Mr. CAIN. Both the Senator from Minnesota and the Senator from Washington are headed in the same direction. We are going to do everything we can to insure peace on the face of the earth. We are in complete agreement on that.

The case for Turkey, Spain, and Greece was tried, in part, 2 years ago, during the time when the Atlantic Pact was debated. I merely wish to say, briefly, to the Senator from Minnesota that one of the reasons for my determination to state the case more clearly is that we have made progress in many directions, but we have not made the progress which some of us dreamed of and prayed for with reference to strengthening our collective security system.

In April of 1949, the Atlantic Pact was signed and it was ratified at a later time. We will agree that it was imperfect, but it was ratified on the assurances that improvements were soon to come. Approximately 2 years have passed by. There have not been any improvements. So I am now working to improve an instrument which was designed several years ago.

Mr. KNOWLAND rose.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. PASTORE in the chair). Does the Senator from Washington yield, and if so, to whom?

Mr. CAIN. I yield first to the Senator from California.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I should like to make this observation. The Senator from Minnesota pointed out that in 1947 the President of the United States presented a program of Turkish aid. I desire to suggest that when he came to Congress with that program, which I supported and which many other Senators supported, he came with proposed legislation, so that the policy which he enunciated on Greek-Turkish aid would have the support and approval of the

Congress. He received the overwhelming approval of a then Republican-controlled Congress. So there is no difficulty, if the Congress of the United States is dealt with frankly and if an affirmative program is brought forward, in securing the cooperation of the Congress of the United States.

In part the trouble we face today is caused by an effort to short circuit the representatives of the people in the Senate and in the House of Representatives.

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

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, I should like to reach an agreement at this hour with my friend from Minnesota that there will be no discussion of prices and wages.

Mr. HUMPHREY. We never can tell.

Mr. CAIN. I think we should stick to the subject.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Senator from Minnesota has been around the Senate long enough to know that germaneness is not a credential in connection with being a Member of this body.

Mr. CAIN. I agree with the Senator.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I shall remain germane. I merely want to say to the Senator from California that the Greek-Turkish aid matter was a bit different. The Greek-Turkish aid program was essentially a legislative program seeking an appropriation, not a commitment of troops. In that sense there is no doubt, under the Constitution, as to where the authority for appropriation rests. There is also involved the authority of the President in the deployment of troops. I regret that all this argument has taken place. I think Congress ought to share in this decision, and I wish it had not started out in the way it did. So our job is not to warm over old, dry biscuits and talk about the mistakes made yesterday. Our job is to recognize that there seems to be an urgency in terms of getting the manpower to Europe which has been called for by a man in whom I place great confidence—General Eisenhower.

So I am not going to argue about who was right and who was wrong. That point could be argued for 150 years. The job now before us is to move ahead and get action on these resolutions. I am not worried about the debate. Let us move ahead on the basis of what we have at hand, and then come back to what the Senator from Washington has suggested.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from Washington yield further?

Mr. CAIN. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I merely raised the point that the Senator had referred to the action which had been taken by the President in the Greek-Turkish program. I also referred to the fact that we have had two bills for the implementation of arms under the treaty; and again the administration forthrightly came to Congress. Proposed legislation was introduced, and it received the overwhelming approval of both the House and the Senate. The thing which is difficult for some of us to understand is why the reluctance in this case to take the matter to the Congress of the United

States. Certainly had the administration come to Congress forthrightly and frankly, I think that many of the difficulties we face on the floor at the present time would not now be present.

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

Mr. CAIN. I yield to the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. BRICKER. Reference has been made during the afternoon to our abandonment of Europe if we do not pass the resolutions, which are innocuous and meaningless, so far as law is concerned. Does the Senator from Washington agree with the Senator from Ohio that when we are now furnishing more than 50 percent of the money and material which Europe is using in connection with her job of rebuilding her armament and military program, and when we have agreed by action of the Senate to defend Europe under the Atlantic Pact, we are really abandoning Europe if we do not send another soldier to Western Europe?

Mr. CAIN. I cannot agree with those who think there is any intention on the part of this country to abandon Europe.

Mr. BRICKER. Behind all this there is a far more important question involved than whether we send 4, 6, 8, or 10 divisions to Europe. There is a constitutional question involving the power of the President of the United States, in contrast with the power of the Congress of the United States, as declared in our basic law, the Constitution under which we exist. By the Constitution the power to declare war, to control armies, to send troops, to appropriate money, is exclusively vested in the Congress of the United States. If we adopt either the simple resolution of the Senate or the concurrent resolution, we abandon our responsibility and say to the President, "Go ahead and send our boys any place in the world you want to send them, and Congress has no authority to stop you."

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

Mr. CAIN. In a moment. When I rose earlier in the afternoon I stated that there was one reason why I could not vote for the resolution, and there were two reasons why I would not vote for it. I saw no choice in the matter. If we were going to implement the treaty through a policy instrument, I could not go along. To the extent suggested, I agree with the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. BRICKER. I thank the Senator, and I shall express my opinion on that point tomorrow.

Mr. CAIN. If the Senator from Minnesota will permit me to make this observation, he said something which is very interesting. He said, "I believe in these resolutions and I want them adopted immediately because the military authorities or the Secretary of State or other highly placed persons have said there is an urgency for getting American forces to Europe."

Is that a fair summation of what the Senator said?

Mr. HUMPHREY. Yes; I think so.

Mr. CAIN. What the Senator from Washington and other Senators are driving at is that if we act with the same urgency to incorporate the manpower of

the excluded nations in the Atlantic Pact it would result in fewer arms being required overseas, and, what is more important, it would result, to my mind, in a far greater and more effective Defense Establishment.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I think the fact that the Senator from Washington and other Senators have brought out the importance of the incorporation of other nations lends some support, but I would remind the Senator that, under the terms of the pact, each signatory must take separate action and there must be unanimity.

Mr. CAIN. I understand.

Mr. HUMPHREY. It would seem only a sign of poor judgment to withhold our aid until we have that kind of unanimity. As a matter of fact, if such unanimity were required in our 48 States, where we have a people of common culture, I doubt if we would even have adopted the first amendment, much less the last one.

Mr. CAIN. That is a good point, and I can understand it. On the other hand, there are approximately a million soldiers available in one way or another for combat today, whose presence in a joint collective security system, I think, would be that much greater a deterrent to an aggressor. So we are not so far apart.

Mr. HUMPHREY. It is a matter of degree, I may say to the Senator from Washington. I appreciate his sincerity. I appreciate not only his sincerity but the enlightening manner in which he is presenting his argument. He has been a member of one of the committees which sat jointly in considering this subject, and he has had the advantage of hearing testimony which some of us have not heard.

Mr. CAIN. I shall offer some of that testimony in my statement, and the Senator may think it worth while to consider.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Reference has been made to Turkey. Turkey, armed as she is, is making her contribution now by the fact that she is armed and stands as a fortress. The Greek Government is making its contribution by virtue of the fact that Greece has been able to survive and is in the Mediterranean as another fortress. Much has been said about Franco Spain. It should be remembered that if Franco did not have anticommunism to talk about he would be out of a job. His business is the business of anticommunism. We do not need to cajole him.

Mr. CAIN. As it is with many people in this country.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Anticommunism is his No. 1 commodity. After all, if we can take to our bosom Yugoslavia, which calls itself a Communist state, we can also take Franco to our bosom, I suppose, in order to fight Joe Stalin.

However, what I am talking about now is the North Atlantic community, which is not mobilized, as Franco, Greece, and Turkey are mobilized. The purpose of the pact was to mobilize the participating countries, countries of many different cultures, whom we would join as an effective working partner. Let us not forget that France, Norway,

Denmark, the Netherlands, Great Britain, and Belgium are powerful countries.

I was greatly impressed the other day to hear someone say—I think it was the Senator from Ohio—that what we need to have in Europe is the will to resist. Let me tell the Senator from Ohio that if there was as much will to resist throughout the rest of the world as there is in the people of Norway, for example, we would not have too much trouble confronting us. Norway has not been on the charity train. She has spent her money well. The same can be said of other small countries. Where is the main problem in Europe today? The main problem in Europe today happens to be in France, which has been involved in wars in 1870, 1914, and 1940. It is any wonder that there is still a problem in France?

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

Mr. CAIN. I may say that I am often amazed that the French have been able to do as well as they have since World War II was concluded.

What I am convinced of is that in the event of trouble France will need some help, and we had better start moving to help France as much as we can, because the United States will not have sufficient help if the going gets too tough too rapidly.

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

Mr. CAIN. I yield.

Mr. LEHMAN. I am delighted to hear the Senator from Washington say that if trouble ensues France will need help. That is exactly what I have been arguing. France will need help. They will need leadership. They will need arms. They, too, will do their full share, as will Norway, Holland, Belgium, Luxemburg, and other countries. That is exactly what General Eisenhower reported when he appeared before the two Houses of Congress a few weeks ago. It seems to me—and I ask the Senator whether I am right—that the Senator from Washington and the Senator from Ohio are arguing the question on different planes. The Senator from Washington says we should not adopt this resolution, and he will vote against it, unless we perfect a plan which would be comprehensive and on a scale involving all free nations of the world.

Mr. CAIN. That is one of the three objections I have. I hope the Senator from New York does not now, in the time of the Senator from Washington, involve the Senator from Ohio and the Senator from Washington, in any differences. The Senator from Ohio will speak in his own time tomorrow.

Mr. LEHMAN. The Senator from Ohio is basing his argument on doubt as to the constitutional right of the President of the United States to deploy troops abroad.

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

Mr. CAIN. I should like to say to the Senator from New York that he was not here earlier this afternoon when the Senator from Washington offered three reasons as to why he thinks it is necessary to oppose the resolutions which are be-

fore the Senate. The first and basic reason is that in my opinion the concurrent resolution is not adequate to do the job of establishing what I believe to be the authority of Congress. In that reason, the Senator from Ohio is closely joined with the Senator from Washington, and I hope they will be so for 50 years to come.

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

Mr. CAIN. Certainly.

Mr. BRICKER. We stand exactly together in explanation to the Senator from New York. It is the constitutional duty of Congress to determine whether troops shall be sent from America into an integrated and international army. Let me say to the Senator from Washington and the Senator from New York that the Senator from Ohio is vitally much more interested today in this body following its constitutional duty and in not abandoning its constitutional concepts of free government than he is fearful of abandoning Europe.

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

Mr. CAIN. Yes. I started my address by saying that I would yield for all questions. I should observe that I do not think any statement has ever been so much interrupted during the course of 4 or 5 hours. There is good reason for it. During the past 2 days the Senator from Washington sat on the floor listening to one distinguished Senator after another offer a prepared statement, during the course of which it was said, and quite properly, that the Senator would rather not be interrupted and asked Senators to save their questions until the end of the prepared statement. That did not seem very satisfactory to the Senator from Washington. Therefore he thought, and he still believes, even though it takes much more time, that it is an excellent course to follow to yield to interrogations at any time during the course of his presentation of a prepared statement.

Mr. WILEY. First, I wish to say that there was nothing in the statement I made previously that should be taken in criticism of the Senator from Washington. I used the word "confusion," and I must stand by that statement. I do not mean that the Senator from Washington has confused anything, but that the whole picture is very much confused. I think the situation has been clarified by the Senator from Ohio. Assuming that the resolutions are defeated, and assuming that the President of the United States comes to Congress and asks for authority to send four divisions to Europe, would the Senator vote for a joint resolution or a bill which would implement the North Atlantic Pact?

Mr. CAIN. I might vote for or against either a joint resolution or a bill, and I would conceive either to be a completely legitimate and valid instrument. I do not conceive the concurrent resolution to be such an instrument.

As the Senator from Wisconsin probably knows, I have offered three reasons for objecting to the resolution, the second one of which we have recently been discussing. That reason is that I think

the time has come to register one's considered complaint against the continuing exclusion from the treaty of nations which have so much to offer.

Mr. WILEY. The Senator has answered my question. I do not know just how he has answered it. I thought he said "Yes," and then "No." But let it stand at that.

Mr. CAIN. I will try to make the answer more clear if the Senator desires it.

Mr. WILEY. In view of the testimony, of which the Senator is so well aware, and in view of the facts which have been developed, if the two resolutions are defeated and the President comes to the Congress and asks for authority to implement the treaty by four divisions, will the Senator vote in favor of such authority?

Mr. CAIN. Yes; and I want to be careful what I say. If during the course of the hearing and the debate assurances were given, which have not yet been given, or explanations provided, which we do not have, that the Atlantic Pact countries recognize the need for taking in Spain, Greece, Turkey, and Yugoslavia, and if during that period—and I think this is perfectly legitimate—we reach an understanding by means of which we are to secure victory in Korea, I will vote instantly for committing four or more American divisions to Europe.

Mr. WILEY. I should like to ask the distinguished Senator from Washington, one further question. As he knows, the President has committed more than 20,000 ground troops to the development of airfields, and more are going. I think the evidence shows that something like 500 planes have been sent to various airfields in the Near East, the islands of the Mediterranean, Africa, and England. What has the Senator to say about that? What would he do?

Mr. CAIN. I will answer the Senator's question by saying that it is my considered view that the President of the United States, without being so authorized by the Congress, has no right in peacetime to commit American forces to an international army.

Mr. WILEY. I did not include that.

Mr. CAIN. I answer it in this way, for this reason: The Senator is raising another question, the answer to which is that, in my opinion, the President of the United States, as the Commander in Chief of our Armed Forces, has the right, on his own initiative, to make the deployments to which the Senator has made reference. But when it comes to committing American forces to a unified international command in peacetime, to my way of thinking that is an entirely different question.

Mr. WILEY. I think it is.

Mr. CAIN. I have tried my best to answer the question.

Mr. WILEY. I thank the Senator, because I believe his answer is that, as Commander in Chief, the President has the authority, if in his judgment it is a question of national defense, to deploy troops as he has deployed them, provided he does not integrate them into an international army.

Mr. CAIN. I think that is correct.

Mr. WILEY. That applies also to the Navy and to the Air Force, does it not?

Mr. CAIN. I think that is correct.

Mr. WILEY. It would apply also to ground forces, if they were not integrated into an international army.

Mr. CAIN. I think so.

Mr. WILEY. Of course, the President has perfect authority, if he desires to do so, to send 100,000 or 200,000 troops to join the occupational forces now in Germany.

Mr. CAIN. He can do that within his own responsibility.

Mr. WILEY. As Commander in Chief.

Mr. CAIN. Yes. I think it would necessarily follow that he would be seriously criticized for so doing, because it would be only a means by which he could commit such troops by indirection to an international army. Nonetheless, he could do it, within his own authority.

Mr. WILEY. I thank the Senator, because I think he has added clarity to the situation. To my mind the issue has been very clearly defined by the Senator this afternoon, when he said, as I think the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] said, in substance, that there is at least a moral responsibility, if not a legal responsibility, for the Congress to implement the Atlantic Pact.

Mr. CAIN. I believe it so firmly that I have taken up these precious hours of time, which belong equally to other Senators.

Mr. WILEY. Is there not this question: If the concurrent resolution is adopted, is that an implementation?

Mr. CAIN. We ought not to argue about that, because the Senator from Wisconsin apparently feels that it is, and the Senator from Washington continues to feel that it simply is not.

Mr. WILEY. I thank the Senator.

Mr. CAIN. It is an expression of opinion on the part of the Congress, but not a legal instrument.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a brief observation?

Mr. CAIN. If that is the Senator's wish, I certainly yield.

Mr. CASE. The observations of the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin call to my mind the fact that in discussing the powers of the President we are bringing in a new factor when we talk about the possibility that he has the authority under the Constitution to deploy our forces in peacetime. Much has been said about the Congress delegating its legislative power; and there is grave doubt as to whether the Congress can delegate legislative power. The President, as Commander in Chief, has certain powers, of course, but the point at issue is whether or not he has, without the consent of Congress, the right to delegate the command and control of our forces to an international command. Personally I doubt that he has such authority. I certainly think that he would be using poor judgment if he attempted to assert the right to delegate the control of our forces to an international command without the express approval of Congress.

Mr. CAIN. I agree with the Senator from South Dakota. The Senator from

Washington is not a constitutional lawyer. Therefore he can only go on the explanations which were offered by administration leaders during the time when the Atlantic Pact was under consideration. Those assurances and declarations were completely contrary to the theory that the President has power within himself to implement a document which is not self-implementing. The North Atlantic Treaty is obviously such a document.

Mr. President, I shall continue, ready to answer the questions of any Senator; but should I be permitted to consume a little of my own time, I would appreciate it, and I can more readily finish my undertaking. I still have some serious things to say, and I beg the indulgence of the Senate.

On March 2 it was my happy task to argue for the approval of certain portions of the manpower bill. During the debate I said a reasonable word about Spain, and my friend the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. HUNT] requested an opportunity to reply to me with an observation. This is what he said:

I may say to the distinguished minority leader and also to the distinguished Senator from Washington that I, too, hold to their point of view. Ever since I have had the honor of being a Member of this body, time after time I have heard our military men of the highest rank say very definitely and positively how important Spain is to Western Europe in event of a Russian attack. I have held the same point of view. The question in my mind has been: "Why do we not bring Spain in?" Up to as late as 3 days ago I had not received any kind of answer. I took it upon myself to go to the highest authority in the city of Washington and said to him, "Tell me the answer, if you have one." Very much to my surprise this was the answer I received "Spain does not want to come in. Franco does not want to come in." Senators remember the old saying, "You can lead a horse to water, but you cannot make him drink." We cannot make Franco "drink."

There is another point to the situation. The second largest party in France is opposed to Spain coming in under the Atlantic Pact. We have that difficulty and we must be careful. The dominant party, the Labor Party, in England does not want Franco in at this time. That results in another difficulty.

Mr. President, I was deeply disturbed by what the Senator from Wyoming related as having come from the highest authority in the city of Washington. What that authority said to the Senator from Wyoming is, to my knowledge, complete and tragic nonsense. That highest authority has, so far as I know, never been in Spain. I doubt if he has bothered to study Spain. Certainly he does not know anything about Spain, and the Senator from Washington thinks it is high time he did.

In the New York Times of March 18 Spain is reported to have told the United States she would dispatch troops to the defense of Western Europe provided United States weapons were sent to her forces. In the same Associated Press article mention was made that some leading Republicans long have been urging the State and Defense Departments to bring Spain into the defense ring. Until now the Secretary of State, so the article related, has resisted such pressure, saying that Spain was a problem

for the Western European nations to agree upon first without United States intervention.

This last might be true, Mr. President, if America was not involved in Europe, but we are involved, and the administration maintains that the security of the United States is inexorably bound to the security of Europe. If that be true, and I think it is, then we have a perfect right and an obligation to demand that the Spanish question be settled and that the Spanish nation work and fight, if required, by the side of other anti-Communist nations.

Is it not a strange if sad thing that every administration witness and every military man who has nothing to say about these excluded nations in his prepared statement is quite willing to speak favorably of them in answers to any Senator's question?

I have had the Library of Congress put together for me the questions concerning the excluded European nations which Senators asked of administration witnesses and leading military authorities whose names have come up occasionally this afternoon. If these answers do not convince the Senate and the country that we ought to get these nations into the Atlantic Pact before committing American forces to Europe in peacetime, I do not know what will.

The Secretary of State was an early witness before the committee. This was proper because he was the number one administration witness. It was to him that the committee had a right to look for information. In his prepared statement Greece, Turkey, Spain, and Yugoslavia might just as well have been nonexistent. I was surprised. In his reply to questions about these countries he was complimentary, but uncertain and evasive. Others may have been satisfied with his reply but I was not. I have accepted too well his repeated pronouncements to the Nation that war was possible, if not imminent at any time. In being willing to accept this premise I expected to be told what role these excluded nations would play in the event of war. The Secretary provided me with no satisfaction of any kind. But let the Secretary speak for himself.

The junior Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] asked the Secretary this question:

Senator RUSSELL. Mr. Secretary, there are millions of people who are very much concerned about the part, if any, that Spain might or could play in the defense of Western Europe. Do you object to stating whether or not negotiations are being pursued to see whether or not the forces of Spain can be fitted into the defense of Western Europe?

Bear in mind that the Secretary of State made no reference to this question in his prepared statement which automatically is released to the press and radio of America as of the instant he gives it before a congressional committee. The questions and answers which follow prepared statements are not so readily available. Secretary Acheson replied to the junior Senator from Georgia:

Secretary ACHESON. May I answer that question a little less directly than you have asked it?

The importance of the association of Spain in the defense of Western Europe I think is clear. I think it is also clear that the relations of this country, and I hope of the other countries, with Spain, are now entering a new phase. We are sending a most able Ambassador to Spain, who is on his way at the present time. I am very hopeful that the objectives which you have in mind, and I am sure I have in mind, can be accomplished. That depends upon the actions of many nations, our own, our partners in the North Atlantic Treaty, and also on the actions of Spain. At the present time we have only intimations from statements made by the Spanish Government as to what their attitude would be. We hope before long that we will know more about that, and we hope that the development will be along the line of the close association of Spain and the Spanish contribution and mutual undertakings in regard to the defense of Western Europe.

Senator RUSSELL. I understand your answer then to be that you are hopeful that progress may be made?

Secretary ACHESON. Yes, sir.

Senator RUSSELL. It boils down to that.

The Senator from Georgia asked this question later on in the interrogation, a very legitimate observation and question:

There are a great many people who feel, and I share that feeling, that the best investment we have made in all of the billions we have spent in undertaking to stay the advance of communism has been in Turkey. Are any efforts being made, or any negotiations being had, to tie Turkey more closely into the defense of Western Europe and into the mutual assistance and mutual defense efforts to which you refer to repeatedly in your splendid statement?

The Secretary replied as follows:

Secretary ACHESON. Yes; I think efforts are being made, Senator RUSSELL, and I think that we could also include Greece with the favorable things you said about Turkey. Our efforts in Greece have been very satisfactory, and as General Marshall pointed out yesterday, the action of the Greek troops as well as the Turkish troops in Korea has been very fine indeed, and we are very much alive to the importance of bringing even closer than they have been in the past the cooperative planning and the relationship between Greece and Turkey and the North Atlantic defense.

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

Mr. CAIN. I yield.

Mr. LODGE. I thoroughly agree with everything the Senator says about the importance of Spain and Greece and Turkey. I think particularly the Greek and Turkish aid bills which Congress passed have been a wonderful investment in human courage. I should like to see them coordinated as intimately and as fully as possible with the Atlantic effort. Of course, the Senator knows new members can be admitted into the Atlantic Pact only by unanimous vote. Is it not true that the more we strengthen and build up the Atlantic defense, the more life we give to it, the better the prospects will be of eventually having it spread out so as to include these countries?

Mr. CAIN. I think the only difference between us is a difference of emphasis. The Senator from Massachusetts thinks that by the sending of American troops, forces, at this time, it will give a substantial lift to the defense operations within—in literal fashion—the North

Atlantic Pact countries to the end that the more rapidly the excluded countries will be brought in.

Mr. LODGE. Yes.

Mr. CAIN. I take a contrary view, and do so most sincerely. That is, I think the time has come to bring some of the excluded nations in, and I think it may best be accomplished by America using caution. That is the real thing about which the Senator from Massachusetts and the Senator from Washington differ.

Mr. LODGE. I thank the Senator.

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, the present occupant of the chair, the distinguished junior Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG] raised the question with me some time ago about Turkey. I should like for a few minutes to say some things about Turkey which I think have not ever been said on the floor of the United States Senate, probably because heretofore they have not been documented so that they were available. These comments are not designed to embarrass the State Department or our relationships with any other nation. But these remarks have been put together to convince anybody who wants to be convinced for once and all that there is no disposition on Turkey's part to drag its feet; that Turkey has wanted to be a part of the North Atlantic Pact since before that pact became a reality.

A number of Senators seem to be of the opinion that Turkey could become a member if Turkey wished to do so. I simply wish to get rid of that assumption, for it is not valid. In case I step on anyone's toes, either by direction or by indirection, let me say in advance that I make these remarks only in the hope that those who represent the various nations can get together and can include Turkey within our defense establishment.

The Turkish Government has, during these last 2½ years, approached the State Department through its Embassy in Washington and deployed continuous efforts in order to establish a contractual bond between the United States and Turkey.

The stages and progress of these efforts, which started during the early phases of the North Atlantic Treaty negotiations, and the ultimate results obtained can be summarized in chronological order as follows:

First. In September 1948, during the initial phases of the North Atlantic Treaty negotiations, the Turkish Government made informal soundings with the State Department for the inclusion of Turkey among the initiators of the treaty. In its reply, so I have been advised, the State Department contended that the proposed pact carried a regional character and that its scope did not envelop the Mediterranean area in which Turkey is situated.

Thereupon Turkey argued that the term "regional arrangement" did not imply only the defense of certain countries within a specific region, but also implied the defense of that particular region as a whole, and that any regional arrangement should be based on the community of interests, rather than upon strictly

geographical concepts. Turkey, however, raised no objection to delaying this argument, which seemed purely academic at the time, thus deferring to such a time when the conclusion of the Atlantic Pact reached its final stages its demand to be included either in the Atlantic Pact or in the Mediterranean Pact more appropriate to its geographical situation.

Second. In February 1949, at a moment when the negotiations of the Atlantic Pact were nearing conclusion, it was reported in the press that the inclusion of Italy and French possessions in North Africa was being contemplated.

Consequently, so I have been told, Turkey immediately approached our State Department and drew its attention to the contradiction which existed between this new development and the interpretation given by the Department a few months ago to the term "regional arrangement"; and in view of this situation, the Turkish Government insistent-ly demanded its inclusion in the Pact.

Mr. President, at this point perhaps I should say that although I do not offer myself as an authority on Turkey, yet I have been there; I have some acquaintances and associates there, and I have the very best possible relationship with the Turkish Embassy here. It is through them and also as a result of my own studies that I have been able to put together what I conceive to be these facts. If any one at any time wishes to challenge any word within these references to Turkey, I think I shall be able to establish them as being facts.

Finally upon clarification and explanations given by the Turkish Embassy with respect to Turkey's position, the Secretary of State expressed sympathy with the Turkish desire, and requested Turkey to withdraw her present demand—promising, however, to accord friendly and careful consideration to the security problem of the Turkish Republic after the conclusion of the Pact by its present signatories and upon its approval by the Senate.

Furthermore, the Secretary stated, so I am advised, that there was no need for Turkey to doubt the United States reaction in the event of an act of aggression upon Turkey's territories, and added that Soviet Russia was perfectly aware of this fact.

Third. In September 1949 the Turkish Embassy approached the State Department and proposed the conclusion of a Mediterranean pact around the already existing Anglo-Franco-Turkish Treaty of Alliance, with the participation of the United States.

The State Department, I am told, advanced the argument that this formula entailed many difficulties. This Turkish proposal has not been accorded either a favorable or a negative response up to this date, so far as I know.

Fourth. The new Turkish Government, which took office following the general elections held in May 1950, concentrated once more all its efforts upon the inclusion of Turkey in the North Atlantic Treaty, and approached, to this end, the chancelleries of the 12 member nations forming the North Atlantic Council.

Our Secretary of State, who received the Turkish request with great sympathy, informed the Turkish Ambassador, so I am told, that the matter was being given careful consideration. However, the North Atlantic Council rejected the Turkish demand with respect to its inclusion in the pact, and only decided to permit the association of Turkey and Greece with such phases of the military planning work of the North Atlantic Treaty organization as were concerned with the defense of the Mediterranean. Upon intimation of this decision by our Secretary of State, in his role as Chairman of the North Atlantic Council, the Turkish Ambassador expressed—both publicly and privately—deep regret and disillusionment. I think his point was well taken. He maintained that any such military agreement not backed up by political engagements was bound to remain theoretical. Furthermore, any potential enemy interpreting the decision of the council as a refusal to include Turkey into the North Atlantic security system, would either confront Turkey with the danger of aggression or, taking advantage of the unfavorable reaction created by such a decision, would attempt to attract the Turkish public opinion with tempting promises of friendship.

With these considerations, I am told that the Turkish Ambassador made a final appeal to the Secretary of State, and invited the United States to establish direct contractual ties with Turkey. However, the Secretary of State informed the Turkish Ambassador, so I am informed, that he was not in a position to satisfy his request. A few days later, in the course of a meeting, a high official of the State Department confidentially disclosed to the Turkish Ambassador that the decision of the North Atlantic Council has been taken pursuant to the insistence of some European members of the pact not to extend the pact in the direction of Turkey and Greece.

The Turkish Ambassador sustained his belief that if the United States of America, which is the mainstay of the North Atlantic Treaty organization, gave its strong support to the inclusion of Turkey in this security system, no objection would have any weight whatsoever.

Fifth. When the main obstacle to Turkey's admission to the North Atlantic Treaty Organization was thus ascertained, it became necessary to find a new formula to overcome or at least avoid these difficulties.

In view of this fact, Turkey approached the State Department, so I am advised, with a formula which envisaged merely the adherence of the United States to the Treaty of Alliance signed in 1939 between Great Britain, France, and Turkey. The State Department admitted that this formula was very simple and practical. There is no necessity to take into consideration, as in the case of the North Atlantic Pact, the observations and objections of other powers. The United States and Turkey are the only powers concerned. Since

the United States has already accorded her moral support to Turkey, this new legal engagement would not constitute an additional obligation. Furthermore, since a regional agreement is not under consideration, no other power can formulate a desire to adhere to it. Due to the fact that the scope of this new alliance limits the area of mutual assistance to an act of aggression perpetrated against Turkey, or to a state of war in the Mediterranean, it is in complete harmony with the foreign policy of the United States, or so I believe it to be. Of course, it is necessary to include Greece in any security system to which Turkey belongs. Although Greece does not appear as a signatory power, its security is safeguarded indirectly through the machinery of the proposed alliance, for, in the event of an armed aggression against Greece, Great Britain and France would come to her assistance, by virtue of their previous guarantees given to that country; and Turkey would then be under obligation to participate in the defense of Greece, in accordance with the provisions of article 3 of the Treaty of Alliance of 1939. The State Department, while stating that this formula was under consideration, added that in view of the tendency prevailing in the United States not to enter into new commitments, a favorable reply should not be expected at this juncture. This reply crippled the information—previously understood—that the main difficulty for the inclusion of Turkey in the Atlantic Pact originated from the objections raised by some European signatory powers.

I have been rather serious in presenting my views regarding Turkey. I know they will be read by those in authority within the State Department. I trust they will have reason to issue a statement of their own with reference to the question of what is to be done in the future about Turkey.

Mr. President, as I said, the Library of Congress did a most excellent piece of work in providing me with a number of the questions asked of certain witnesses who appeared before the two Senate committees, sitting jointly, concerning the four nations, Spain, Greece, Turkey, and Yugoslavia. The hour is late, and I shall therefore not read all the questions and answers; but I wish to say that the distinguished Senator from Texas, in his very fine presentation on Friday last, made reference to America's leading military authorities being in support of the resolution, and in favor of sending four American divisions to Europe at this time. All of that is true. But we must not forget that, in answer to every question, without exception, every witness of a military or political character who had anything at all to say about Greece, Spain, Turkey, and Yugoslavia, stated for the record that the sooner those countries were included in our collective defense system, the greater would be the chance of free people to live in the Western World in the days of our tomorrow.

I think I shall cite one or two of the witnesses by way of example, and then

pass over the subject, but I intend to ask permission that all of them be included in the RECORD. The witnesses to whom I would refer—and their testimony will be found in the hearings—are General Bradley, Secretary Acheson, and Secretary of Defense Gen. George Marshall, the latter interestingly enough, the only military leader who had nothing of a substantial nature to say upon the question regarding these countries; for with reference to Spain, General Marshall, in answering a question asked by the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], said:

As to Spain, that is quite a delicate international diplomatic question today. For the Defense Department, I would not care to make any comment at this time.

I quote further:

Senator RUSSELL. I thought perhaps since you have served as Secretary of State you would be able to comment from that standpoint. We have had the Secretary of State before us and he has replied that there are a good many military questions involved, and you say it is a question of diplomacy. I had thought, perhaps, since you had served in both capacities, you might give us the answer.

The great soldier in his own right, Gen. George C. Marshall, merely added:

When I walked out of the door of the State Department I ceased to be Secretary of State very definitely, and a great deal of water has gone over the dam since then.

Particular attention should be given to all the references made by the Secretary of State and by these military leaders, as well, because I am trying to establish as a valid point the fact that what faces us is much more a political than a military question. Were it a military question, we should not be arguing about it, because the countries named would already have been included within the Atlantic Pact. The answer which we seek we must obtain from those in political office; and the sooner we do it, the healthier the future will be for everyone.

I had a particularly interesting answer from General Eisenhower whose name has been quoted this afternoon on a number of occasions. It happened that I was interrogating General Eisenhower about the advisability of bringing the excluded countries into the alliance, in order to add immeasurably and immediately to our collective strength. No one thus far has seen fit to quote General Eisenhower's answer, since advice of this sort was given to the committees in executive session, and it was some days thereafter before it was decided that certain portions of the testimony given by General Eisenhower, not strictly related to security, might be made available to the public. The time to have made it available was when the General said it. I quote now a statement which ought to make people simply stand up and wonder what kind of political leadership is actually trying to run our free world. Again, to set the stage, I, along with certain other Senators, was saying that in my opinion it would be a first-class thing if we were to bring these nations in. In reply to me, General Eisenhower said:

As a matter of fact, Senator, I will answer that this way: As of now, anybody that has

the slightest conception of even the history of war—he doesn't have to be a soldier—sees the hard common sense of what you have been talking about. Therefore there is no one, as I see it, who needs to be reticent about expressing such a view, except only the professional soldier, because it is not his business to talk in public international affairs.

You people would properly resent, I think, if I or any other soldier gets too free in talking about international relationships, where it is anything except military. But any man here can make his own evaluation of that situation, and I think it would be rather persuasive.

General of the Army Dwight D. Eisenhower, one of the great Americans of today, charged by the President with the duty of becoming the supreme commander of an international allied army, came before us to say, "You do not have to be a soldier to know the great value which would accrue to freedom within the United States by including these countries, Spain, Turkey, Greece, and Yugoslavia." Yet, in the committee report, there is not one reference to what General Eisenhower said, in his capacity as the commander of the international army. What a great pity it is to have the General, distinguished though he so obviously is, feel required to say to us, "I continue to be a military man. You Senators on this committee must begin to look," is what General Eisenhower was saying, by strong inference, "for the answers you seek ought to come from political levels, higher than the military post which I occupy." Yet, how many millions of Americans have been led by our political leadership to believe that General Eisenhower and certain other American professional soldiers are running the show around the world at this time?

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that other excerpts from the testimony be included in the RECORD at this point.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Long in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

The excerpts are as follows:

Senator CAIN. Now my statement against that, Senator WHERRY: Would there be an opportunity between now and the time when we could deliver troops in force and in being to Europe, to do something more than we have ever tried to do before in working with the American State Department to exercise leadership sufficient to reopen—if in fact they ever open, which I doubt—and to examine thoroughly the capabilities and desirabilities of bringing, for example, Spain, Turkey, and Greece into this association of nations in order that when we have an integrated army in Europe we know that it consists of the best that all of the nations now in and out of the Atlantic Pact have to offer?

Senator WHERRY. Certainly the opportunity presents itself.

Senator CAIN. How do we go about it, sir?

Senator WHERRY. We have to amend the treaty, I suppose. If anybody vetoed, it would be impossible to get them in the North Atlantic family of nations. I suppose the United States could make a separate alliance with Spain, if the Atlantic Pact nations vetoed their applications for membership. I suppose that the State Department would not recommend a separate alliance, because they would not want to cause any difficulty with the two countries

or whatever countries are not in favor of Spain coming in.

However, I would like to suggest this to the Senate: that if it could be done, it should be done. The question of morale building is a two-way street. If we had the forces that are available in Yugoslavia and in Greece and in Turkey and in Spain as a part of the Atlantic nations community, it seems to me it would do more to build morale in this country than the way we are working now.

Of course, the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee knows about the situation probably better than anybody in the room, but I do think that every effort should be made. We have been told that within the year it might be—I am not sure—but certainly if we could depend upon that manpower, by furnishing them arms, it would settle one of the great questions confronting the American people; that is, to help those nations defend themselves and form a bulwark for Western Europe. I think every effort ought to be made to bring Spain, Greece, and Turkey into the defense plan.

Senator CAIN. Senator WHERRY, I think you have just rung the bell. You have rung the bell in this sense. You, like myself and a lot of other Senators, hope that these things are going to be done. You go on assurances that perhaps a year from now they will be done, and you and I and nobody else that I know anything about does anything about it.

Now the question I have, is: Do we not, as a Congress, in viewing a strategic concept of how best to defend ourselves in Western Europe, do we not have a right and a responsibility for asking the Secretary of State—and I say this again without prejudice—to come before these appropriate committees of the Congress and tell us in positive form what plans American leadership has in mind for securing the capabilities of those countries mentioned to work with us of the free world in trying to save our lives? Now, is that not reasonable?

Senator WHERRY. I think it is. You are a member of the armed services and you are very much interested in the bill now on the floor for debate.

Senator CAIN. In these hearings you have heard a serious responsible witness deny we should bring Greece, Turkey, and Spain into these defensive operations?

Senator WHERRY. No; and to be perfectly frank about it, for several years I have been told by men in the military that it was very desirable especially that we have Spain on our side, as well as the other countries mentioned.

Senator CAIN. Does not, therefore, the consensus of opinion indicate that there is no responsible person in America but what wants these nations in the Atlantic Pact, and, therefore, if that be so, the obstacle to getting them into the pact must lie not in the United States but somewhere—I do not know where—in Europe, is that not logical?

Senator WHERRY. That is logical.

Senator CAIN. Then do you not think the Secretary of State ought to be willing and desirous of coming up to frankly discuss this American security question with us before we too rapidly commit American forces to an integrated European army which is weaker than it ought to be because of the continued exclusion of these three nations?

Senator WHERRY. I agree with you.

Senator CAIN. My last question, sir: Maybe nobody in the world agrees with me in this, but I think what we are really talking about before these committees is the future of what is known as the republican form of government. I think we are testing the strength of our governmental structure for the future. It is my own opinion that if we permit the Executive, without prejudice to Mr. Truman, the President as a man to decide this matter, we shall have abdicated probably forever the right or the willingness of the

Congress to the United States, in speaking for the American people, to stand up and determine this Nation's policy throughout the world.

To what extent do you think that conclusion is valid?

Senator WHERRY. I think it is a very sound conclusion.

Senator RUSSELL. General Clay, I notice that you said that you think we should realistically extend assistance in the form of military equipment to all of the countries in Europe who are willing to fight to save their independence. You do not limit that, then, to the countries in the North Atlantic Treaty?

General CLAY. No, sir. I think that it would be a great mistake not to provide military aid to the countries who are not members of the North Atlantic Organization, but who already have large and capable forces in being.

Senator RUSSELL. I assume as a military man you would like very much to see Spain and perhaps Turkey and Greece, make their forces available to the common effort to defend Western Europe?

General CLAY. I think it would be a great mistake not to use all of those countries and any others willing to make this fight, and I would include therein the elements behind the iron curtain, who we know are prepared to resist the Communist aggression if given a reasonable chance.

Senator RUSSELL. As you have had a great deal of experience in Europe in an advantageous post to be able to observe the politics of Europe as any man who was there, are you convinced that the breach between Yugoslavia and the other Cominform countries is genuine and sincere, that there is truly a breach there that would warrant our extending military aid to Yugoslavia?

General CLAY. I think there is a very definite breach and that we have no need to worry with respect to the Yugoslav Government returning to the domination of the Kremlin. Perhaps the very fact that they were once together has made their breach a more irreparable one. It is like a fight between two brothers.

Senator RUSSELL. So when we speak fearfully of 175 divisions or even 300 divisions, and some people use 500 divisions, we at least can comfort ourselves with the belief that a considerable number of those divisions will not be available for an all-out attack on Western Europe?

General CLAY. I am very sure of that and I am sure that they would have to leave many of them to cover their flanks. If you look behind you on that map, you will see a real threat to their flanks. The Turks are a great fighting nation.

Senator RUSSELL. From what little I know of the situation, I think the best investment we have made in all of our expenditures in Europe has been the arms aid we have made to Turkey. We are getting more return on the nickel there than we might on the dollar in some other spots. That is just my opinion.

Senator RUSSELL. Of course, we could make a more effective defense of Western Europe if we had all of the Western European nations in the compact, could we not, Governor Stassen?

Mr. STASSEN. Right.

Senator RUSSELL. What are your views on whether or not we should undertake to get Spain and the Spanish military forces in the common effort to prevent war by having an adequate defense for Western Europe?

Mr. STASSEN. I think clearly you should move forward with the nations first who are actively organized with you and are moving forward with you now, but I think that it is quite evident that inside of a year Spain will be a part of the defense of Western Europe and of General Eisenhower's program. That is my own judgment and I think it will

inevitably unfold in that direction, but I do not think that you should put the Spanish cart before the Western European horse. I think you had better get the horse moving along first, and then hitch the cart on.

Senator RUSSELL. I certainly hope your prediction that within 1 year Spain will be within the orbit of the North Atlantic defense force will be borne out.

Senator CAIN. Against your background and your tremendous patriotism and concern, I think you have a view on this question, just between Americans. How does it come about that there is such a pressing determination in terms of urgency—and you are but the last of a long series of witnesses to that question—to commit American forces to an integrated Atlantic Pact army and such a lack, such a total lack, of any eminent determination to open the membership of that pact to any new members? You yourself have emphasized this morning, as most other witnesses have, that our European allies will only firm up their willingness to fight and to defend themselves if America provides sizable forces in the near future. That indicates to me that there is a real need to get on with this work and I subscribe to that. Then how does it come about that we are so willing to overlook vast opportunities presented by nations not in the Atlantic Pact, to be of fighting assistance to us if required; and to use two names, particularly, I have never heard anybody question Turkey's or Spain's willingness and determination to defend themselves. They are willing to do that, John Cooper, whether we help them or whether we do not.

Now, will you just give us your best thinking as to why we do not proceed to get these people into this defense establishment? To my mind, this is the first priority.

Mr. COOPER. I think that I would presume if I tried to answer that in the terms I know you want an answer.

Senator CAIN. I just want your view, Mr. Cooper, because we are all concerned with it.

Mr. COOPER. I have nothing to do with those considerations. I would think, as you have said, there may be a difference of timing on armaments, for example: I am not arguing now that it should not be done. I am just giving you what may be some of the reasons.

For 2 or 3 years Greece and Turkey have been receiving equipment and arms. They have probably reached a pretty high stage of efficiency. You have been there; I know that. You went out there and got them to send 5,000 troops to Korea.

Senator CAIN. They are willing to fight, and they are fighting.

Mr. COOPER. You did that. I know that. You did a great deal of it. They are at a peak. That may be true in Spain. I have not been there.

It may be the feeling of the people in this group that they would want themselves to be brought up to the higher peak. That might be one of the reasons. There may be other reasons. There is always a problem, too, that every country has to get support of its people, just as we do here. They have problems, perhaps, with regard to the support of their people that we do not have, and it may be that we have to bring them over. I do not think that we can just always tell everyone what they should do and have them do it.

Senator CAIN. I am the first to admit, Senator, that the problem is very awkward and difficult, but what really concerns this committee or myself is that none of those in authority even presume to suggest what steps are being taken to get these nations to fight for the free world. The Secretary of Defense or of State the other day, not on his own initiative but in answering a question, expressed the highest hope that that would be done some day, but we have a right to look to those in higher political authority for information as to what is intended.

Mr. COOPER. I agree with you. I have no executive power. I should suggest that in your capacity as a member of the Armed Services Committee, you raise the question and find out, and I say that respectfully.

Senator CAIN. I know you do.

Permit me this question, and answer it if you can at all: In your opinion, if the decision were left to the United States do you believe that we would soon work out a military alliance with those nations talked about this morning who are not presently in the Atlantic Pact?

I am obviously driving at wherein lies the weakness. What are the road blocks? Do you concur with everybody, as presumably you do as an American, that you want these nations to be joined with us? Therefore my question, if the decision were left to the United States, do you think those nations would soon be given membership?

Mr. COOPER. I can't answer that, Senator CAIN. It would be a speculation which I am sorry that I cannot make.

Senator RUSSELL. At the risk of being repetitious, you say you would agree to sending these four divisions if the Joint Chiefs of Staff certify that our associates in the North Atlantic Treaty had promised to contribute enough forces to make an effective land army?

Senator TAFT. That is right, effective to defend Western Europe. And, incidentally, in that respect, I do not quite see how they are going to defend Western Europe with Italian divisions, for instance. As I think one of the witnesses pointed out, they would have under that, of course, to certify that they had enough divisions where they had to be to defend Western Europe, not just that they had 60 divisions, of which 30 were in Greece and Turkey and Italy, and could not be gotten to Western Europe.

But I do not presume they would make any such statement.

Senator RUSSELL. Turkey and Greece are not in the North Atlantic Pact.

Senator TAFT. But they might promise to contribute troops. They can join if all the members agree.

Senator RUSSELL. I suppose you likewise would be willing to accept Spain into the defense of Western Europe, would you not?

Senator TAFT. Yes; I think that they are an essential part in any kind of war I can think of with Russia. It seems to me Spain is as strategic a location as any there is in Western Europe.

Senator CHAPMAN. Would you like to comment on the desirability and possibility of Spain, Turkey, and Greece uniting in this mutual defense program in Europe?

Mr. COOPER. I certainly would. Again personally, I would like to see their strength added. I am not in a position, though—I am not trying to evade any question—just frankly, I do not know what steps have been taken. I am not in a position to comment on what steps are being taken to bring them into the North Atlantic Treaty organization. I am certain that with respect to working with perhaps the countries in the Mediterranean, certain preliminary steps have been taken.

Senator WHERRY. Do you think that Russia could overrun Europe today with the defense army we are going to have over there, today or in the next 2 years?

Governor DEWEY. I hope not.

Senator WHERRY. You have a lot of information. I am trying to get it. I want to get all I can.

What is your opinion about it?

Governor DEWEY. Let me put it this way: If General Eisenhower has a little time in which to bring about a new sense of unity of military command, he will then have quite an army at his disposal automatically. I personally think that Switzerland has discovered that she cannot live alone surrounded by a Soviet sea. Switzerland could pro-

duce, I understand, the equivalent of 20 divisions in 24 hours who, today, would leave their mountain fastnesses and go out and take the field. Whether she would have the equipment is a problem, but I should think she would.

Norway is prepared to fight to the death, and they are really preparing, and I believe that Norway is all-out.

I believe that France—and this is a thing that too few people know or have recognized, that the divisions France is producing today are the largest divisions in the world. They are 20,000-man divisions, and they have a firepower 50 percent greater than the divisions France had in World War II.

I should say that when you add up all of the forces that exist from Norway to Great Britain, the Netherlands, Denmark, Belgium, France, Switzerland, and if you can mobilize Spain's 22 divisions, and Yugoslavia's 30 divisions, and you get Greece encouraged, and I would give her all the arms she will take for half a million men and I would offer them tomorrow morning at 10 o'clock, and if you get Turkey's 25 divisions, and you could really unify this thing, I think Europe can be held and held with overwhelming success.

Senator WHERRY. That brings up one more question. Of course we do not have the four countries you are talking about, Greece, Yugoslavia, Spain, and Turkey, or West Germany, in the North Atlantic Treaty countries. Do you anticipate that they will be brought into the North Atlantic community in time to develop that potential power you are talking about?

Governor DEWEY. I would hesitate to risk the role of a prophet but I would say that we had a very good chance to bring each of those nations into the flexible orbit of a defense army for Europe in time.

Senator WHERRY. I agree with you implicitly. If you get Spain into this thing and all this potential you are talking about, it would be a wonderful thing, but when you say when we have that army and are going to depend on them, you are asking the American people, are you not, or saying to the American people, that the potential will come from this whole area.

I have tried my level best to get Spain into the North Atlantic Treaty. I have failed. I think the Governor is for that. We haven't gotten them in yet. We have to rely upon the North Atlantic Treaty countries for the time being, at least, in all the evidence has been that they can produce about 16 divisions and Congressman KENNEDY, from Massachusetts, testified that he had been over there and had great experience and he said that it was very difficult to learn what number of divisions they would afford in a mobile army.

Governor DEWEY. I have given you all the information I have; I mean, all that comes to mind at the moment.

Senator CAIN. I appreciate your views, sir. I have a great and abiding respect for the United Nations as a debating society for the most part, at which nations with troubles ought to come and talk. Korea has taught me that, unless we find some improvement and do it P. D. Q., there is no more collective security in the Security Council of the United Nations than there is in a jackrabbit, and Uncle Sam had better be guided accordingly.

You said this is a real emergency, in your opinion. How real do you think that it is and what ought we to do, from your point of view as a distinguished American and citizen throughout the world, to get ourselves most rapidly prepared to withstand any real trouble?

General CLAY. Senator, I think that with our air power and with our atomic bomb we have gained for ourselves to get ready and to help our associates to get ready, a period of time of at least a year, and maybe longer,

and that during that time it is up to us to raise the aircraft and troop equipment and troops which would make it extremely unprofitable for war to come about. I think what we in this country are doing recognizes that situation. While it has not been evident in the full, I think by fall we will be in an all-out production of war equipment which will insure our own preparation, and I have hopes that in that same period we will get a substantial increase in European troops partly with what we produce and partly with what they produce, which will give us a position in which there can be no profit for war to Russia, and when that comes about I think that we can have an armed truce. I think it will be an armed truce for a long, long time without war, and the cost of maintaining those forces, while it will be large, will be proportionately much less than the initial cost of equipment.

Senator CAIN. Your greatest hope then, which I share and most Americans do, is that we can help to band the free world together so that we can make war unlikely. From that point of view, isn't there something the leadership of America and our friends of the North Atlantic Treaty could do to take advantage in this next critical year of the potential and willingness and capacity of certain nations with whom we are not presently doing business, just like you looked at this map, which makes me shudder when I look at the Iberian Peninsula and at that unprotected eastern flank?

What are your suggestions as to how we can get action? We have been debating these things academically now for the last 2 or 3 years.

General CLAY. The Congress has provided for certain military aids to—

Senator CAIN. Turkey and Greece.

General CLAY. Turkey and Greece. That is something that has, I think, paid us tremendous dividends.

Senator CAIN. Yes, sir.

General CLAY. Not only in developing real fighting forces but in developing real friends.

Senator CAIN. I agree, sir.

General CLAY. I personally would be very happy to see that extended to any other peoples who would put themselves in the same willingness to fight. I mean by that, and I am quite prepared to say so, Yugoslavia, which I think is prepared to fight and which I think should receive military aid from us.

Senator CAIN. Do you know the Turks reasonably well, General?

General CLAY. I have had quite a few visits from them. I have never actually served with them long enough to know other than that our people who have been with them have a high respect for their fighting ability.

Senator CAIN. I am never unmindful of the fact that Turkey, to our knowledge, on at least two occasions, has formally applied for membership in the Atlantic Pact, which thus far has been denied to them. The Turks are a very sensitive and a very noble people, and I think that they have a growing and deep resentment against this continuing exclusion of their ability as a nation to gather with the other free peoples, and the Spanish to a lesser degree. I just keep talking about this in the hopes that our leaders—that is what we are talking about—you have 12 leaders in Europe running 12 nations. I have heard it said that if Great Britain and France faced up to this Spanish problem, both of those Governments would fall. I think that question must be faced up to, and they must no longer look to America as that source of luxury which can provide them with equipment and that will make things reasonably right and still keep these political questions under foot.

General CLAY. I agree with you, Senator. I think failure to utilize the manpower of the European countries that are willing to fight is very unrealistic, indeed.

Senator KNOWLAND. Senator, for many reasons that have been given here, I do not disagree with the importance, from a morale point of view, of sending additional troops to Europe. But I do not quite fully agree that at all times this Government should proceed and should ask no commitments in return. I think it is perfectly legitimate for us to ask for a quid pro quo when it is in the mutual interest of mutual defense that that be done.

Now, we raise the question of the roughly 4 or 5 hundred thousand troops in Spain being brought into the picture, and we are told that should not be a prior requirement, that we should go along on the present basis and hope that we would get them in later. There are 12 members in the organization of the North Atlantic Pact, any single one of whom could veto the bringing in of those 4 or 5 hundred thousand troops.

We raise the question of Greece and Turkey being brought into the common defense of the free world, and the same question or the same answer is given: "Well, you should not put any prior requirements up."

We raise the question as to the sending of strategic materials to the Soviet Union, and we get the same answer.

I am not suggesting that we, necessarily, put a prior requirement before we send some additional divisions, but it does seem to me, when it is a matter that is affecting the common defense, that we have a right to, at some place along the line, say, "Now look, we go this far, but beyond this you must show your absolute will to resist by putting up a certain number of divisions, or by joining in seeing to it that these war materials that might be beneficial to the one potential aggressor in the world today are not getting in there to help them in their potential aggression."

I merely point out that to you at this time, because I think both in the executive session and on the floor that question will be raised, and we should at least have a full explanation of it.

Mr. COOPER. My own view is that I think every effort should be made to get those results. That is merely my own statement.

Senator HICKENLOOPER. Now I would like to pursue just a little further a question Senator RUSSELL asked you a moment ago; the matter of Turkey. Turkey seems to be doing some very valiant service to the United Nations in Korea, and I think it is pretty well known that Turkey would like to be brought into a Mediterranean Defense Pact, or into the Western European Pact, or the North Atlantic Pact in some way so that Turkey could join with the nations of Europe if aggression occurs, and could have some assurance of their collective security.

Your answer to Senator RUSSELL, so far as I was concerned, was quite indefinite. I do not want to press you beyond reasonable limits in asking about details, but did I understand you to say that we are looking into that particular situation?

Secretary ACHESON. I pointed out in answer to Senator RUSSELL's question that the same consideration applied to Greece and Turkey and, of course, Yugoslavia is a very important factor in the whole question of military balance in Southeast Europe. We have had a strong military mission in Greece and in Turkey. We have made very considerable headway working with the Greeks and the Turks, developing their capacities to resist. They have good establishments.

We have recently considered in the North Atlantic Treaty Organization the whole question of the relationship of Greece and Turkey to that organization, and an invitation was extended to them to work with the military planning for the defense of that whole area, which is now going forward.

I think the importance of that area is fully understood both by the Government

and by the supreme commander. The situation is one which is likely to develop, and a great deal of thought is being given to it.

GENERAL BRADLEY

Senator RUSSELL. You mention here 11 friendly nations throughout your statement, General Bradley. If we can make that 13 or 14 or 15 friendly nations, and they had something to contribute to resist communism, we would be that much better off, would we not?

General BRADLEY. Yes, sir. The more military strength we can add to our collective defense and the more potential that is back of them, undoubtedly the better chance you have of success.

Senator RUSSELL. There are nations in Europe that are not in the North Atlantic Pact who would be in a position to make a real contribution to attaining the objective of that treaty, are there not, General?

General BRADLEY. That is correct.

Senator RUSSELL. Turkey, Greece, Yugoslavia, and Spain could all make a real contribution to a war, if a fellow had them to fight on his side, could they not?

General BRADLEY. All of those countries have considerable military strength, and any strength we can get on our side instead of being neutral or on the other side is that much to the good.

Senator CHAPMAN. It is possible that the success of this program and maybe the movement toward inclusion of Spain and Turkey and Greece as part of our defense in Europe might weaken the hold of Russia on some of those satellite countries.

Secretary ACHESON. It might, sir; yes, sir.

Senator SPARKMAN. There is a great deal in the press and on the air these days about the possibility of an attack on Yugoslavia by the satellites, and if such an attack should occur, would that, in your opinion, place a greater strain and greater emphasis upon the need of defending Western Europe?

Secretary MARSHALL. I think it would, sir.

SECRETARY MARSHALL

Senator RUSSELL. I do not know whether you would care to discuss this at this open session or not, Mr. Secretary, but I have brought it up at other sessions and I think that it is a tremendously important part of this whole program. If we are compelled to fight, we naturally want as many people to help us as we can. I think that next to the instinct of self-preservation, that is about the second strongest instinct we feel. What are your views on agreement with Turkey or with Spain, or other nations that might be in a position to contribute substantially to the defense of Western Europe?

Secretary MARSHALL. As to Spain, that is quite a delicate international diplomatic question today. For the Defense Department I would not care to make any comment at this time.

Senator RUSSELL. I thought perhaps since you have served as Secretary of State you would be able to comment from that standpoint. We have had the Secretary of State before us and he has replied that there are a good many military questions involved, and you say it is a question of diplomacy. I had thought, perhaps, since you had served in both capacities you might give us the answer.

Secretary MARSHALL. When I walked out of the door of the State Department I ceased to be Secretary of State very definitely, and a great deal of water has gone over the dam since then.

I will make this comment, that any acquisition of battle-worthy troops would be tremendously helpful at a time like this. Any acquisition of battle-worthy troops would be very helpful at a time like this. We have very positive indications of the splendid fighting capacity on the part of the Turks, for example, and I think, incidental to this comment, that we have gotten a larger return from the

amount of money that was appropriated toward the rehabilitation of the equipment of the Turkish Army than for any other measure of a similar nature.

Now we are getting a very positive demonstration of the fighting capacity of the Greeks in Korea. There is no doubt whatever about their aggressiveness, their morale, and their dependability. So we have gotten a great return out of that action, in addition to suppressing the Communist guerrilla warfare in Greece that was a very dangerous development in that country.

Senator HICKENLOOPER. That brings me to another question then. In the event of war with Russia, would the position of the Dardanelles and the Turkish Straits and Turkish territory by Russia be detrimental to the security of the United States? I say in the event of war with Russia and her ownership or control of those areas.

General SPAATZ. That would not directly threaten the United States, insofar as military operations over the United States are concerned. It might become important eventually for us in order to project our air power more properly to the heart of Russia.

Senator HICKENLOOPER. How would the control of the Dardanelles and Turkish territory affect the security of the Mediterranean, so far as our operations were concerned?

General SPAATZ. Well, of course, there would always be the danger that it would give a chance for Russian submarines to move out of the Black Sea into the Mediterranean. But, remember, when we moved into Africa the Germans not only controlled the Dardanelles, but they controlled Tunisia, Sicily, Sardinia, Corsica, Pantelleria, and the Italian Peninsula.

Senator HICKENLOOPER. And they also had Russia at their back door. Their situation, I think, would be a little different.

General SPAATZ. I think if we went to war with Russia we eventually could move our air base close enough to Russia, including those established in the Mediterranean area, which would take some time, so we could strike the blows that would make them want to quit.

Senator CAIN. You have told us, General Spaatz, that the present day is very critical, and that we have need of accelerating our defense preparations because in your view we are not yet prepared to win a war were it to be imposed upon us. Is that the substance of your deep conviction at this time?

General SPAATZ. Yes, sir.

Senator CAIN. Against that conviction do you consider that Western Europe is probably America's first line of defense at this time?

General SPAATZ. Well, I would not say that at this time. I would say that if we move rapidly and build up their strength with whatever assistance we have to give, it can be made our first line of defense, and by that I do not mean on the Rhine. I mean going as far east as we can. But I certainly would not say it was our first line of defense at this time because there is nothing there to prevent the Russians from overrunning it.

There is a vacuum as far as military force is concerned. The only military force that holds Russia back is the strategic bomber and the atom bomb.

Senator CAIN. Do you feel that the sooner we work in concert with our allies to the building of a completely adequate defense system the better off the free world is going to be?

General SPAATZ. I think we should have started that 2 years ago. We are wasting a lot of time now, and we ought to go after it as fast as we can.

Senator CAIN. That is why all of us are anxious to ask all of you questions.

Portugal geographically is a part of Western Europe, it appears from the map.

General SPAATZ. Yes, sir.

Senator CAIN. And Portugal is a member of the Atlantic Pact, our defense system?

General SPAATZ. Yes, sir.

Senator CAIN. Against everything you have said, General, I would appreciate it if you would give us your views on the desirability or lack of it of including, say, Spain and Turkey, Turkey at the eastern flank of the Mediterranean Sea. I would appreciate your views on that.

General SPAATZ. I think the sooner that is done, the better.

Senator CAIN. May I ask this question: Do you know, in your very broad experience, a single responsible military leader who does not think that the geography, manpower, and resources of all of the Iberian Peninsula would not be extraordinarily helpful to any intended defense or war in Western Europe.

General SPAATZ. No, sir. They are bound to think that way because of its strategic position.

Senator CAIN. You said during the course of your testimony that in your view, Spain within a year would probably come under the operational jurisdiction of General Eisenhower, as I understood it, for the creation of a stable defense for Western Europe.

Mr. STASSEN. Yes, sir.

Senator CAIN. I would like to have what you base that judgment on and how do we go about getting a nation like Spain, not now a member of the Atlantic Pact, into that concert of nations?

Mr. STASSEN. You first get the concert of nations functioning and building and developing its own conference, and then you have it appraise its own essential military problems, and when you consider Western Europe and all aspects of it, I think they will reach similar conclusions.

Senator CAIN. That is purely anticipatory, based on the logic involved in the question?

Mr. STASSEN. That is right; and my confidence in the competence of the men who are now at long last in charge of the building of the defenses of Western Europe.

Senator CAIN. During the course of these hearings, every military man who has testified on this question concerning Spain has been very strong in his support of the inclusion of Spain, not a year from now, not today, but a year ago or several years ago, because the obvious logic in that question is that it has been outstanding for a very long period of time.

The CHAIRMAN. There have been statements of conversations with those in high political authority with whom this is going to be done, but you do not know that to be a fact?

Mr. STASSEN. It is on my constant information from men in high authority in most of these countries as to their own processes of thinking. I have been in touch with leaders of many of these countries ever since the war.

Senator CAIN. Mr. Governor, let us suppose General Eisenhower and all of his military associates do recommend that Spain become a part of the defense of Western Europe. What steps then must be taken to get Spain, not now a member of the Atlantic Pact, into that operation?

Mr. STASSEN. Well, she herself must be willing to come in and the terms and basis of that must be worked out and the other members must be willing to accept her membership.

Senator CAIN. All told, the Atlantic Pact consists of 12 nations. Would it be so that a majority or all of those would have to accept Spain or any other country as a new member?

Mr. STASSEN. I think that all of them would have to do it.

Senator RUSSELL. You mentioned one matter about which I am very much concerned. I feel very strongly that we should use every possible resource and ally that is available

to us in this movement to resist Communist aggression. I should like for you to state your views as to whether or not Spain should be included in the defense of Western Europe.

Governor DEWEY. I believe it should be at the earliest possible moment, sir. I should like to say also that that answer would apply to Yugoslavia, and I should like to see Greece and Turkey brought into the North Atlantic Treaty at the earliest possible moment consistent with the diplomatic problems involved.

Senator RUSSELL. In other words, if we can go to bed with Dictator Stalin to defeat Hitler, we should not be too particular about the company of lesser dictators in the present situation.

Governor DEWEY. When my country is in peril, I am not too fussy about the people who will defeat the enemy, sir.

Senator RUSSELL. Thank you for that statement.

That is all.

The CHAIRMAN. Of course you realize there will have to be certain diplomatic arrangements made?

Governor DEWEY. I recognize the difficulty. I am not criticizing our failure to achieve it. I should like to see it pursued as rapidly as possible.

Senator RUSSELL. We should pursue every diplomatic effort available?

Governor DEWEY. Yes, sir; I recognize also there are certain political forces in the center of Europe, and in France, in Italy, and in Britain which make it difficult to bring about the things that I should like to see done with the speed that I should like to see. But I believe that we should move with all possible speed and I believe we are providing enough aid to Europe so that they should be reminded of it as we persuade them to go along.

The CHAIRMAN. Is that all?

Senator RUSSELL. That is all.

The CHAIRMAN. Spain has a great military background over the past many, many years; is not that true?

Governor DEWEY. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. And it is reported that Yugoslavia has a very sizable army.

Governor DEWEY. Thirty divisions.

The CHAIRMAN. Maybe not as well equipped as they should be, but still they are a fighting people, are they not?

Governor DEWEY. I understand that they have 30 well-trained divisions about half or two-thirds of which are well armed, and that with additional arms they could provide an immense force.

Of course, I personally believe that the only way to be sure that that particular tinder box would not blow up on us is to include them, if they will come and if we can get them in, into the North Atlantic Treaty.

The CHAIRMAN. Turkey has a good fighting background, also, has she not?

Governor DEWEY. They say their troops are doing magnificent fighting in Korea, and I believe that they have 25 divisions well trained and well armed.

The CHAIRMAN. Greece is smaller, of course, but it has a good fighting force.

Governor DEWEY. Greece has offered already to produce 200,000 troops, fighting troops, and I think that there is no one in this world who would deny the fighting quality of the Greeks throughout all history, and at this moment Greece stands ready, I was advised only the day before yesterday, to produce not 200,000, but 500,000 fighting troops if we will arm them, and make them available to General Eisenhower for use as a part of the Western European armed forces. Of course, that is a contribution, I guess, of about 8 percent of the entire population. It would be the largest percentage contribution by any nation in the world to our side.

The CHAIRMAN. I hope your information is correct.

Senator CAIN. When you have reason to believe, as the average American believes, that Western Europe is not secure today, to what extent would that security be improved if we were to reach, in concert with our allies, military agreement with nations not now in the Atlantic Pact? Adding Turkey on the east and Spain on the west, Greece in between, and Yugoslavia to the north, we would pick up roughly 1,000,000 foot soldiers with their companion air and navy arms, and so on. To what extent would our chances of success in terms of security be advanced if we were to take such nations as now want to be with us into our Defense Establishment?

General GEORGE. I think it would be materially increased.

Senator CAIN. Would there be any other conclusion, General George, that you could draw?

General GEORGE. It would be foolish to say that the nations in Western Europe, the anti-Communist nations, should not be given every encouragement to build up their own defenses to the extent that they offer a tremendous power against Russia; and, if the existence of our strategic Air Force and our atomic bombs can give a period of time long enough for that to happen, then it should be done. We should encourage it. We should help it.

Senator CAIN. The stronger we make Western Europe, the more time we are going to have if attacked by the Russians across the polar regions?

General GEORGE. No; that will not delay the attack by Russia with her strategic air force against this country. When she wants to move—

Senator CAIN. She could move independently, in your opinion, of ground forces or any other military establishment?

General GEORGE. Absolutely. It will be air warfare as students of air warfare have always visualized it.

Senator CAIN. Certainly; but, in terms of military posture in Western Europe, you can only move in the direction of 100 percent effectiveness by taking into your Defense Establishment every single nation which either wants to help or has anything to contribute.

General GEORGE. I agree with you wholeheartedly.

Senator HICKENLOOPER. Just one more question which has been touched on by two or three other committee members here. I understand that it is your opinion, speaking strictly from a military standpoint—I am not asking you to commit yourself on a political opinion, but from a strictly military point of view—that it would be very advantageous to have as full cooperation and assistance from such countries as Turkey and Spain and Greece for our own good as possible?

General BRADLEY. As I heard someone express it the other day, I believe it was General Eisenhower, if you get into a barroom fight, you would not care who was swinging the chair behind you on your side, and I think that is the position we are in here. We want all the strength on our side that we can get and possibly we should not in some cases be too particular what he does outside of that, but any help that anyone can give us from the military point of view is very advantageous to us when you are talking purely military matters.

Senator HICKENLOOPER. Well, we are doing this, or going into this program now, with the possibility that there might be a barroom fight. Otherwise there would be no object in building up these forces over there.

General BRADLEY. And when that happens you would like to have as many chairs swung on your side as possible?

Senator HICKENLOOPER. Therefore, if that happens, it will be far more helpful than detrimental to have these countries fighting on our side?

General BRADLEY. You asked me from a military point of view, and the answer is "Yes."

Senator HICKENLOOPER. I want to be sure I am not attempting to commit you on a political or policy question or a diplomatic question.

Senator HICKENLOOPER. Admiral, speaking from the military standpoint as compared to a political standpoint, and without attempting to involve you in policy, political or diplomatic policy, in the event of any aggression by, let us say, for instance, Russia in Europe, would it be substantially to our advantage to have Turkey on our side fighting with us and with the North Atlantic Pact nations?

Admiral SHERMAN. My military opinion is definitely yes.

Senator HICKENLOOPER. And the same way with Greece, I take it?

Admiral SHERMAN. The same with Greece. Senator KNOWLAND. I would like to ask this, Admiral. I believe in the New York American of yesterday there is an article, an Associated Press article, which gives what is purported to be the strength of the western armies and the strength of the Communist-bloc armies in Europe. I think for the record—and I am not claiming that these are official figures—but for the basis of my following question, I would like to first read this.

It shows Norway with 35,000; Denmark with 10,000; England with 375,000; the Netherlands with 175,000; Belgium with 85,000; Italy with 250,000; France with 500,000; and Portugal with 65,000. And then it shows in a box the United States of America 591,700, and Canada 62,000. So much for the western armies.

Then it lists as other anti-Soviet nations, with a total of 1,743,000, the following: Spain, 422,000; Yugoslavia, 500,000; Greece, 146,000; and Turkey, 675,000.

As a responsible member of the Joint Chiefs of Staff who, while Chief of Naval Operations, sits in on decisions regarding defense of this country, do you believe that you can have an effective defense of Western Europe unless you bring into the defense the elements represented by Spain with 422,000; Yugoslavia with 500,000; Greece with 146,000; and Turkey with 675,000 troops?

Admiral SHERMAN. I would like to answer that question by commenting briefly on each country, if I may.

Turkey has, in my opinion, not only a national determination to resist aggression but also an army which, as a purely ground army, is quite effective. The Turkish naval force is quite small but because of its positioning has importance beyond that which is derived only from its size.

The Greeks have an army which has been in combat. I have watched it in action at the front. As armies go, in smaller nations, it is quite a good army and quite a significant factor. Its significance has been increased considerably by the change in orientation of the Yugoslavs.

The Yugoslavs in turn also have an army which, while not well equipped is large and was one that we worried about rather considerably 3 years ago.

Certainly all three of those countries, since they have a common frontier with Communist satellites, are extremely important. Spain has an army which has not engaged in external conflict for a great many years. But certainly it is part of the potential resources.

As I recall it, the North Atlantic Treaty made rather a definite reference to the possibility of bringing Spain into the alliance, but I believe there was a reservation that it could only be done with the consent of all

of the allies, which is a political problem. Geographically Spain has a position of great importance.

So my over-all answer to the question would be that I would hope that eventually the defense of Western Europe and the free world might be strengthened by establishing closer relationships with the four countries that you mentioned.

Senator KNOWLAND. * * * Now, let us just assume for the moment that the situation worsens, but war did not break out.

Suppose it was granted by the Joint Chiefs together with the European consultants that instead of needing 100,000 troops from somewhere we would have to get 500,000 more, just to use an example. Suppose Spain should be willing to come in, or Spain and Turkey should be willing to come in. And suppose Denmark, which according to the newspaper figures, to round out the argument, has 10,000 troops, should exercise its veto. When you say they have to agree unanimously, that means that any one of the signatories has an absolute veto. Suppose they veto the bringing of Spain or Turkey or Greece, as the case might be, into the North Atlantic Alliance, and you as the Joint Chiefs and your conferees in Europe had determined that 500,000 troops were absolutely essential. That one vote of a nation which is only supplying 10,000 troops would almost automatically mean that the only other place you could get troops would be from the United States, wouldn't it, as a practical matter?

Admiral SHERMAN. Well, sir, I would have my doubts that we would run into the same type of veto and intransigence in cooperative action in NATO that we have had at times in the United Nations.

Senator WHERRY. That brings up another question. Do you feel you can have a proper defense of Western Europe without having Spain brought into the family of nations?

General COLLINS. I think it would materially aid, and again I am speaking from a military point of view. I think that it would materially aid if Spain were to contribute to the military power of NATO.

Senator WHERRY. Would there be a possibility of holding the flank along the Mediterranean without having Spain as a friendly nation where we might have bases and the help of their army to protect Spain to hold defensively.

General COLLINS. Yes, sir. In my judgment, it is possible without Spain to hold it defensively.

Senator WHERRY. * * * Military experts have also stated it was very necessary to have Spain friendly to the North Atlantic Treaty community. And I was asking your opinion, if you felt that an adequate defense could be built without Spain.

General COLLINS. Yes, sir; I believe it could be. The alternative, of course, would be if Spain were an enemy. If Spain were an enemy then the lines of communication through the Mediterranean would be dreadfully threatened but we did operate through the Mediterranean with Spain neutral, during the last war. Certainly if Spain were an opponent of ours, then it would seriously threaten the line of communications through the Mediterranean. Perhaps I did not understand the intent of your question.

GENERAL EISENHOWER

Senator RUSSELL. Would you mind stating, General, whether or not you have found any change in the attitude of our allies toward Spain and the use of certain Spanish military forces?

General EISENHOWER. I was told that there has been definite change; for numbers of reasons, unfortunately in one case the man telling me something swore me to secrecy, but he did say, "Give us a little time and we can take this thing much better than we are taking it now," and he gave me specific

reasons for wanting a little bit of time. But when I went to Portugal, they want to talk only one thing: Spain. They say we can't get into Europe except through Spain. "What is the use of talking to us about our place in NATO until you take Spain into NATO?"

I must say there was in other capitals a very great desire to see us gradually incorporate all of those great Mediterranean forces—Turkish, Greek, Yugoslav, and Spanish—right into the thing, and then in the picture of placing behind that whole line-up strong American sea and air strength to establish a really strong flank instead of a weak one.

Senator CAIN. This committee, of which I am a member, has seen fit today, for reasons adequate to the committee, to see that facts such as you were talking about are not yet to be made available to the American people, because this is an executive session. Perhaps that will be changed in due time. But this is what you have said, I think. With a light in your eye which otherwise I did not see, you said that if Spain, if Turkey, if Greece, and even if Yugoslavia, were a part of your jurisdiction, it would shore up your eastern and western flanks, which today are in relatively bad shape, and would add gigantic strength to this over-all movement.

General EISENHOWER. But, Senator CAIN, I did say "as a soldier, as a commentator on a military situation."

Senator CAIN. This is an executive session, and certainly I am going to respect it.

General EISENHOWER. I did not enter into the political attributes or concomitance of that question.

Senator CAIN. I want to ask this question, because the American people are so tremendously concerned and looking for light.

All of us know that Turkey, for example, on several occasions has pleaded, on the basis of what they thought was their right, to become a member of the Atlantic Pact, to which they have much to offer. I know that the Secretary of State of this Nation is sympathetic to it, but no progress has been made. Greece probably to a lesser extent has made overtures. The question I wanted to ask, and it is a highly delicate one, is, in your role as the commander in chief, whose primary function it is to advise the free world with reference to Western Europe as to how best Europe can defend itself, do you, sir, have a responsibility to the American people to say that "As the commander in chief, with the tools now at my disposal I will offer you this plan, which leaves out of consideration Turkey, Greece, Spain, and Yugoslavia. As commander in chief, I do hope the nations will reach an agreement which will bring all of those nations on board, because it will overnight give to us an immediate supply of strength which otherwise might be years in the making?"

General EISENHOWER. As a matter of fact, Senator, I will answer that this way. As of now, anybody that has the slightest conception of even the history of war—he doesn't have to be a soldier—sees the hard common sense of what you have been talking about. Therefore there is no one, as I see it, who needs to be reticent about expressing such a view, except only the professional soldier, because it is not his business to talk in public international affairs. You people would properly resent, I think, if I or any other soldier gets too free in talking about international relationships, where it is anything except military. But any man here can make his own evaluation of that situation, and I think it would be rather persuasive; considering the eloquence I have heard around this table, I think you could do a pretty good job.

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, I have but several minutes to go in support of the

three reasons why I must oppose this resolution.

My third reason for opposing Senate Resolution 99 seems to be somewhat singular to myself. At least, other Senators have not recently said very much about the war in Korea. I have thought for some time, and have said so several times, that the United States should concentrate all its attention on the United Nations until that organization, of which we are a member, has brought the war in Korea to a successful conclusion. If what we need in Korea is more troops from more countries, we ought to work with others in getting them there. There are given nations within the North Atlantic Pact which have not as yet, after 9 months of war, contributed a single soldier. If we are getting ready to win a war which might break out in Western Europe, then the Western Europeans ought to learn how to fight a war by taking part in the Korean war. Nobody denies that the best way to learn how to fight is to fight. Instead of the United States sending troops now to Europe, Europe ought to be sending most of the military strength it has to Korea. That is one man's point of view.

I think that other members of the United Nations who have done nothing worthy of the name up to this time in Korea ought to do something first class, and do it now. Again, I am convinced that if we win the war in Korea by having inspired every member nation of the United Nations to make sacrifices through a strong participation we shall have established and earned the right and created the might to maintain peace on the face of the earth.

I shall not be among those in or out of the Senate who take their eyes and hearts off of Korea because they are preoccupied with Europe. The war in Korea has been going nowhere for months. Our job is to make it go somewhere before we waste our substance and energy anywhere else.

America has a limited military strength at this time. We shall soon, however, have four combat divisions to be made available to Europe. I can say with no certainty that these divisions will not be required in Korea. Can anyone say they will not be required in Korea? Can anyone say with any certainty that the troops we are proposing to send to Europe may not be imperatively required in Korea in the immediate future?

Until we know beyond question that these divisions are not necessary to the attainment of victory in Korea, I shall not vote to send them anywhere else. I do not think there is such a rush as many would have us believe.

In June of 1950, 53 nations resolved to stop the aggressor in Korea. That was 9 months ago. I am told that 13 out of these 53 nations have contributed anywhere from 50 men to 22,000 men to fight alongside United States and Republic of Korea forces. This showing causes one to wonder about the political leadership which guides the free world today. When the war in Korea began America was charged with the responsibility for marshaling the forces

of free nations together. Though I may be wrong, I think that America's political leadership has been lacking. I think it can be improved on, and I believe it should be immediately improved on.

In my opinion other nations would have made far greater contributions to the fighting forces in Korea had America's political leadership been more active and dynamic. In my own experience I know it to be a fact that America's leadership in the early days of the Korean war was inexcusably slow and indifferent.

I was in Europe during July and August of last year. In that period I visited every Atlantic Pact country and most of the European nations outside of the pact. My diary of that trip will tell me whom I visited with and when. I remember going to almost every American Embassy in Europe. I recall asking every Ambassador or some agent of his what was being done to encourage the European nations to participate in the Korean war. The answer was invariably the same. "We are waiting," they said, "for instructions from Washington. We have cabled to find out what they want us to do. We have had no instructions." The Ambassador in one country told me that he had been instructed not to ask for a fighting unit. I have no desire to embarrass that Ambassador, but, if I am required to support that statement, I can produce the Ambassador.

The Ambassador in another nation told me that he had cabled to Washington 2 weeks before for instructions and had had no reply. The war had been going on in Korea for some weeks at that time. I think we need to do a little soul searching these days to find out who is doing what to whom.

On my return to Heidelberg from having visited every European country, I sent a cable to the Secretary of State, which I read to the Senate in September. I have not previously released the cable I received in reply from the Secretary of State. I think it is not improper that I say now what the Secretary of State cabled to me last August, even though he wrote it confidentially. Many soldiers have died since last August. I am inclined to think that the Secretary of State never saw my cable, though the response to it was signed by his name. This is what I said to the Secretary of State:

AUGUST 11, 1950.

TO SECRETARY OF STATE, WITH COPY TO SECRETARY OF DEFENSE:

After conferring with responsible persons in all of the MDAP title I and II nations, I am completely distressed that so few ground troops have been committed to Korea. With no desire to embarrass your difficult labor, I want to make an observation and suggestion. People everywhere believe their country ought to offer ground force aid to Korea. Governments are hesitant for many reasons but primarily because your representatives have apparently not been instructed to urge assistance in positive fashion. It is my firm belief that every nation would make a political commitment for token ground forces if your agents encourage them to do so. This would be particularly true should you let it be known that General MacArthur,

after consultation with government concerned, would determine if the offer should be accepted. I am convinced that this approach would find favor everywhere. People understand that if they fail to offer to help America now in name of United Nations, that America may be unable to help them should trouble break out elsewhere after the Korean war on the ground has been won alone and by an exhausted America. Europe has no defense establishment worthy of the name, but I know of no nation which is incapable of making a reasonable and worthwhile ground force contribution. Because these contributions are lacking after weeks of war, the Russians are employing devastating European propaganda against us. Your representatives abroad are splendid and respected and they will secure the commitments so imperatively required if our national policy will give them the green light to go ahead. Europe looks to America for direction in this question and thus far that leadership has been lacking.

That cable was sent on August 11, 1950. It was responded to on August 16, 1950, with the following notation:

AUGUST 16, 1950.

The following message is relayed to Senator CAIN for action, from the State Department, signed Acheson:

"Greatly appreciate your message. Your observations are in full accord with my own views on this question. You will be gratified to know that with Secretary Johnson's full agreement, I had already initiated the precise steps you suggest with a number of other governments. Foregoing is, of course, for your personal and confidential information."

I wonder whether any Senators have heard that cablegram read before. It ought to give them something to think about.

Mr. President, these cablegrams passed between the Secretary of State and the junior Senator from Washington in August 1950. That was some 7 months ago. In those 7 months a few nations have substantially increased their fighting forces in Korea, and other nations have done nothing at all. If we wish to be charitable, and claim that our American leadership has not been responsible for what other nations have not done, we must agree that the lack of leadership lies somewhere else. Certainly we must be as one in understanding that the total effort in Korea has not been a compliment collectively to the free nations of the world.

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

Mr. CAIN. I gladly yield.

Mr. LONG. I should like to ask the Senator to repeat the answer which the Secretary of State sent to him regarding his cablegram concerning the contribution of ground forces by other nations.

Mr. CAIN. The cable from the Secretary of State, with particular reference to what the Senator has in mind, said:

You will be gratified to know that with Secretary Johnson's full agreement, I had already initiated the precise steps you suggest with a number of other governments. Your observations are in full accord with my own views on this question.

My view and the Secretary's view apparently was that it was only a lack of political action that was keeping every nation from contributing ground forces to the struggle in Korea. Under date of August 16 the Secretary said, "I agree

with you. We have previously taken steps to carry out what were our suggestions, and you can look for results soon."

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

Mr. CAIN. I yield.

Mr. LONG. Has the Senator seen any evidence of such a policy being pursued, namely, of other nations being encouraged by the United Nations to contribute troops?

Mr. CAIN. The Senator from Washington cannot be certain, but he does know that either we have failed to exercise the right and positive kind of leadership, or the nations in Europe have resisted our leadership. In either event the Senator from Louisiana will agree with me that something is distressingly wrong, because the fact remains that some of those fine nations—and they are fine nations in Western Europe—have been so unimpressed about the Korean threat and challenge to freedom and survival that they have not as yet, 9 months after the war began, and 7 months after the Secretary of State said he would take up the question with them, committed a single soldier to service in Korea.

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

Mr. CAIN. I gladly yield further.

Mr. LONG. Does it not seem to the Senator that the United States should make it clear to other nations that if they expect the United States to spend its blood fighting for them, they had better help us now? Perhaps those nations would make a greater response than they have heretofore.

Mr. CAIN. In one sentence of my cablegram I said, "Your leadership, Mr. Secretary of State, must convince these people that if the people of Western Europe do not pitch in and contribute to collective effort in Korea, should trouble break out in the future in Western Europe how are we to know that an exhausted America would find it possible to go to their rescue."

All I have been attempting to say is that there is strength in unity, and the place to test it is where we have the first challenge, which is in Korea, as a result of which we create ourselves a ball team and then become more concerned with Europe, which certainly is well qualified to keep things going until we get over there, even though we may be delayed for a few months.

Mr. LONG. I was interested in what the Senator said in an address last fall with respect to having talked when he was in Turkey to certain officials of the Turkish Government who were at that time attempting to make a decision as to sending troops to Korea. The Senator stated that he told the Turkish officials that it would certainly make a difference to the United States if Turkey were ever in trouble whether Turkey had sent troops when we needed them in Korea, and that the Turkish people were impressed by that logic, and partly because of that logic they decided to send troops to Korea.

Mr. CAIN. There was a reason why the junior Senator from Washington

told the Turkish officials anything. I remember the occasion very well. I was sitting with the American Ambassador, Mr. Wadsworth, a splendid citizen if I have ever known one, and a splendid professional soldier, Major General McBride, who headed our Turkish military mission. The three of us were sitting with the Turkish General Staff, the Foreign Minister, and the Secretary of War. The Foreign Minister and the Turkish gentlemen were giving serious consideration whether they should make a decision to help or not help in Korea. It happened that during the course of the conversation my opinion was requested. I jumped at the opportunity. I said, among other things, "Mr. Foreign Minister, your country continues to have difficulty getting into the Atlantic Pact. I think you should have been in it from the beginning. However, that is beside the point. If you participate now in Korea you will have earned that much greater right to consideration from the North Atlantic Pact countries, some of whom have not even thought about participating up to this time. In addition to which, however"—and this argument struck deeply, I think, from the point of view of logic—"it stands to reason that this is the first fire of aggression which has broken out during this so-called collective-security effort. Why do we not collectively go into Korea and try to put out the fire? Now, Mr. Turk, if you can forget your animosity toward North Atlantic nations for not letting you in, and come along with us and help us put out the fire, it stands to reason that your wishes and dreams ought to come true in the future." The Turks, having even less reason for going into the fight than certain of our unnamed friends in Western Europe, have gone forth and many Turkish soldiers have suffered and numbers of them have died in Korea. But they knew what they were doing. They have a far greater understanding of what worldwide communism can do to them than do some of our friends in Western Europe, who talk so much about communism, but do so little to fight it.

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

Mr. CAIN. I yield, gladly.

Mr. LONG. Would it not support the Senator's argument to tell some of the European nations who so far have not contributed one man or one life, "Insofar as your nation is concerned, we are willing to help you, but you should help us get Turkey into the pact because Turkey has been willing to fight for freedom, and we know that Turkey would fight again in the future as she has done in the past"?

Mr. CAIN. I wish to associate myself with the Senator's point of view in that respect. I do not think it would be an exercise of unreasonable pressure. Reasonable men can sit down and say, "We have so much to share with each other, and our first undertaking is to use our resources to put out the fire in Korea, and our second undertaking is to continue to do what we have been doing now and ever since the end of the last war, namely, to help Europe in every way we can."

Mr. LONG. Did not the Senator last fall give us some idea of the attitude of the Government of Denmark toward contributing to our efforts in Korea?

Mr. CAIN. No; Denmark was the one country, on the trip to which the Senator from Louisiana has made reference, where the ambassador, Mrs. Anderson, was temporarily absent. I did not have a chance to meet her during my trip. The question would have been academic even if she had been there, because Denmark had been occupied during the last war and had come out of the war with very little, and it was having quite a time getting ready to take care of its own small bailiwick. But even so, if Mrs. Anderson had been there, I would have said that a handful of Danes—a fine people—would help in Korea.

Mr. LONG. Did not the Senator place something in the RECORD or make a statement last fall to the effect that the press of some or at least one nation had stated that the contribution of that nation, if it made a contribution would be so small that it would be better not to make any contribution at all?

Mr. CAIN. No. The only editorial comment which I placed in the RECORD last summer was from a Danish newspaper, which made the point the other way around. It stated, in effect, "There is not much we can do in Korea with our limited facilities, but you Danes listen. The bells are tolling in Korea for us here in Denmark; and however small our contribution is, in heaven's name let us stand up and send it to Korea." Whether they have done so or not I am not at present prepared to say.

Mr. LONG. I thank the Senator.

Mr. CAIN. I thank the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. President, in conclusion, let every man make his choice. I have made my own this afternoon, in favor of continuing to grapple with the Korean situation until victory is assured, before supporting any proposal which could only be a side issue—an unimportant issue for the time being.

On the front page of the Washington Star of Monday, March 19, there was a cartoon. I studied it. I understood it. I thought it spoke the truth, unfortunate as that truth is. Gen. Douglas MacArthur was talking on the battlefield with his field commander of the Eighth United States Army, or the Eighth United Nations Army, Gen. Matthew Bunker Ridgway, who was trying by telephone to make a connection with our country. General MacArthur said, "Well, what does Washington want us to do," and General Ridgway replied, "I can't get an answer, sir; everyone there is either on vacation or investigation." Those few words probably made a greater impression and said far more than I have been able to accomplish in the Senate this afternoon.

The only thing about my observations today which has made me heartsick is that I may have added to the troubles which belong to General Eisenhower, the supreme commander of the army to which it is intended to commit four American divisions. I treasure General Eisenhower's friendship. I have a great respect for him and his ability. I would

never hurt him in any way if I could help it. If I am not mistaken, when General Eisenhower was recently in this country and appearing before our committee in executive session, I was the only member of the Committee on Armed Services whom General Eisenhower addressed by his first name. That is because of a friendship which goes back quite a long time.

I would never hurt General Eisenhower in any way if I could help it. But my love of country is greater than my admiration for any man who lives. General Eisenhower did not seek his present assignment. That assignment sought him. He will always do the best he can with what he has to work with. He will be the first to cheer should large contingents of forces from nations not now involved in the Atlantic Pact be shortly placed under his command. For quite some time to come General Eisenhower will be more concerned with planning than with troops in the field. I hope he will understand that I am trying to help and not hinder his future success and that of the free world.

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

Mr. CAIN. I yield.

Mr. LONG. The junior Senator from Louisiana would like very much to congratulate the junior Senator from Washington on the speech which he has just made.

It has been the observation of the junior Senator from Louisiana that the Senator from Washington, as a member of the Committee on Armed Services, has done this Nation a real service in traveling to Europe at his own expense to see what has been done to implement the North Atlantic Pact, and reporting thoroughly and ably to the Senate on that subject. He has made the observation that most needed to be made on the floor of the Senate, that the one thing that would best be done to implement the North Atlantic Pact has not been done. Obviously the contribution which Turkey, Greece, Spain, and even Yugoslavia, could make to the defense of Europe would be far greater than any four American divisions we could send.

Mr. CAIN. I am very grateful for the Senator's comment. I want to associate myself with his views, which to me make good, hard-headed American sense, which is good for us and for the rest of the world.

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

Mr. CAIN. I yield.

Mr. CASE. I should like to add that I endorse what the distinguished Senator from Louisiana has said. I feel that the address by the Senator from Washington this afternoon has been one of the most important, from the standpoint of considering and bringing out the real issues which are involved in the matter before us. I express my appreciation to the Senator from Washington for what he has said.

Mr. CAIN. I am grateful to my friend from South Dakota. I wish to make it clear to him that I am privileged to have had an opportunity this afternoon, as a member of the Committee on Armed Services, merely to make refer-

ence to some things which had not previously been made available to the Senate by other members of the committee.

What the Senate is about to do is to vote on the basis of what the two committees did. From my point of view, every member of the committees ought to speak his own mind on this question, in order that the Senate may make its choice and make up its mind on the basis of all the information available.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Snader, its assistant reading clerk, announced that the House had passed, without amendment, the bill (S. 683) authorizing vessels of Canadian registry to transport iron ore between United States ports on the Great Lakes during 1951.

ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills and joint resolution, and they were signed by the President pro tempore:

S. 58. An act for the relief of Edulji Dinshaw and his sister, Mrs. Bachoo Dinsha Woronzow;

S. 63. An act for the relief of Marie Louise Ardans;

S. 243. An act for the relief of Dewey Pickett;

H. R. 609. An act for the relief of Carroll L. Vickers;

H. E. 2339. An act to clarify the immigration status of certain aliens; and

H. J. Res. 173. Joint resolution to amend and extend the provisions of the District of Columbia Emergency Rent Act, as amended.

ASSIGNMENT OF GROUND FORCES TO DUTY IN THE EUROPEAN AREA

The Senate resumed the consideration of the resolution (S. Res. 99) approving the action of the President of the United States in cooperating in the common defense efforts of the North Atlantic Treaty nations.

Mr. MALONE obtained the floor.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me for the purpose of suggesting the absence of a quorum?

Mr. MALONE. I am happy to yield to the distinguished Senator from South Dakota.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CARLSON in the chair). The Secretary will call the roll.

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

Aiken	Ellender	Johnston, S. C.
Anderson	Ferguson	Kem
Benton	Flanders	Kerr
Brewster	Frear	Kilgore
Bricker	Fulbright	Knowland
Butler, Md.	George	Langer
Byrd	Gillette	Lehman
Cain	Green	Lodge
Capehart	Hayden	Long
Carlson	Hendrickson	McCarran
Case	Hennings	McCarthy
Chavez	Hickenlooper	McClellan
Clements	Hill	McFarland
Connally	Hoey	McKellar
Cordon	Holland	McMahon
Dirksen	Humphrey	Magnuson
Douglas	Hunt	Malone
Duff	Ives	Martin
Dworshak	Jenner	Maybank
Eastland	Johnson, Colo.	Millikin
Ecton	Johnson, Tex.	Monroney

Mundt	Russell	Taft
Murray	Saltanstill	Underwood
Neely	Schoepfel	Watkins
Nixon	Smathers	Wherry
O'Connor	Smith, Maine	Wiley
O'Mahoney	Smith, N. J.	Williams
Pastore	Smith, N. C.	Young
Robertson	Stennis	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A quorum is present. The Senator from Nevada.

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

Mr. MALONE. I ask unanimous consent that I may yield to the Senator from Arizona without losing the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection it is so ordered.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, we have been considering Senate Resolution 99 since last Friday morning. I had hoped we would be able to finish the debate and vote on the resolution by tomorrow evening. I have done my best to work out a unanimous-consent agreement to that effect. I have also tried to effect a unanimous-consent agreement for a day next week, but thus far I have been unable to accomplish either.

I feel that the resolution which has been the subject of the debate is very important, and that it is also important that the Senate promptly finish its consideration of it, one way or the other. It is important because we have information which indicates that the fact that the two resolutions have not been acted upon is hindering General Eisenhower in his efforts in Europe. Senators, of course, have divergent views as to what should be in the resolution as it may finally be agreed to, or whether the pending resolution should be adopted; but there is one thing which it seems to me we all ought to agree upon, namely, to vote at the earliest possible moment. For that reason, I propose a unanimous-consent agreement, as follows:

Ordered. That upon the calendar day of next Tuesday, at the hour of 12 o'clock, the Senate proceed to vote, under the limitation of debate hereinafter provided, upon any amendment or motion (including appeals) that may be pending or that may thereafter be proposed to the resolution (S. Res. 99) approving the action of the President of the United States in cooperating in the common defense efforts of the North Atlantic Treaty nations: *Provided,* (1) That after said hour of 12 o'clock, debate upon any amendment or motion (including appeals) shall be limited to not exceeding 1 hour, to be equally divided and controlled, respectively, by the mover of any such amendment or motion and Mr. CONNALLY; (2) that no amendment or motion that is not germane or relevant to the subject matter of the said resolution shall be received; (3) that debate on the resolution itself shall be limited to 2 hours, to be equally divided and controlled, respectively, by Mr. CONNALLY and Mr. WHERRY, subject to the right of either of said Senators, during the consideration of an amendment proposed by another Senator, to yield to the latter Senator, in addition to the 30 minutes to which he is entitled under proviso numbered (1), any portion of such time of 1 hour allotted to each such Senator for debate on the resolution as he may desire; (4) that no vote on any amendment or motion (including appeals) shall be had prior to said calendar day of Tuesday next.

Ordered further. That immediately after the disposition of said Senate resolution 99, the Senate shall immediately proceed to the

consideration of Senate Concurrent Resolution 18, of an identical title, under the same conditions, provisions, and limitations of debate applicable to Senate Resolution 99, except that the time for debate on said concurrent resolution shall be limited to 1 hour instead of 2 hours.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield? I shall take but a second.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Arizona yield to the Senator from Massachusetts?

Mr. McFARLAND. I yield.

Mr. LODGE. I should like to commend the Senator from Arizona for making this effort to bring these resolutions to a vote. There is no doubt that the delay which has taken place in meeting this issue has had a hampering effect on the progress of General Eisenhower. In spite of this hampering effect, General Eisenhower has been able to make some notable achievements within the past few days in setting up his command structure, and it would be my hope that we would work as diligently here as he has worked in Europe.

The stories which have been appearing in the press, that there is some thought of taking a 10-day recess, or of letting an entire week go by before we meet this issue, are I think having an unfortunate effect abroad, and they are not reflecting any credit upon the United States Senate here at home. The world situation is extremely serious, and it is no time for a group of serious and responsible men such as we are to be talking about a long 10-day Easter vacation, when we confront such a peremptory and vital challenge as this. I commend the Senator from Arizona.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, so far as I know no one in the Senate is talking about taking a 10-day recess. I think the criticism is very unfair.

Mr. LODGE. I have not criticized anyone Senator at all. I have—

Mr. WHERRY. Just a moment. I do not yield at the moment.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, I have the floor.

Mr. WHERRY. I think an effort to work out an agreement—

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President—

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

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

Mr. MALONE. I am very happy to yield to the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I thought the Senator from Nevada yielded for this purpose.

Mr. WHERRY. That is what I thought. I thought he had yielded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair understood that the Senator from Nevada had yielded to the Senator from Arizona until this matter could be disposed of.

Mr. McFARLAND. That is correct.

Mr. MALONE. I yielded to the Senator from Arizona, provided I did not thereby lose the floor.

Mr. WHERRY. I wish to say again that there has been no intention, on the part of those who have drafted this unanimous-consent request, that there

be a vacation for 10 days. The attempt is merely to reach an agreement which will enable the Senate to recess from tomorrow to whatever day next week the distinguished majority leader may find acceptable, at which time we can start a limitation of debate. That is all that is before the Senate.

I have done my level best to cooperate with the majority leader. I canvassed the Senators on this side, in order to learn their views, and I think we have at least ascertained the minimum number opposed to fixing a definite day and hour, and those in favor of fixing a day and hour who are in a majority. I hope the majority leader will continue to press for a unanimous-consent agreement until we can agree upon a day and hour when we can have a limitation of debate and a final vote upon both resolutions. I assure the majority leader he will have the complete cooperation of Senators on this side in attempting to do that.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request?

Mr. WHERRY. Yes, Mr. President; I might just as well be frank about it. We cannot get a vote by next Tuesday, and I will state why. It is contemplated that tomorrow afternoon a recess will be taken at least over Friday, which will be Good Friday, and perhaps over Saturday.

I may as well be frank and admit that the very best I can do on this side of the aisle is to agree to a recess from Thursday until Monday, and from Monday either until Tuesday or Wednesday, and thus have 3 days in which to debate the issue, the time to be divided between proponents and opponents, so that each side may have an opportunity to have its position stated in the RECORD.

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

Mr. WHERRY. If we resumed the session Wednesday, we would have Wednesday, Thursday, and Friday for the debate. We are perfectly willing to start the limitation of debate the following Monday morning at 10 o'clock, allowing 1 hour for amendments and 1 hour for the resolutions, taking up both resolutions at once, and continuing to vote on the amendments and on the resolutions until there has been a decision; and to remain in continuous session, so far as we are concerned.

I now yield to the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. LODGE. Is not what the Senator proposes a 10-day vacation?

Mr. WHERRY. No, I do not think it is, because we will be back in session next Tuesday or Wednesday, debating the resolution. I should like to have at least 3 days allowed for the debate. To me, it would not seem to be a vacation. We would be back here debating the issue, and each and every Senator having an opportunity to express himself and to make his observations, and to get them in the RECORD; and we would start limiting debate on the Monday following. The debate will proceed tomorrow.

Four Senators would like to speak tomorrow. The Senator from Nevada [Mr. MALONE] is anxious to speak this

evening, because if the Senate is to take a recess on Thursday he would like to be away for 2 or 3 days. There are 10 or 11 other Senators who wish to express themselves on the resolutions. How long they will take I do not know, but certainly they should be guaranteed at least a day and a half. If they do not need that much time they do not have to take it. I do not think 3 days is too long in which to debate the issue. It does not mean a 10-day vacation. We are doing the work of the Senate, and on the tenth day we shall be voting on both resolutions.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I should like to make the same request I have submitted, but substituting Wednesday for Tuesday. Would the Senator from Nebraska object to that?

Mr. WHERRY. The Senator from Nebraska would have to object. I do not object to taking a recess from tomorrow to next Monday, and then to Wednesday, providing the majority leader will allow 3 days in which to debate the issue.

With reference to limitation, my suggestion is that the best plan would be to start the limitation on the following Monday at 10 o'clock in the morning. I am satisfied that the minority would be willing on that day to have a limitation of debate on Resolution 99, including the amendments, of 1 hour and 30 minutes to a side, and to continue with Senate Concurrent Resolution 18 with debate limited to an hour on the amendments and an hour on the concurrent resolution itself.

Mr. McFARLAND. Then the Senator objects to voting on Wednesday, Thursday, or Friday?

Mr. WHERRY. Yes; to a limitation on those days.

Mr. McFARLAND. Then there is no need of my making proposals for those days. I am only trying to save a little time.

Mr. President, I make the same proposal for a week from Monday, which will be April 2, starting at 10 o'clock in the morning.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arizona submits a unanimous-consent request with reference to Monday, April 2. Is there objection?

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, the unanimous-consent request is very long, and I am not clear as to the position of the Senator. Are we to have an opportunity to discuss the amendments?

Mr. McFARLAND. Yes. An opportunity is afforded to debate amendments.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Amendments can be offered at any time preceding the vote.

Mr. MUNDT. Within 5 or 10 minutes prior to the vote?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Yes.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I suggest that the clerk read the unanimous-consent request so all Senators can hear it and know what is in it.

Mr. FLANDERS. Mr. President, is there or is there not to be a joint session of the House and Senate on April 2?

Mr. McFARLAND. There will be a joint session on Monday, April 2. That is why I set 10 o'clock as the hour for meeting on Monday.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will read the unanimous-consent request.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

Ordered, That upon the calendar day of Monday, April 2, 1951, at the hour of 10 o'clock a. m., the Senate proceed to vote, under the limitation of debate hereinafter provided, upon any amendment or motion (including appeals) that may be pending or that may thereafter be proposed to the resolution (S. Res. 99) approving the action of the President of the United States in cooperating in the common defense efforts of the North Atlantic Treaty nations: *Provided*, (1) That after said hour of 10 a. m., debate upon any amendment or motion (including appeals) shall be limited to not exceeding 1 hour, to be equally divided and controlled, respectively, by the mover of any such amendment or motion and Mr. CONNALLY; (2) that no amendment or motion that is not germane or relevant to the subject matter of the said resolution shall be received; (3) that debate on the resolution itself shall be limited to 2 hours, to be equally divided and controlled, respectively, by Mr. CONNALLY and Mr. WHERRY, subject to the right of either of said Senators, during the consideration of an amendment proposed by another Senator, to yield to the latter Senator, in addition to the 30 minutes to which he is entitled under proviso No. (1), any portion of such time of 1 hour allotted to each such Senator for debate on the resolution as he may desire; (4) that no vote on any amendment or motion (including appeals) shall be had prior to the said calendar day of April 2, 1951.

Ordered further, That immediately after the disposition of said Senate Resolution 99, the Senate shall immediately proceed to the consideration of Senate Concurrent Resolution 18, of an identical title, under the same conditions, provisions, and limitation of debate applicable to Senate Resolution 99, except that the time for debate on said concurrent resolution shall be limited to 1 hour instead of 2 hours.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, actually the Senate would be in session every day of the week with the exception of Good Friday and Tuesday of the following week.

Mr. McFARLAND. That is correct.

Mr. HOLLAND. Reserving the right to object, I should like to ask the Senator from Arizona if he has explored with the Senator from Nebraska the thought that we might debate this question on Tuesday, Wednesday, and Thursday of next week and vote on Friday.

Mr. McFARLAND. Yes, I did. I asked the distinguished minority leader if he would object to voting on Friday. I have tried my very best to get a unanimous-consent agreement for Tuesday, Wednesday, Thursday, or Friday, and the distinguished Senator from Nebraska tells me he is unable to work it out. I am doing the best I can.

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

Mr. McFARLAND. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. I want to say to my respected friend from Florida that I have exhausted every effort to do the very thing which he has suggested. I shall be very glad to give my reasons if the Senator would like to know them, but it would take a long time. I want to accommodate the Senator.

Mr. HOLLAND. I should like to have the reasons stated by the Senator from

Nebraska, if there be any, because it seems to the Senator from Florida that with 3 days scheduled for debate there is no necessity for any Senators being present those first 2 days except the ones who are actually to do the speaking. Personally, I think every one of us should remain here until the matter is out of the way. It has dragged on for an unconscionably long time already, and the suggestion of such a long additional delay is shocking to the conscience of the country. I fully agree with the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LONCE] that it would establish a precedent which we should find very hard to support, and, personally, I do not care to support it.

I hope the Senator from Nebraska will reconsider and agree that the debate may proceed on Tuesday, Wednesday, and Thursday, because under his suggestion, as I understand it, there will be at least a day and a half of debate allowed on each side. All Senators do not have to be present at one time. If they were, it would break all precedents of the Senate since the Senator from Florida has been a Member of this body. I think the debate should proceed on Tuesday, Wednesday, and Thursday, and we should have a vote on Friday.

Has it occurred to the Senator from Nebraska that he and those who insist with him on the program are asking for an almost unlimited deferment of action on a matter which has been debated for more than two weeks? I express the very sincere hope that the Senator from Nebraska will find it possible to have some of his speakers available for Tuesday. Surely the Senator from Arizona can have some of his speakers available for Tuesday, so that the voting can take place on Friday, and so that Senators who have plans of long standing, to be away will not have to come back on Monday. On another occasion an engagement of long standing had to be canceled in order to accommodate ourselves to the vagaries of those who were trying to fix days ahead, a date for voting.

It seems to me to be unfair to Senators who have stayed here and have been in their seats throughout the debate to have to wait any such period of time, and then be told that they must disturb again a weekend program, exactly as they were required to do at the time of the voting on the selective service bill.

I hope the Senators will reexamine the situation to see whether at least two Senators on each side of the question may not be available to speak on Tuesday, so that 3 days of debate can be completed by Thursday, and that the voting may take place on Friday. I sincerely hope that will be possible, because I know several Senators who have planned to be away for that weekend, and who had no idea at all, after the announcement was made the other day that we had abandoned the 10-day recess—and I commend the Senator from Arizona for having abandoned the plan—that an arrangement would be worked out on the same basis as if the 10-day recess had been in effect and been granted and enjoyed by the Mem-

bers of the Senate. I do not think the Senate can afford to put itself in that position in the eyes of the country. I hope a vote can be had on next Friday.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, the Senator from Florida has answered his own question. I have had several requests not to approve a vote on Friday, for the reason mentioned by the Senator from Florida, namely, that several Senators live long distances from Washington and do not want to return on Friday to vote. However, they would be perfectly willing to return on the following Monday. I submit that if we debate the issues on Wednesday, Thursday, and Friday, it is not so shocking to wait until Monday to vote. The reason why two of the Senators want to vote on Monday is that they do not want to come back on Friday. They tell me that if we are to remain in session until Friday, they cannot see any reason why we cannot go over to Monday.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. WHERRY. I should like very much to make a suggestion with reference to a paragraph of the proposed agreement. I have done my level best in my attempt to reach an agreement. I have canvassed the situation thoroughly. I worked on it all day yesterday and all day today. I have tried everything possible to get a unanimous-consent agreement with respect to the very day to which the Senator from Florida is referring, namely, Friday, as the majority leader knows. We have reached total agreement on this side of the aisle. I say to the Senator from Florida that I hope he will agree to the proposal, too, because I believe it is very sensible not to compel Senators to return from great distances on Friday when they are perfectly willing to be here Monday, which will be a very good time to vote.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. HOLLAND. Further reserving the right to object, I wonder if the distinguished Senators have explored the possibility of having speeches made on Monday, Tuesday, and Wednesday, with a vote to be had on Thursday, thus not interfering with the Senators who wish to leave on Friday.

Mr. WHERRY. If we come back on Tuesday we will have 3 days of debate anyway. Therefore we would not accomplish anything.

Mr. HOLLAND. I asked the Senator whether he had explored the possibility of sitting on Monday, Tuesday, and Wednesday and having a vote on Thursday.

Mr. WHERRY. That is exactly what I understood the Senator to say. I have asked some Senators about it, and they said that if they had to come back on Monday and start the debate on Tuesday and have it continue through Thursday, it would involve 3 days of debate anyway, and there would therefore be no use of entering into an agreement. Under those circumstances they would rather go on until Monday. They do not want to be obligated to come back for a week end. I asked about Thursday. I even asked the majority leader to talk

to some Senators on this side of the aisle in order to get a unanimous consent agreement. I say to the distinguished Senator from Florida, with all respect, that we have done our level best to reach an agreement.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the unanimous-consent request?

Mr. HOLLAND. Further reserving the right to object, I wonder if the distinguished Senators would agree to an amendment of the unanimous-consent agreement which would require a continuous session on Monday until the matter is disposed of?

Mr. WHERRY. Does the Senator mean with reference to Monday?

Mr. HOLLAND. Yes.

Mr. WHERRY. That is agreeable. It is contained in the request.

Mr. HOLLAND. No; it is not in the request.

Mr. WHERRY. Does the Senator mean next Monday?

Mr. HOLLAND. No, the following Monday. I wonder whether we could conclude the matter by Monday evening.

Mr. WHERRY. I think we could, but I understood that we were to meet on Monday at 10 o'clock in order to accomplish what the Senator suggests. I understood that we were to take out 1 hour, or whatever is necessary, for the joint session, that following the joint session we were to return to a consideration of the resolution, with debate on each amendment to be limited to 1 hour, 30 minutes to a side, and that debate on the resolution would be limited to 2 hours. If it is desired to limit the debate on the resolution to an hour and a half, it is agreeable to me. After the disposition of Senate Resolution 99 we could proceed to the consideration of Senate Concurrent Resolution 18 with debate, limited as already provided.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, if the distinguished Senator will not object, and he can work out his arrangements on the 2d of April, I will include in the unanimous-consent agreement a provision that the Senate remain in session until the consideration of the resolution is concluded.

Mr. HOLLAND. In continuous session?

Mr. WHERRY. That is April 2?

Mr. McFARLAND. Yes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the unanimous-consent request is modified accordingly.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, the distinguished minority leader has asked that the time for debate on Wednesday, Thursday, and Friday be equally divided, and controlled, respectively, by the minority leader, the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY], and the Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY].

Mr. WHERRY. That is with respect to March 28, 29, and 30?

Mr. McFARLAND. Yes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the unanimous-consent agreement is modified accordingly. Is there objection to the unanimous-consent request? The Chair hears none, and the order is entered.

The unanimous-consent agreement, as reduced to writing, is as follows:

Ordered, That on the calendar day of Monday, April 2, 1951, at the hour of 10 a. m., the Senate proceed to vote, under the limitation of debate hereinafter provided, upon any amendment or motion (including appeals) that may be pending or that may thereafter be proposed to the resolution (S. Res. 99) approving the action of the President of the United States in co-operating in the common defense efforts of the North Atlantic Treaty nations: *Provided*, (1) That after said hour of 10 a. m., debate upon any amendment or motion (including appeals) shall be limited to not exceeding 1 hour, to be equally divided and controlled, respectively, by the mover of any such amendment or motion and Mr. CONNALLY; (2) that no amendment or motion that is not germane to the subject matter of the said resolution shall be received; (3) that debate on the resolution itself shall be limited to not exceeding 2 hours, to be equally divided and controlled, respectively, by Mr. CONNALLY and Mr. WHERRY, subject to the right of either of said Senators, during the consideration of an amendment proposed by another Senator, to yield to the latter Senator, in addition to the 30 minutes to which he is entitled under proviso No. (1), any portion of such time of 1 hour allotted to each such Senator for debate on the resolution as he may desire; and (4) that no vote on any amendment or motion shall be had prior to the said hour of 10 a. m., on Monday, April 2, 1951.

Ordered further, That on the calendar days of Wednesday, March 28; Thursday, March 29; and Friday, March 30, respectively, the time for debate shall be equally divided and controlled, respectively, by Mr. CONNALLY and Mr. WHERRY.

Ordered further, That immediately following the disposition of said Senate Resolution 99, the Senate shall proceed to the consideration of Senate Concurrent Resolution 18, of an identical title, under the same conditions, provisions, and limitation of debate applicable to Senate Resolution 99, except that the time for debate on said concurrent resolution itself shall be limited to not exceeding 1 hour instead of 2 hours.

Ordered further, That the consideration of the said Senate Resolution 99 and Senate Concurrent Resolution 18 shall be proceeded with on said day of Monday, April 2, until they shall have been disposed of. *Provided, however*, That it shall be in order on said day of Monday, April 2, notwithstanding the provisions of the above agreement, for the Senate to attend a joint meeting of the two Houses in the Hall of the House of Representatives to hear an address by the President of France.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, it has been indicated that there is quite a bit of confusion in regard to paragraph 6 of Senate Resolution 99. I send to the desk an amendment to be proposed by myself, the senior Senator from New York [Mr. IVES], the senior Senator from Connecticut [Mr. McMAHON], and the junior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE].

The amendment submitted by Mr. McFARLAND (for himself and other Senators) was ordered to lie on the table, to be printed, and to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

On page 4, line 19, strike out all of section 6 through page 5, line 2, and in lieu thereof insert the following:

6. The Senate hereby approves the policy of assigning American forces, including ground troops, to Western Europe when such assignment is in implementation of article

3 of the North Atlantic Treaty and hereby approves the present plans of the President and the Joint Chiefs of Staff to send four additional divisions of ground troops to Western Europe; to this end it is the sense of the Senate, in the interests of national unity and understanding, that there should be the fullest collaboration between the Congress and the President; and it is the sense of the Senate that, whenever either a majority of all the members of the Senate Committees on Foreign Relations and Armed Services, acting jointly, or a majority of all the members of the House Committees on Foreign Affairs and Armed Services, acting jointly, may disagree with any proposed new long-range policy pertaining to the implementation of article 3 of the North Atlantic Treaty, or with the certified opinions referred to in paragraphs 4 and 5, the matter in disagreement should be submitted to the Senate and House for their consideration in such manner as the dissenting committees may recommend.

LET US DO SOME STRAIGHT THINKING

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, there is today no question about the survival of the United States. There is no need for the feeling of panic the administration is spreading throughout the land. The United States, if properly prepared, can defend itself against any aggressor or aggressors in the world. There is, however, a dire need for some sound thinking on the subject of national defense and the preservation of our national economy. We seem to have substituted action for thinking. We are living in the past, Mr. President. We fought two successful World Wars, but there is no reason to believe that the methods used in the last two wars will be successful in a third world war.

THE PACE OF TOTAL WAR HAS CHANGED

Air power, nuclear fission, guided missiles, and improved submarines have completely changed the offensive and defensive methods of modern warfare. The sending of foot soldiers into Europe and Asia, where there are already at least 30 percent more people than can make a living without outside assistance, just does not make sense.

COUNTRIES OVERPOPULATED FOR THEIR OWN RESOURCES

England, for example, has at least fifteen to twenty million people more than can ever make a living there, unless England can permanently maintain her empire and force her colonies to send their raw materials to the homeland to be processed, and then force the colonial peoples to buy her manufactured and processed goods. This the British and the other colonial nations have done for hundreds of years. They will not be able to keep their colonial empires much longer, however. Empires are falling apart, as the press tells us every day.

INCREASE OF EXECUTIVE POWER

The Congress has approved the United Nations organization and the Atlantic Pact, among many other devious international agreements.

The number of "sleepers" in the United Nations Charter and the Atlantic Pact always amazes the citizen taxpayer and the Congress of the United States. No one—least of all the Congress—seems to have any idea of the hidden executive authority included in the many New

Deal acts passed during the last 18 years. Many of them were passed by voice vote. No one has any idea who voted for them or who voted against them.

PRESIDENTIAL AUTHORITY ENLARGED BY CONGRESS

The President has the constitutional responsibility of fixing the foreign policy. Congress has transferred to the President its constitutional responsibility to regulate foreign commerce. Thus the President now has the authority for the regulation of both domestic and foreign policy. The Congress has no responsibility left in the field of domestic and foreign economic policy. The Congress has few prerogatives left except to appropriate the taxpayers' money in response to bills sent to the Congress by the President and his departments.

Senate Resolution 99 is the usual type of vague and inconclusive statement of the congressional viewpoint. Legally it means nothing; although the Congress is actually passing upon a historical affair, namely, upon the question of presidential power. This was indicated by General Eisenhower when he addressed a joint meeting of the Congress.

CONGRESS AND THE NATION MISLED

The administration is subjecting the Congress to the old hidden-ball trick, the Statue-of-Liberty play. The President focuses the attention of the Congress and the people on sending four additional divisions of troops to Europe, while the administration is destroying the economic structure of the Nation.

TWO MAIN OBJECTIVES FOR UNITED STATES

The two most vital objectives for the United States are, first, to assure our own ultimate safety; and, second, to preserve our national economy. The great military debate has only confused the real issues. We have been steered into a blind alley. The country has been given a false impression by centering the debate upon the question whether or not the President can send four divisions to Europe without the consent of Congress, or whether that action should be authorized by Congress. That question is really one of strategy, but strategy cannot be determined until we have decided what areas are necessary to defend for our own ultimate safety.

THREE BASIC QUESTIONS

The basic questions should be considered and decided in the following order:

First. What areas must we defend for our own ultimate safety?

Second. What methods, what kinds of weapons are best suited for such defense?

Third. What number of men and what type of training is best suited to such defense?

NATIONAL ECONOMY MUST BE PRESERVED

Mr. President the preservation of our national economy is just as important to the ultimate safety of the Nation as are military preparedness and defense. To preserve our national economy it is necessary to completely reorganize and realign our domestic and foreign policies.

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

Mr. MALONE. I am happy to yield to the distinguished Senator from Kansas.

Mr. SCHOEPEL. The Senator has just made reference to the economy of this country. Does the Senator intend to cover somewhere in his address this evening the proportionate share of the over-all expense which the American taxpayer is going to have to bear in connection with the international European army, which is being added to, and could conceivably be added to in unlimited degree?

SENATE RESOLUTION NO HINDRANCE TO
PRESIDENT

Mr. MALONE. I am glad that the Senator raised that question at this point. I will give specific figures later on. However, let me answer you in a general way now. General Eisenhower has his headquarters in France already. The President intends to send four additional divisions to Europe whether this resolution is adopted or not. No one has suggested a method of stopping the President. He has stated to Congress that it has no authority whatever, in this matter and we have not been able to refute him. So I say that if we act favorably on this resolution, or if we do not act favorably, we have two divisions in Europe now and it is proposed to send four more. That action is only the forerunner of sending to Europe perhaps millions of men ultimately.

A SERIES OF COSTLY GIFTS

As to the cost, I ask the distinguished Senator from Kansas if he has any idea that any other nation but the United States has any intention of paying any of the cost. I may answer the question in this way:

Seven or eight years ago we started with lend-lease. That led into UNRRA, the direct loan to England, a gift of three and three-quarters billion dollars, although called a loan. Then the administration inaugurated the great Marshall plan. Mr. Marshall himself had no more idea what it would cost than had the distinguished Senator from Kansas, who was not then a Member of the Senate.

But Mr. Bevin in England knew all about it ahead of that time. He took the ball on the first bounce, and told the United States how much it would cost us.

The Marshall plan was followed by ECA, point 4, the arming of Europe, and the sending of troops to Europe.

We have troops in Europe now, and we must feed them. Their number is continually increasing. Supplying our troops has the same effect on the trade balances and on the monetary situation of the foreign nations as American tourists have on Europe. We must continually send goods, arms, and everything else needed by the troops. We give our troops their pay and they will spend the money in Europe. The whole question of stationing large amounts of troops in Europe may well mean another shot in the arm, financially, for the European nations.

So far as the junior Senator from Nevada can ascertain, there has never been any understanding or suggestion

that any other nation pay anything. We are supposed to furnish the arms. We are supposed to furnish the troops, and we will pay all the bills.

ATLANTIC PACT BEGAN WITH VANDENBERG
RESOLUTION

Mr. President, the Vandenberg resolution was the first move toward the Atlantic Pact. The junior Senator from Nevada debated that subject with the distinguished Senator from Michigan, and said that the adoption of the resolution meant giving the President a blank check to make a pact with the various nations. After passing the resolution we were bound to approve any pact when it was sent by the President to the Senate. By so doing, I contended, we would break a 175-year-old precedent. Congress had never before authorized a pact without writing it out in detail. In the past a pact was returned to Congress for approval if the crossing of any "t" and the dotting of any "i" contained in the pact, had been changed.

Mr. President, first came the Vandenberg resolution. Then came the pact. Then the provision with respect to arms, and then the measure dealing with men. The junior Senator from Nevada outlined the procedure on the floor.

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

Mr. MALONE. I yield.

Mr. SCHOEPEL. I have not followed the proceedings as carefully or in as much detail as many members of the Foreign Relations Committee and the Armed Services Committee. I should like to ask the distinguished Senator from Nevada, who now has the floor, if it is not a fact that we were informed that the military leaders of the Atlantic Pact nations and some of the leaders of our country, certainly the Secretary of State, and perhaps some of our military leaders, had met and were to determine what the plans and the policies should be.

I should also like to ask the distinguished Senator from Nevada whether he has any information as to whether they have ever arrived at an agreement as to what in a general way should be the proportionate share of the expense; that is, what the United States should bear, what England should bear, what France should bear? Has the Senator any information on that subject? Has he any information as to whether the United States at some place along the line is going to be handed a bill and be expected to pay it?

Mr. MALONE. In answer I will say I expect that we shall have a repetition of what occurred in World War II. Mr. Churchill at that time made certain requests of us. I consider Mr. Churchill to be the greatest statesman alive today. I wish we in the United States had a few men like him. He is for England in all he does. Early in World War II, while the war was still confined to Europe, before the United States had entered the war, Mr. Churchill said to the United States, in general terms, "Give us the money we need. We will fight the war." Later he said, speaking of lend-lease and of other ways of getting equipment from the United States, "Give us the equip-

ment we need. We will furnish the men."

Later on during the war, in a speech which was published in every newspaper in the world, he said, "We are destroying the seed of England. You must send us more troops." We ended up by furnishing nearly three-quarters of the Allied troops fighting in Europe. We are headed in exactly the same direction at the present time.

In answer to the remainder of the question of the distinguished Senator from Kansas, I will say: No; there has been nothing said about the proportion of troops to be furnished. What is now being done by the administration is simply the breaking of the ice, pacifying the people in order to get our troops to Europe. No one believes the present two divisions can do anything effective in Europe. No one believes that the four additional divisions would be of much help to the two divisions of American soldiers now there. In my humble opinion, no one who has studied the question believes that any force consisting of less than 300 divisions is going to stop Russia in Europe. No one has ever discussed the subject seriously.

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

Mr. MALONE. I yield.

Mr. CASE. In the early stages of the Churchillian speeches, the first phrase I remember was, "Give us the tools, and we will finish the job."

Mr. MALONE. The Senator has more accurately quoted the statement than I did.

Mr. CASE. At a later date, when the question of sending ships into belligerent waters was under consideration, Mr. Churchill, as I remember, said, "When I said give us the tools, I meant place them within our reach."

Mr. MALONE. The Senator has quoted Mr. Churchill more accurately than I did. I was quoting his statements in a general way. He led us step by step into furnishing more and more in the way of material and men in World War II. I am not complaining about that. I am simply reviewing history. The only possible way to tell what is likely to happen this time is to consider what has happened before. It is the firm opinion of the junior Senator from Nevada that we will now find almost an exact repetition of what happened in World War II.

A QUESTION OF STRATEGY

Mr. President, no one doubts that we are going to defend Europe. Least of all, Europe should not doubt it, because we have done so twice. Twice we have taken the lead in defending Europe.

The important question is: How are we going to defend Europe? That is the question which should be before this body, and not the question of whether we should draft 18-year-olds, or 18½-year-olds, or 19-year-olds or other extraneous matter. The question we should be concerned with is: What areas we are going to defend in Europe? We know we are going to defend Europe and parts of Asia. But we must determine how we can best defend them.

First we have to determine what weapons to use to do the job. Then we

will determine how many men will be needed, and where they ought to be.

As I previously said, the question is really one of strategy, and even the strategy cannot be determined until the United States has decided what areas should be defended for our own ultimate safety.

The basic problem should be considered and decided in the following order:

First. What areas must we currently defend for our ultimate safety?

Second. What methods will we use? What weapons are best suited for such defense?

Third. What number of men and what type of training is best suited for such defense?

NATIONAL ECONOMY MUST REMAIN HEALTHY

The preservation of our national economy is of the same importance to the ultimate safety of this Nation as military preparedness and defense.

We must restrict domestic expenditures and confine any deficit financing to national defense expenditures, and not continue the deficit expenditures for domestic nondefense purposes. We must economize in our nondefense spending.

ADMINISTRATION DIVERSION TACTICS

Mr. President, as I said before, we are being subjected to the hidden-ball trick. While Senators are being diverted to the matter of troops to Europe, they apparently forget that the Senate Finance Committee has it within its power to take the first step toward regaining the constitutional authority of Congress to regulate foreign trade. That responsibility of Congress was transferred to the President by passing the 1934 Trade Agreements Act. Congress can and must regain that authority by simply refusing to extend the life of the 1934 Trade Agreements Act for 3 years, as provided for in House bill 1612, now before the Senate Finance Committee.

THE BIG STEP TOWARD REGAINING CONGRESS' POWERS

The Senate Finance Committee can take the first big step in the direction of Congress regaining the power to regulate our national economy by the simple expedient of refusing to renew the power Congress transferred to the President, power which never should have been transferred to him in the first place.

CONSTITUTIONAL GRANT OF POWER

Mr. President, the Constitution clearly provides that the power of regulation of foreign trade shall reside in the Congress. That regulation is mainly done through the fixing of tariff rates and import fees. The Congress transferred that power into the hands of an industrially inexperienced State Department which has had it in its power to change the industrial pattern of the United States of America. It has it in its power to determine what industries may survive and what industries will be sacrificed on the altar of "one economic world."

OUR FINANCES SHOULD BECOME BUSINESSLIKE

Mr. President, we should restrict our foreign spending to providing arms to our allies and to making loans to those

private enterprises in which additional production is necessary.

We should not make loans to foreign governments, enabling them to continue themselves in power. For instance, the Socialist government of Britain would have fallen 4 years ago if we had not given it, as a direct gift-loan, the money it needed in order to retain itself in office. As a result, we have little cause for complaint if the present government of Britain socializes all British industry. That government has nationalized the British steel plants and the British coal mines. If we continue on the road along which we now are moving, the United States shall arrive at the same destination. Here in the United States we have the same kind of government as Britain has—a socialist administration, just as the British Government is today, for the present administration in the United States is not a democratic administration.

CONGRESS SHOULD BE CONSULTED

Despite the fact that I feel that the present resolutions will have no effect, I agree with all Members of this body who believe that the present administration should discuss those matters with the Congress. The President should ask Congress for authority in that connection, because certainly the present administration shows no responsibility itself.

DETERMINATION OF STRATEGY WILL CLEAR THE AIR

By means of the kind of preparation and analysis of strategy I suggested, many of today's great debates would fall by the wayside. The decisions which must be made now are in regard to how we are going to fight the next war. We must decide about just what kind of weapons we are going to depend upon in engaging in that war, in carrying the fight to the enemy. We must also decide about what kind of preparations in our national defense will have the greatest effect in deterring aggression by other nations.

Under such a program, our preparations for the next 12 or 18 months would not vacillate in procedure or in extent because of any changes in Russia's intentions. Our preparations would not vary at all, no matter what Russia or Asia intend to do.

SOME NATIONS STRADDLE THE FENCE

We have before us continually the question of what European nations are likely to help us when that contest comes. Later in my remarks I shall point out that two of those nations, two of the "Big Five" established at San Francisco—have economic and military pacts with Russia, so-called non-aggression pacts, pacts startlingly like the Atlantic Pact. Inasmuch as those two nations have signed up with both sides, it should be very easy for them to get along, no matter what happens.

LET OUR STRATEGY REFLECT AMERICAN KNOW-HOW

Mr. President, the real issue at stake, today, in this debate, is the preparation for our national defense or, to state the matter in another way, the nature of basic American strategy. The real is-

sue is whether we are going to channel our manpower into the old-style ground warfare, in which the enemy enjoys all the advantages, or whether we are going to invest our manpower in air strategy, in which we can attain clear supremacy, both in numbers and in quality, because of our industrial capacity and know-how.

Mr. President, our present European strategy is wrong. At the present time we are squandering our resources, and we are headed for disaster. In my opinion, Russia will not try to move against us now, because Russia sees that we are destroying ourselves economically. Russia will not move against us as long as we are doing this job for her.

WE HAVE LOST ASIA THROUGH LACK OF POLICY

On the other hand, Russia is moving in Asia. We should abandon the mainland of Asia, Mr. President; it only drains our manpower.

It took the present administration about 5 years to turn a 100-year-old Chinese civil war into a war between the United States and China. That was quite an accomplishment in so short a time, Mr. President. We sent our Navy to surround Formosa, and we sent a quarter million trained troops to Korea, whereas all that the Chinese Nationalist armies needed was a little help in arms, and then to be turned loose and allowed to use those arms. We should have helped arm the guerrillas in China. If we had followed that course, the result would have been to turn the war between the United States and China back into a Chinese civil war.

Today the President of the United States likes to call the war going on between the United States and China a police action—with about 60,000 of our boys already dead or wounded. But it is war, an avoidable war.

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

Mr. MALONE. I yield.

Mr. CASE. Is the Senator from Nevada suggesting that the blockade of Formosa amounted, on the one hand, to intervention in the civil war in China on the side of the Communist forces, which, on the other hand, in Korea, we are engaged in fighting?

GIVE MAC ARTHUR AUTHORITY

Mr. MALONE. In answer to the distinguished Senator from South Dakota, I would say that General MacArthur, who is in charge of our forces there, should be given authority to turn Chiang Kai-shek loose whenever in General MacArthur's opinion the opportune time arrives. I say we should give General MacArthur that authority because we have had Chiang Kai-shek cooped up there for 6 or 8 months now. Of course, it will be necessary for those forces to be properly armed when they begin operations, in order for them to be able to be effective. It is my opinion that if we allow General MacArthur to give the Chinese Nationalist armies the proper equipment and show them how to use it, within a comparatively short time after those armies begin operations the Chinese Communists will be so busy on their mainland that the war in Korea will be over.

AS LONG AS WE DESTROY OURSELVES, RUSSIA WAITS

Mr. President, Russia will not move against us as long as we are floundering; that is my opinion. We are floundering, and we shall continue to flounder, as long as we mix our national economy with our foreign policy and continue our program of sending foot soldiers to Europe, without having a proper strategic program of our own and without building up the proper amount of air power, submarine power, guided missiles, and the rest of the new equipment which will be controlling factors in the third world war.

The Russians will probably never allow us to make adequate preparations in Europe and install our army there. Air power is the only deterrent to Russian aggression. I am sure that it is Russia's intention to do away with colonialism in Asia. The Russians will probably move next into Indochina, the Malayan States, and farther into Asia.

UNITED STATES SUPPORTS SLAVERY, RUSSIA FIGHTS IT

Some time ago, Mr. President, I discussed this matter on the floor of the Senate, and in that connection I mentioned the matter of our support of colonial slavery in the Far East, in Africa, and in the Mediterranean area. At that time I said that we were making enemies faster than we could possibly make friends.

Our continued support of colonial slavery gives Russia the excuse to say to the people of Indochina, the people in the Malayas, and the people in other areas that we are supporting the colonial slavery system, which we are. No one believes that England would be in the Malayan States or that the French would be in Indochina for longer than 30 days, if we stopped supporting the colonial slavery system.

UNITED STATES CAN MAKE FRIENDS BY STOPPING SUPPORT OF COLONIAL SYSTEM

Mr. President, if we did announce that we had stopped supporting colonial slavery, we would then make friends very rapidly among the people in those areas. Many persons who live in Indochina, in the Malayan States, in Africa, and in the Mediterranean area, and many of the Moslems, all the way from Turkey to Pakistan, would become very friendly to us. Sufficient troops would be forthcoming without any trouble. In that way we would be able to obtain the number of troops the west would need in Asia and in Africa. All we would have to do would be to furnish the necessary air power and submarines and guided missiles and the other improved instrumentalities of warfare to fight, and more likely, to prevent a third world war.

I quote from the Book of Genesis, chapter 27, verse 22:

And Jacob went near unto Isaac, his father, and he felt him and said, "The voice is Jacob's voice, but the hands are the hands of Esau."

The voice of this strategy we are using is the State Department's voice, but the hands are those of Europe, principally those of England controlling our hybrid combination domestic and foreign policy. This combination is wrecking our na-

tional economy and puts us into an international position which is indefensible.

WE HAVE LOST VALUABLE TIME

This Nation has practically wasted five years in air power and submarine construction, while we have dabbled in international skulduggery.

We have allowed our airplane construction companies to disintegrate. For 3 or 4 years they had nothing to do, and we then found ourselves in a war, short of airplanes—and we still are.

OUR ESTIMATES ARE DANGEROUSLY WRONG

Mr. President, the administration is counting on 60 divisions in Europe doing the job when they need at least 250 divisions.

The Allies had 239 divisions in the last war.

Russia now has 300 divisions and probably could raise this to 400 divisions with the use of oriental troops.

If we were going into a ground war in Europe, we should know before we start the ratio of such troops we were to furnish, because we simply do not have the manpower.

If we were going into Europe, we must of necessity use the available manpower which would include Germany, Turkey, Yugoslavia, Spain, and North Africa. However, these areas are specifically excluded by our State Department and national defense leaders.

I was extremely interested this afternoon in the able address by the distinguished Senator from Washington [Mr. CAIN], when he said virtually the thing which the junior Senator from Nevada is at this moment saying, namely, that we are simply out of our minds to talk about furnishing enough foot soldiers in Europe, without the help of these peoples whom we are carefully disregarding and keeping away from any organization to defend Europe.

Obviously, under present conditions, we must discard any idea of winning the war with ground troops.

Every dollar that we can spend should be put in long range bombers and air power and submarines. We should have at least 1,000 snorkels. We probably do not have more than 300 at this time. Russia has over 1,000 it is reliably reported.

We should also bend our efforts in the creation of revolutions and civil war through the underground forces behind the iron curtain.

We might need one hundred to one hundred and fifty thousand long-range bombers, the number dependent upon the strength of the potential enemy.

But we should control the air over any place in the world that is of interest to us, from the point of view of our ultimate safety.

UNITED STATES HAS NO MANPOWER TO WASTE

To help arm Europe, we must retain our men here. We do not have the manpower to furnish the number of troops to Europe which we furnished in the last war and still have the manpower necessary for our industries to provide the equipment for ourselves and our allies which we could furnish them to the extent of our ability, without injuring our economy.

It is the definite opinion of the junior Senator from Nevada that we should confine our efforts to the production of air power, water power, and technical services, such as chemical and biological warfare—the countries of Europe to provide their own ground troops.

Mr. President, do not be misled by the people who try to divert your attention by arguing about 18-year-olds, or 18½-year-olds—two divisions, four divisions, or six divisions, while they are pulling the economic rug right out from under the feet of the American people—the workmen and the investors of this Nation.

America's greatest strength is not even the bomber, the submarine, or the foot soldiers—it is our industrial production line. The bomber, the submarine, and foot soldiers would be helpless without our industry. We must conserve our manpower, so that the industrial construction line will not be impaired.

The common sense of the American people will decide this issue when they know the truth and the facts. That is our secret weapon—the common sense of the American people.

THOUGHTLESS PROGRAMS HAVE BROUGHT US DANGER

We have substituted action for thinking. We have not thought this problem through. We are being sucked in, one move at a time, just as we have been since the latter part of World War II. During the war we had lend-lease, and we then wrote everything off and left the equipment where we had finished with it. We then had UNRRA, which was going to settle everything; there was never going to be another request for money, equipment, and raw material gifts. We then had the British loan of \$3,750,000,000, which was a gift loan; then the Marshall plan or ECA, which was concocted in Europe and sent to the United States through General Marshall. Next, we had the Atlantic Pact; then arms to Europe; and now foot soldiers to Europe.

Mr. President, we are now about to commit ourselves to building and maintaining a balanced Army, Air Corps, and Navy, exactly as we did in fighting World Wars I and II.

THE START OF OUR SECURITY PACT

Regarding the Vandenberg resolutions, I should like to recall to your mind, Mr. President, the fact that on June 11, 1948, the Vandenberg resolutions were presented to the Senate, and at that time the junior Senator from Nevada debated the subject with the senior Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG]. At one point, on that date, the junior Senator from Nevada said:

Mr. President, I had intended to make a statement on this very subject—

That is, on the policy-making resolution—

I consider it very important for the reason that I believe there has been a tendency on the part of the Senate over a period of years slowly to relinquish its independent attitude, not only with respect to treaties but with respect to appropriations for foreign nations and various other subjects, concerning which we were supposed at the time of the original writing of the Constitution, if I correctly understand it, to be independent.

Further along in that debate, the junior Senator from Nevada said:

Their purpose is to place the Senate on record as advising the President to negotiate regional security agreements under the United Nations Charter. Each regional security agreement, when negotiated by the President, must be ratified subsequently by the Senate; but, by advising the President to go ahead, the Senate in effect guarantees that a future Senate will ratify such treaties.

Further along in the debate, Mr. President, the junior Senator from Nevada also said:

I am not contending that such a treaty made subsequent to the passage of the resolutions would not have to be ratified by this body.

It was argued several times today that every time one of these resolutions is adopted, the subsequent legislation would have to be ratified or passed by the Senate.

I further stated:

But I also believe that there is through these resolutions an implied approval of any such treaty that may be made and that this action could well be the first step in relinquishing the policy which has been long established through the Constitution of the United States. This is the first step, just as we took the first step in violation of the Constitution by appropriating money for foreign nations for any purpose over a long period of years through small appropriations in the beginning. Finally, we reached the point where the appropriations for foreign nations closely approach or even surpass what ordinarily would constitute an entire year's Government appropriation. It took some time to establish this precedent, but finally it is established and is not now questioned.

In my humble opinion, this is the first step toward breaking down the independence of the Senate by the executive department and the constitutional provision that the Senate review any treaty before final approval.

Mr. President, we vote away our responsibility. We have transferred our constitutional responsibilities to the President, one by one. In 1934 we passed the 1934 Trade Agreements Act. We simply transferred to the President of the United States the constitutional responsibility of the Congress to regulate foreign commerce. By regulating foreign trade we, in effect, regulate the national economy.

TREATIES HAVE SLEEPERS

Second, we transferred authority to the President under the United Nations. That is evidenced by the decision against

the alien land law in California, which was declared to be invalid under a clause in the UN Charter.

Then the Atlantic Pact came along. No one yet knows for certain, Mr. President, just what authority has been transferred to the President of the United States through the Atlantic Pact or through action of the United Nations.

There are many other such acts or treaties. During the past few years many other responsibilities of the legislative branch have been transferred to the President without any strings attached. The Congress of the United States wakes up and tries to take back some of its authority by debate. That is impossible, Mr. President. It is only through honestly analyzing bills, such as the proposed extension of the 1934 Trade Agreements Act now before the Senate Finance Committee, that we can take back our authority by refusal to renew the act. But we spend our time arguing on the Senate floor about something of doubtful profit to us. We entirely overlook the simple fact that by not passing a bill now before one of the principal committees of the Senate, Congress could now take back its responsibility and authority to regulate foreign commerce.

The simple fact, Mr. President, is that a second-best poker hand is not much good.

INSTEAD OF SPLITTING OUR STRENGTH, LET US BUILD AIR POWER

This Nation cannot split its forces and fight Russia on its own ground or in Europe, if Russia has the superior forces which it is known to have.

The only deterrent to Russia is air power: our atom bombs and long-range planes capable of delivering them.

We have no method of sending enough troops to Europe to stop Russia or even seriously retard her advances. We must accept the established fact that we do not have the forces—that we do not have enough manpower to split them up. We must follow Napoleon's old maxim, "Concentrate your forces, do not split them up."

We must put our entire effort into building an Air Force that could deliver the bombs and striking force from America.

If we try to support an Army in Europe and an Air Force we will lose our essential resources—they are not unlimited.

We must stay out of any position that would tempt Russia to attack such as sending our troops to Europe.

LET EUROPE MAKE AN HONEST EFFORT

If the Europeans mean business they can furnish the foot soldiers and much of the armament material since their income is now 30 percent higher than prewar. We are assigning approximately 30 percent of our income to national defense. Few European nations have assigned more than 5 percent and most of it is being expended in the defense of their colonial empires. We are coddling them by sending everything they ask us for.

As soon as we talk of decreasing appropriations, they say, "Well, we will go Communist."

Mr. President, the threat of communism has hung over our heads for 4 years in Europe, and during that time those nations have, one by one, turned to Socialist governments nationalizing utilities and industries, with our money. Frequently this has slowed down production.

The European nations look upon our troops to Europe and arms to Europe as a continuing Marshall plan in line with the point 4 and other plans of sending our capital and resources to Europe.

EUROPE STILL TRADES WITH THE ENEMY

The seriousness of Europe's intentions must be challenged since we cannot even keep them from trading with the enemy. The 16 European countries still have their trade treaties with Russia and the other iron-curtain countries, sending them the material they need to consolidate their gains and to fight world war III. The English are still sending tin, rubber, steel, and other supplies through Singapore and Hong Kong to Communist China. England has recognized Communist China and is continually urging us to do likewise.

Mr. President, it will be remembered that on May 5 of 1950 I submitted the latest list of foreign-trade agreements for the RECORD. Then there were 96 trade agreements. I am sure there are more now. I have a list here bringing that information up to date. Some are old agreements which have been renewed, and some are new agreements which have been made. I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, to have appear in the RECORD at this point the list of such agreements which I am now submitting for the benefit of the Senate.

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

List of most recent agreements between Eastern European countries and the rest of the world

Agreement partners	Duration (signature)	Type of agreement
U. S. S. R.-Austria.....		
U. S. S. R.-Belgium.....	May 1 (Nov. 15) 1950, to Apr. 30, 1951.....	Protocol to February 1948 trade and payments agreement.
U. S. S. R.-Denmark.....	July 27 and Aug. 10, 1950.....	Barter agreements.
	July 1 (July 8), 1948, to Dec. 31, 1949.....	Protocol to agreement of July 19, 1946.
U. S. S. R.-France.....		
U. S. S. R.-Greece.....		
U. S. S. R.-Iceland.....		
U. S. S. R.-Ireland.....	No renewal of 1946 agreement.....	
U. S. S. R.-Italy.....	Dec. 11, 1948, to Dec. 31, 1951.....	Trade and payments agreement.
	Dec. 11, 1948, to Dec. 31, 1951.....	Investment agreement.
	October (Sept. 12) 1950 to February 1951.....	Grain contract within framework of investment agreement.
U. S. S. R.-Netherlands.....	June 10 (July 2), 1948, to 1953.....	First postwar trade, payments, and investment agreement. No annual schedules for later years; most recent reports concern 2 contracts signed December 1950, presumably within framework this agreement.
U. S. S. R.-Norway.....	Jan. 1 (Jan. 10) to Dec. 31, 1949.....	Protocol to agreement of December 1946; replaces protocol of January 1946.
	Jan. 1 (Jan. 10), 1949, to Dec. 31 1951.....	Long-term grain agreement.

List of most recent trade agreements between Eastern European countries and the rest of world—Continued

Agreement partners	Duration (signature)	Type of agreement
U. S. S. R.-Portugal		
U. S. S. R.-Sweden	Jan. 1 (Apr. 2) to Dec. 31, 1949	Protocol to trade and payments agreement of October 1946; replaces protocol of January 1948.
U. S. S. R.-Switzerland	October 1946 to Dec. 31, 1951	Investment and credit agreement.
U. S. S. R.-Turkey	Apr. 1 (Mar. 17), 1948, to April 1949; extended to December 1949.	First postwar trade and payments agreement with investment protocol; deliveries to 1951.
U. S. S. R.-United Kingdom	Investment schedules Apr. 1, 1948 to 1951.	
U. S. S. R.-West Germany	Dec. 27, 1947 to 1951	First postwar trade, payments and investment agreement. Soviet deliveries: February to September 1948; United Kingdom deliveries: 1948 to 1951.
Bulgaria-Austria		Trade contracts regarding grain deliveries: September 1949 and November 1950; timber deliveries: June 1950.
Bulgaria-Belgium	July 1 (June 29), 1950, to June 30, 1951	Protocol to trade and payments agreement of December 1948.
Bulgaria-Denmark	Apr. 21, 1949, to Apr. 21, 1950	Renewal protocol to trade and payments agreement of April 1947; automatically renewable unless denounced. No data, new quotas, or termination.
Bulgaria-France	May 9, 1947, to May 9, 1948	First postwar trade and payments agreement; automatically renewable unless denounced.
Bulgaria-Greece	June 15 (June 10), 1947, to June 15, 1948	Trade and payments agreement; no renewal clause.
Bulgaria-Iceland		
Bulgaria-Ireland		
Bulgaria-Italy	November 1948 to November 1949	Renewal protocol to trade and payments agreement (with investment protocol), Dec. 30, 1947.
Bulgaria-Netherlands	(March 1950)	Grain contract.
Bulgaria-Norway	Jan. 1 to Dec. 31, 1950	Renewal protocol to trade and payments agreement of June 4, 1947; replaces protocol of March 1949. Automatically renewable unless denounced.
Bulgaria-Portugal	(December 1950)	Grain contract.
Bulgaria-Sweden	October (Sept. 22) 1947 to December 1948	Trade and payments agreement, automatically renewable unless denounced. Agreement still in effect.
Bulgaria-Switzerland	Jan. 1 (Nov. 9, 1948), 1949, to Dec. 31, 1949	Protocol to agreement of Dec. 4, 1946. No renewal clause.
Bulgaria-Turkey	Apr. 15 (Mar. 27), 1942, indefinite	
Bulgaria-United Kingdom	July 1 (July 28), 1950, to Mar. 31, 1951	Protocol to trade and payments agreement of October 1947. Replaces protocol of August 1949.
Bulgaria-West Germany	July 1 (July 28), 1950, to Mar. 31, 1951	Renewal protocol to trade and payments agreement of October 1948. Replaces protocol of July 1949.
Czechoslovakia-Austria	(Dec. 10, 1950) to Oct. 31, 1951	Trade and payments agreement. Replaces agreement of April 1948. Automatically renewable.
Czechoslovakia-Belgium	Oct. 1 (Nov. 30), 1949, to Dec. 31, 1950	Trade and payments agreement. Replaces agreement of September 1948 and payments agreement of November 1945 with protocol of September 1946. Automatically renewable for 1 year unless denounced.
Czechoslovakia-Denmark	Dec. 1 (Dec. 17), 1949, to Nov. 30, 1950	Trade and payments agreement. Replaces agreement of August 1948.
Czechoslovakia-France	May 1 (June 2), 1950, to Apr. 30, 1951	Renewal protocol to July 1947 agreement.
Czechoslovakia-Greece	August 1948 to August 1949	Trade and payments agreement. Replaces agreement of February 1949. Monetary agreement of Feb. 23, 1946, remains in force with modification.
Czechoslovakia-Iceland	May 1 (May 19), 1950, to Apr. 30, 1951	Compensation agreement containing no quotas. Automatically renewed for 3-month period unless denounced. Three barter deals within framework of agreement.
Czechoslovakia-Ireland		Trade and payments agreement. Replaces agreement of May 1949.
Czechoslovakia-Italy	(July 2) 1947 to Dec. 31, 1947	Renewal protocol to trade and payments agreement of Mar. 20, 1947. Replaces protocol of March 1949. Automatically renewable unless denounced.
Czechoslovakia-Netherlands	Aug. 1 (July 29), 1950, to July 31, 1951	Protocol to trade and payments agreement of November 1945. Replaces protocol of February 1949.
Czechoslovakia-Norway	Oct. 1 (Nov. 4), 1950, to Sept. 30, 1951	Agreement has just been signed.
Czechoslovakia-Portugal	Feb. 1 (Mar. 30), 1950, to Jan. 31, 1951	Annual protocol within framework of December 1949 agreement.
Czechoslovakia-Sweden	(March 1951)	Trade and payments agreement. Replaces agreement of September 1948.
Czechoslovakia-Switzerland	Jan. 1 to Dec. 31, 1950	Protocol to trade and payments agreement of July 1949. Tacit renewal.
Czechoslovakia-Turkey	Jan. 1 (Dec. 22, 1949), 1950 to Dec. 31, 1954	Protocol within framework of September 1949 agreement. Replaces protocol of September 1949.
Czechoslovakia-United Kingdom	July 1, 1950, to June 30, 1951	Long-term framework trade agreement. Payment agreement Aug. 19 (Aug. 18), 1949, to August 1953.
Czechoslovakia-West Germany	Sept. 28 (Sept. 28), 1949, to June 30, 1954	Protocol to October 1949 agreement.
East Germany-Austria	(Dec. 21, 1950)	Barter agreement with Austrian steel plants.
East Germany-Belgium	Nov. 10, 1947, to Nov. 9, 1948; extended to Feb. 9, 1950	Trade and payments agreement; negotiations for new agreement postponed indefinitely in February 1950.
East Germany-Denmark	Jan. 1, 1949 (Dec. 20, 1948), to Dec. 31, 1949	First postwar trade and payments agreement. No new agreement expected.
East Germany-France		
East Germany-Greece		
East Germany-Iceland		
East Germany-Ireland		
East Germany-Italy		
East Germany-Netherlands	Jan. 1 (Oct. 25, 1948) 1949 to Dec. 31, 1949	Interim agreement pending conclusion of new agreement.
East Germany-Norway	Not renewed	Trade and payments agreement; replaces agreement of June 1948. No new agreement expected.
East Germany-Portugal		Renewal protocol to agreement of February 1947.
East Germany-Sweden	July 1 (July 19), 1949, to June 30, 1950	Trade and payments agreement. Replaces agreement of June 1948.
East Germany-Switzerland	Nov. 8 (Nov. 10), 1950, to June 30, 1951	Private compensation agreement.
East Germany-Turkey	Dec. 10 (Dec. 1), 1948, to Dec. 31, 1949	Trade and payments agreement. Replaces agreement of July 1947.
East Germany-United Kingdom		
East Germany-West Germany		
Hungary-Austria	Oct. 8 (Oct. 8), 1949, to Sept. 30, 1950; extended to Mar. 31, 1951	Trade and payments agreement.
Hungary-Belgium	Sept. 1 (Sept. 22), 1950, to Aug. 31, 1951	Protocol to agreement of March 1948 replaces protocol of Sept. 1, 1949. Automatically renewable.
Hungary-Denmark	Feb. 18 (Feb. 18), 1949, to February 1950; extended to Apr. 18, 1950	Trade and payments agreement. Replaces agreement of Apr. 23, 1947. Automatically renewable.
Hungary-France	Mar. 1 (Feb. 10), 1951, to Feb. 29, 1952	Protocol to agreement of Mar. 1, 1949.
Hungary-Iceland	Nov. 1 (Dec. 2), 1949, to Oct. 30, 1950; extended to Jan. 31, 1951; supplemented, June 12, 1950	Trade agreement; replaces agreement of November 1947 with modified payments provisions. Automatically renewable.
Hungary-Italy	June 1 (May 30), 1950, to May 31, 1951	First postwar trade agreement.
Hungary-Netherlands	Jan. 1, 1951, to Dec. 31, 1951	Tacit renewal of trade and payments agreement of December 1948.
Hungary-Norway	June 1 (May 31), 1950, to May 31, 1951	Trade and payments agreement; replaces agreement of January 1949.
Hungary-Sweden	Feb. 1 (Jan. 22), 1951, to Jan. 31, 1952	Protocol of trade and payments agreement of August 1946; replaces protocol of January 1950.

List of most recent trade agreements between Eastern European countries and the rest of world—Continued

Agreement partners	Duration (signature)	Type of agreement
Hungary-Sweden	Dec. 1 (Nov. 30), 1949, to Nov. 30, 1950.	Protocol to trade and payments agreement of June 1946; replaces protocol of October 1948.
Hungary-Switzerland	July 1 (June 27), 1950, to June 30, 1951.	Annual protocol within framework of long-term trade and payments agreement of June 1950.
Hungary-Turkey	July 1 (June 27), 1950, to June 30, 1955.	Long-term trade and payments agreement. Replaces agreement of April 1946 and protocol of October 1948.
Hungary-United Kingdom	June 1 (May 12), 1949, to May 31, 1950. (?) to Apr. 30, 1951.	Trade and payments agreement; no quotas. Automatically renewable for 1 year. Financial protocol to May 1949 agreement.
Hungary-Western Germany	Aug. 1 (Aug. 9), 1947, to July 31, 1950.	Trade and payments agreement. Latest schedules available for August 1948 to 1949.
Poland-Austria	Jan. 1, 1951 (Nov. 22, 1950), to Dec. 31, 1951.	Protocol to trade and payments agreement of October 1949.
Poland-Belgium	Aug. 1 (Aug. 1), 1950, to July 31, 1951.	Trade and payments agreement; replaces agreement of July 1949.
Poland-Denmark	Apr. 13 (Apr. 13), 1950, to Apr. 12, 1951.	Trade and payments agreement; replaces agreement of Nov. 1, 1948.
Poland-France	Oct. 1 (Nov. 30), 1950, to Sept. 30, 1951.	Trade agreement.
Poland-Greece	May 27 (Mar. 19), 1948, to Dec. 31, 1952.	Protocol modifying and implementing long-term agreement of August 1947.
Poland-Iceland	Jan. 1 to Mar. 31, 1951.	Temporary agreement.
Poland-Ireland	Jan. 1 (Nov. 18) to Dec. 31, 1950.	Trade and payments agreement. Replaces agreement of July 1948. Negotiations in progress.
Poland-Italy	July 1 (July 15), 1949, to June 30, 1952. Schedules to June 30 extended to Sept. 30 and Dec. 31, 1950. Nov. 1 (July 23), 1949, to Nov. 1, 1952.	Trade and payments agreement; replaces agreement of Dec. 27, 1947.
Poland-Netherlands	Mar. 22 (Mar. 22) to Dec. 31, 1950.	Investment agreement.
Poland-Norway	Jan. 1, 1950 (Dec. 21, 1949) to Dec. 31, 1950; extended to June 30, 1951.	Replaces agreement of January 1949.
Poland-Portugal	Jan. 1, 1950 (Dec. 21, 1949) to Dec. 31, 1950; extended to June 30, 1951.	Protocol to trade and payments agreement of January 1949.
Poland-Sweden	Nov. 1 (Oct. 31), 1950 to Oct. 31, 1951.	Protocol to trade agreement of March 1947; replaces protocol of October 1949.
Poland-Switzerland	Mar. 19, 1947, to 1952, extended to June 2, 1953. July 1, 1950, to June 30, 1951.	Long-term investment agreement. Protocol to 5-year framework trade and payments agreement of July 1949.
Poland-Turkey	July 1 (June 26), 1949, to June 30, 1954.	Long-term trade payment and investment agreement; replaces agreement of March 1946.
Poland-United Kingdom	Aug. 1 (July 18), 1948, to July 31, 1949; extended 1 year to July 31, 1950. (Mar. 17) 1950 to Dec. 31, 1950.	First postwar trade and payments agreement. Annual protocol within framework of 5-year trade agreement of Jan. 14, 1949.
Poland-West Germany	Jan. 14, 1949, to Dec. 31, 1953. July 1 (Oct. 9), 1950, to June 30, 1951.	Framework long-term trade agreement. Protocol to trade agreement of July 5, 1949. Payments agreement of Aug. 1 (June 30), 1949, to July 31, 1950, apparently extended.
Rumania-Austria	Apr. 17 (July 12), 1950, to Apr. 16, 1951.	First postwar trade and payments agreement.
Rumania-Belgium	Sept. 3, 1949, to Sept. 2, 1950.	Tacit renewal of trade and payments agreement of September 1948.
Rumania-Denmark	Aug. 3, 1949.	First postwar trade and payments agreement.
Rumania-France	July 15 (July 6), 1946, to completion.	Trade and payment: agreement.
Rumania-Greece		
Rumania-Iceland		
Rumania-Ireland		
Rumania-Italy	Dec. 20 (Nov. 25), 1950, to Dec. 19, 1951.	Trade and payments agreement. Replaces exchange of notes of December 1947.
Rumania-Netherlands	Jan. 1 (Dec. 8, 1947), 1948, to Dec. 31, 1948.	Trade agreement not renewed.
Rumania-Norway		
Rumania-Portugal		
Rumania-Sweden		
Rumania-Switzerland	Nov. 4 (June 29), 1946, to June 30, 1947 supplemented Feb. 7, 1947. Credit protocol Mar. 4, 1947, to March 1950.	Trade and payments agreement, no quotas. Credit protocol.
Rumania-Turkey	Negotiations reported in late 1950.	
Rumania-United Kingdom		
Rumania-West Germany		

List of latest trade agreements between Yugoslavia and countries of Western Europe

Agreement partners	Duration (signature)	Type of agreement
Yugoslavia-Austria	Jan. 1 (Feb. 13) to Dec. 31, 1951.	Protocol to trade and payments agreement of August 1948. Replaces protocol of November 1949.
Yugoslavia-Belgium	Jan. 1 (Oct. 12, 1950), 1951, to Dec. 31, 1955. Nov. 8 (Nov. 8), 1950, to Nov. 7, 1951.	Credit agreement. Protocol to trade and payments agreement of September 1948 extended to November 1950.
Yugoslavia-Denmark	Nov. 8 (Nov. 8), 1950, to Nov. 7, 1955. Oct. 1 (Oct. 16), 1950, to Sept. 30, 1951.	Credit agreement. Protocol to trade and payments agreement of June 1947. Replaces protocol of April 1949.
Yugoslavia-France	May 21 (May 1), 1949, to May 21, 1950; extended to Aug. 21, 1950; extended to Dec. 31, 1950.	Trade and payments agreement. Replaces agreement of May 1948.
Yugoslavia-Greece		
Yugoslavia-Iceland		
Yugoslavia-Ireland		
Yugoslavia-Italy	Aug. 4 (Aug. 4), 1950, to Aug. 3, 1951. Nov. 28 (Nov. 28), 1947, to Nov. 28, 1952. (Dec. 23, 1950)	Protocol to trade agreement of Apr. 28, 1947; protocol of August 1949. Investment agreement. Reparations agreement.
Yugoslavia-Netherlands	Nov. 1 (Nov. 7), 1949, to Oct. 31, 1950.	Annual protocol within framework of long-term agreement of February 1948.
Yugoslavia-Norway	Feb. 1 (Feb. 20), 1948, to Jan. 31, 1951. May 1 (May 26), 1950, to Apr. 30, 1951.	Long-term trade and payments agreement. Annual quotas. Protocol to trade and payments agreement of August 1946. Replaces protocol of April 1949.
Yugoslavia-Portugal	Jan. 1 (Feb. 12), 1951, to Dec. 31, 1955.	Credit agreement.
Yugoslavia-Sweden	Apr. 15 (Aug. 19), 1950, to June 30, 1951.	Annual protocol within framework of long-term agreement of April 1947. Replaces protocol of May 1949 with supplement of December 1949.
Yugoslavia-Switzerland	Apr. 15 (Apr. 12), 1947, to Apr. 15, 1954. Jan. 1 (Apr. 1) to Dec. 31, 1950.	Long-term trade payments and credit agreement. Annual protocol within framework of long-term agreement of September 1948.
Yugoslavia-Turkey	Oct. 1 (Sept. 27), 1948, to Sept. 30, 1953.	Long-term trade payments and credit agreement.
Yugoslavia-United Kingdom	Jan. 5 (Jan. 5), 1950, to June 30, 1951. Jan. 1 to Dec. 31, 1951.	Trade and payments agreement. Replaces agreement of October 1947. Annual protocol within framework of long-term agreement of Dec. 26, 1949.
Yugoslavia-Germany (western zone)	Jan. 1 (Dec. 26, 1949), 1950, to Dec. 31, 1954. (December 1950) Aug. 11 (Aug. 11), 1950, to June 1952.	Long-term trade and payments agreement. Credit agreement. 2-year contract (lumber for transportation equipment).
Yugoslavia-Finland	Jan. 1 (Sept. 23, 1950), 1951, to 1956. Oct. 1 (Sept. 12), 1949, to Dec. 31, 1950.	Credit agreement. Protocol to trade and payments agreement of October 1948.

List of latest trade agreements between Yugoslavia and non-European areas

Agreement partners	Duration (signature)	Type of agreement
LATIN AMERICA		
Yugoslavia-Argentina.....	Jan. 1 (Jan. 20), to Dec. 31, 1950.....	Protocol to agreement of June 1948.
Yugoslavia-Brazil.....	June 8 (June 7), 1948, to Dec. 31, 1951.....	Long-term trade and payments agreement.
Yugoslavia-Mexico.....	Feb. 25 (Feb. 24), 1950, to Feb. 23, 1951.....	Trade and payments agreement.
Yugoslavia-Paraguay.....	Mar. 1 (Mar. 17), 1950, to Feb. 28, 1951.....	Trade agreement.
Yugoslavia-Peru.....	Jan. 27 (Jan. 17), 1950, to Jan. 26, 1952.....	Trade and payments agreement.
Yugoslavia-Uruguay.....	July 26 (July 26), 1950, to July 25, 1951.....	Do.
	Jan. 1 (Jan. 5) to Dec. 31, 1950.....	Do.
NEAR AND MIDDLE EAST		
Yugoslavia-Egypt.....	Aug. 7 (Aug. 7), 1950, to Aug. 6, 1951.....	Do.
Yugoslavia-India.....	Mar. 22 (Dec. 29, 1948), 1949, to Mar. 21, 1950.....	Trade agreement.
Yugoslavia-Israel.....	Jan. 1 (Jan. 30), to Dec. 31, 1951.....	Trade agreement. Replaces agreement of November 1949.
Yugoslavia-Pakistan.....	Apr. 1 (Feb. 10), 1949, to Mar. 31, 1950.....	Trade agreement.
FAR EAST		
Yugoslavia-Indonesia.....	Nov. 1 (Feb. 1), 1949, to Oct. 31, 1950.....	Do.

List of latest trade agreements between Finland and countries of the Soviet sphere

Agreement partners	Duration (signature)	Type of agreement
Finland-U. S. S. R.....	Jan. 1 (Dec. 2) to Dec. 31, 1951.....	Annual protocol within framework of long-term agreement. Replaces protocol of June 1950.
Finland-Bulgaria.....	Jan. 1 (June 13, 1950), 1951, to Dec. 31, 1955.....	Long-term trade and payments agreement.
Finland-Czechoslovakia.....	Jan. 1 (Jan. 15), 1951, to Dec. 31, 1951.....	Annual protocol within framework of long-term agreement. Replaces protocol of March 1950.
Finland-Hungary.....	Oct. 6 (Oct. 6), 1948, to Dec. 31, 1951.....	Long-term trade and payments agreement. Annual quotas.
Finland-Poland.....	Oct. 1 (Oct. 20), 1950, to Sept. 30, 1951.....	Protocol to trade and payments agreement of May 1, 1946.
Finland-Rumania.....	Jan. 1 (Nov. 25, 1950) to Dec. 31, 1951.....	Annual protocol within framework of long-term agreement. Replaces protocol of September 1949.
Finland-Eastern Germany.....	Oct. 1 (Sept. 25), 1948, to Dec. 31, 1951.....	Long-term trade and payments agreement.
	Jan. 1 (Jan. 9) to Dec. 31, 1951.....	Protocol to agreement of February 1948. Replaces agreement of December 1949.
	Oct. 1 (Oct. 15), 1949, to Sept. 30, 1950.....	Protocol to trade and payments agreement of September 1948.

List of latest trade agreements between Finland and countries of Western Europe

Agreement partners	Duration (signature)	Type of agreement
Finland-Austria.....	Jan. 1 (Jan. 14) to Dec. 31, 1951.....	Protocol to trade and payments agreement of November 1945. Replaces protocol of November 1948 with extensions of November 1949 and May 1950.
Finland-Belgium.....	July 1 (July 8), 1950, to June 30, 1951.....	Protocol to trade and payments agreement of June 1945. Replaces protocol of March 1949 with supplement of January 1950.
Finland-Denmark.....	June 1 (May 25), 1950, to May 31, 1951.....	Trade agreement. Replaces agreement of May 1949.
Finland-France.....	July 1 (May 25), 1950, to (7).....	Payments agreement.
Finland-Greece.....	Mar. 24 (Apr. 11), 1950, to Mar. 23, 1951.....	Protocol to trade and payments agreement of March 1949.
Finland-Iceland.....	Mar. 1 (Mar. 6), 1950, to Feb. 28, 1951.....	Trade and payments agreement.
Finland-Ireland.....	Nov. 1 (Nov. 1), 1949, to indefinite period.....	First postwar trade and payments agreement.
Finland-Italy.....	July 1 (June 29), 1950, to June 30, 1951.....	Protocol to trade and payments agreement of June 1947. Replaces protocol of July 1949.
Finland-Netherlands.....	Nov. 1 (Oct. 25), 1950, to Oct. 31, 1951.....	Trade agreement and protocol to 1946 credit agreement.
Finland-Norway.....	Jan. 1 (Jan. 12) to Dec. 31, 1950.....	Trade and payments agreement.
Finland-Portugal.....	Apr. 1 (Mar. 29), 1950, to Mar. 31, 1951.....	Protocol to trade and payments agreement of February 1947.
Finland-Sweden.....	Sept. 1 (Aug. 16), 1950, to Aug. 31, 1951.....	Protocol to agreement of September 1940. Replaces agreement of August 1948.
Finland-Switzerland.....	June 20 (June 12), 1948, to June 1, 1949.....	Trade and payments agreement. Replaces agreement of May 1946.
Finland-Turkey.....	(Mar. 13, 1950) Dec. 31, 1950.....	Automatically renewable unless announced. No quotas.
Finland-United Kingdom.....	Jan. 1 (Jan. 10), 1951, to Dec. 31, 1951.....	Trade and payments agreement.
Finland-West Germany.....	Jan. 1 (Dec. 23, 1950), 1951, to Dec. 31, 1951.....	Credit agreement.
Finland-Yugoslavia.....	Oct. 1 (Sept. 12), 1949, to Dec. 31, 1950.....	Protocol to trade and payments agreement of February 1949. Replaces agreement of December 1949.
		Protocol to trade and payments agreement of October 1948.

List of latest trade agreements between Finland and non-European countries

Agreement partners	Duration (signature)	Type of agreement
LATIN AMERICA		
Finland-Argentina.....	(Mar. 2, 1951).....	Protocol within framework of long-term agreement of July 1948. Replaces protocol of September 1949.
Finland-Colombia.....	July 8, 1948, to Dec. 31, 1952.....	Long-term trade, payments, and credit agreement.
Finland-Uruguay.....	(Mar. 24, 1949).....	Trade agreement.
NEAR AND MIDDLE EAST		
Finland-India.....	Jan. 1 (Jan. 10), 1951, to Dec. 31, 1951.....	Do.
Finland-Israel.....	Nov. 16 (Nov. 15), 1950, to Nov. 15, 1951.....	Trade and payments agreement, replaces agreement of August 1949.
FAR EAST		
Finland-Japan.....	Aug. 1 (June 21), 1949, to July 31, 1950, extended indefinitely.....	Trade agreement.

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

Mr. MALONE. I yield.

Mr. CASE. Does the Senator have any information as to what concessions

are now being negotiated at the Torquay Conference?

SECURITY OF TORQUAY CONFERENCE

Mr. MALONE. I will say to the distinguished Senator that it is a very

supersecret conference. Some American businessmen went to Torquay, England, and tried to attend the conferences and discuss the matter with our representatives. I understand there are nearly 100

State Department representatives there negotiating with approximately 40 nations. The industrialists were denied any access to any meetings of importance. But we do have general information gained in various ways that they are negotiating approximately 350 bilateral agreements. The nations participating in the conference negotiate with each other, bilaterally, meaning that a nation makes an agreement with every other nation, each agreement involving several hundred products.

I want to tell the distinguished Senator from South Dakota that when such treaties are made they are not really trade agreements. That is a misnomer. They do not deal with trade. They are agreements to lower tariffs.

CONCESSIONS TO US ARE NEGATED

When we agree with another nation to lower tariffs, they do actually lower theirs as we do ours. However, other nations will immediately resort to embargoes, import licensing, exchange controls, quotas, manipulations of their currencies, specifications, and many other subterfuges that they have developed over many years of foreign trading. The trade agreements, so far as we are concerned, have no force and effect. Making them, therefore, is a one way street.

For example, specifications were used with respect to automobiles allowed to run on the roads of Bermuda. That looked very reasonable. One of the reasons given for establishing specifications was the conditions of the roads on the island. It was soon found that the only automobiles that filled the specifications were those made in England. That is how specifications are used as trade barriers.

There is very little information coming out to the workman, the industrialist, and the investor of this country from the Torquay meeting. It is a supersecret conference.

RESULTS OF TORQUAY CONFERENCE SOON TO BE PROCLAIMED

I will also say to the distinguished Senator from South Dakota that even if the Congress refuses to extend the 1934 Trade Agreements Act for 3 years—and it will run out on June 12—the results of the conference will still become effective. The plan is, I am informed, to complete the Torquay Conference, which has been under way for 3 or 4 months, with the expectation that it will be completed late this month or early next month and make the trade treaties effective under the 1934 Trade Agreements Act as it is now in effect until June 12.

The job of removing the floor under wages and investments is practically finished. I will also say to the distinguished Senator from South Dakota that after they complete these 350 trade treaties—I am assuming that is the number of treaties that are to be concluded—that they will then draw up a multilateral treaty in which the treaties would be welded together to be joined in the GATT.

GATT EFFECTUATES PART OF ITO

The main provisions of the International Trade Organization charter is al-

ready a part of GATT. The Secretary of State testified that he would not push the International Trade Organization now. Since GATT he need not press for the ITO, since much of it is in effect already.

MOST-FAVORED-NATION CLAUSE

As trade agreements are subject to the most-favored-nations clause, that means that whatever concession we make to another nation bilaterally is immediately available to all other nations of the world, who do not contribute anything. Therefore, if there were any reciprocal features in the set-up, they would be annulled by the most-favored-nations clause.

ASIA'S MILLIONS RUSSIA'S AIM

Mr. President, the show-down, so far as war is concerned, when world war III comes along, will take place in the air over Russia and over the United States of America, and probably over Europe. The people of Asia cannot enter into that kind of war. They do not have the material, and they do not have the know-how. They are not trained. A large percentage of the people of Asia are not trained through education and practice, as is the case in the United States and in Europe. Russia will probably move first into Indochina and the Malay States, on the general premise and general theme of Asia for the Asiatics. We have heard that before. It would bring to an end the colonial and slavery systems which the empire-minded nations have had in vogue for over 300 years, and which we, through our loans, are backing up. But it would make enemies of the peoples we could have as friends.

ATLANTIC PACT TIES OUR HANDS

As I said when we debated the Atlantic Pact, what we are doing is promising to help all these nations in the Atlantic Pact. In other words, when they get into trouble, we are in trouble. How do they get into trouble? By defending the colonial empire system and the system of colonial slavery. So we have already committed ourselves to defend their system.

Many and varied reasons have been advanced for the steps taken by the President in sending additional troops to Europe at this time. They include:

First. The four extra divisions will show the European nations that we mean to oppose any Russian invasion.

Second. They will protect the strategic minerals and materials needed by this Nation, such as manganese and uranium.

General Eisenhower mentioned and emphasized both of these points, and seemed to attach great importance to them. In support of the first, it can only be said that we have supported Europe in two World Wars. We have two divisions in Germany. Certainly four more divisions will make no difference.

TROOPS TO EUROPE WILL NOT DETER RUSSIA

The facts are that the four divisions only constitute a foot in the door. If we adopt the policy of sending foot soldiers to Europe we will wind up, as we did in World War II, with a majority of the troops in Europe, and with a method of fighting with which we cannot win, that is, with a ground army and a full

naval and air power in Europe. Mr. President, it would be impossible for the economy of this country to support all three branches in full in order to win a war any place on the ground, any place on the ocean, or any place in the air. We must be selective this time, and that is the reason I advocate to the Senate that we further explore the possibility of air power, in which we can be supreme anywhere in the world.

DEFENSE OF EUROPE DOES NOT DEFEND MINERAL SOURCES

The second reason, the protection of manganese, uranium, and other minerals by defending Europe, is simply childish. The administration says that if Belgium were controlled by Russia we would lose the uranium in the Belgian Congo, and that if England lost South Africa we would lose the manganese and chromite in that area. Such a conclusion is childish. They may as well say that if England lost Canton Island in the Pacific, between Hawaii and the Fiji Islands, American planes could not land there, since England controls Canton Island. Mr. President, it would make no difference at all, and everyone knows it. Just how foolish can we get?

WESTERN HEMISPHERE LOGICAL SOURCE OF STRATEGIC MATERIALS

At this point I would like to say that if we would cooperate with the Pan-American countries in South America and Central America we in this hemisphere could make ourselves almost self-sufficient in the production of the strategic and critical materials needed by this Nation in either peace or war. All we would need to do is make long-term contracts with potential producers of rubber, tin, manganese, and other materials. The contracts could be made long term enough to pay-back the initial investments, and ample quantities of such materials and minerals would be available.

The difficulty is with the State Department's policy of stopping such purchases when an emergency is over, and investors have lost their capital and have learned their lesson. The administration resumes its purchases from the Far East in peacetime, such as from the Malayan States, where temporarily it can get such materials cheaper, until the sources are unavailable. In an emergency we pay through the nose for such materials from strategically safer sources.

Mr. President, it is well known that as soon as we had lost the sources of rubber and some other materials developed during World War II in South America and Central America, where competition had been provided to the Asiatic sources, the prices of those materials from the Far East and other areas doubled, trebled, and quadrupled. Russia was bidding against us for those materials.

It will be well remembered that England, controlling the Malayan States, Indochina, and other areas where such materials are produced, deliberately doubled the price, and had Russia and other nations bidding in competition for them. When I visited those areas in 1948 I found that shiploads of such ma-

materials were going to Russia; and such shipments have not stopped.

In addition, the production of many of such minerals and materials can be materially increased in this Nation if the difference in the wage standard of living as between this country and competitive nations is paid for such materials. However, the administration has discouraged the production of these indispensable materials in this country.

BRITISH CONTROL THREE-FOURTHS OF RAW MATERIALS

Mr. President, I should like to refer to my statement about the raw materials controlled by England. On my trip there in 1947 I had a very interesting conversation with Mr. Cripps, Mr. Bevin, and others. But one conversation with Sir Ben Smith, who controlled raw materials, including many of the coal fields, really paid off. I was looking for information. I was not giving out very much, because I had very little information at that time. It was in Birmingham, England that I visited Sir Ben Smith. I read now from my statement in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

Sir Ben Smith, who happened to be in charge of coal production in England when I was inspecting the coal mines there late in 1947, stated to me in December of that year that England controlled three-fourths of the strategic and critical materials of the world, and that, if necessary, they would prevent access to them.

Mr. President, I hope that the Senate gets the full significance of the British plan to control three-fourths of the raw materials of the world through the colonial system, which we are supporting with our money. One of their principal representatives made the statement that they would prohibit our access to such materials if it became necessary.

Quoting further from my statement:

This was apropos of the conversation I had had with him previously. I took no issue with Sir Ben Smith, but it showed the attitude. We were talking about the proposed Marshall plan, and I had said I was there to investigate the steel industries and the coal mines. This was in Birmingham, England, about 56 or 58 miles outside London. They seemed not only to resent the fact that we were investigating with a view perhaps to modifying the program to the extent that the money would be paid back. He finally said to me not only that they could exclude us from the area where three-fourths of the strategic and critical minerals of the world were located, and would do so if it became necessary, but he said we should merely adopt the lend-lease attitude; we should continue lend-lease and have no thought of payment in return.

Mr. President, Sir Ben Smith was a very important cog in the machine at that time in the operation of the industries of Great Britain. I have no doubt that he voiced, perhaps, inopportunistly, the European sentiment that, as a matter of fact, there is never any thought of paying any money back; that it is not a loan; it is a gift; and that we should not expect it to be repaid; it ought to continue as gifts rather than loans.

Mr. President, I hope the Senate takes cognizance of the fact that there was an effort to keep us from obtaining access to the raw materials of the world that we need. Three-fourths of the raw materials of the world are controlled

through a colonial system supported by us. This was a threat to keep us from getting them unless we kept up the pension plan, as represented by all the plans which I have named here this afternoon.

RUSSIA IS BIDDING HIGH ON WORLD MARKETS

Last year the Russians received 64,694 tons of Malayan rubber by the end of October 1950, a 10-month period. This represented an increase of more than 1,000 tons over entire 1949 shipments, according to statement issued by British Board of Trade President Harold Wilson. Wilson also disclosed that Malayan rubber exports to Red China totaled 16,482 tons in November and December 1950.

The United States took 34 percent of Malayan rubber and 70 percent of tin in 1950. The prices that have risen were based on the fancy prices Communist countries were willing to pay, so if the United States stops buying Malayan tin, tin as a strategic material will be bought by Russia and Red China.

Malayan rubber shipments to China and Hong Kong have more than doubled—they totaled 83,000 tons in 1950 against 30,000 tons in 1949.

Czechoslovakia doubled her tonnage of rubber imported in 1950 against 1949.

Two Australian warships were bought by Chinese Reds. This was done in February of this year. They were two British-made corvettes about as big as American destroyer escorts. They are now lying in Pearl River just below the city of Canton. They had been declared surplus by the Australian Navy and were acquired by private parties who were Communist intermediaries.

According to a report issued by the United States Department of Commerce, the Soviet are snapping up all raw materials and machinery they can lay their hands on from the West. The tempo of their buying has increased sharply during the past year. The principal suppliers are Great Britain and Belgium in that order, and principal supplies are rubber, tin, wool, copper, cotton, industrial machinery, and tools.

THE WEST IS STILL ARMING RUSSIA

Russian imports of natural rubber before World War II averaged 35,000 tons a year. In 1950 they bought directly about 85,000 tons, most of it from British Malaya. In addition, 38,000 tons of Malayan rubber went to China, and 44,000 tons to British Hong Kong to be transhipped to the Soviet Union. Another 22,000 tons went to Eastern Germany, Czechoslovakia, and Hungary. China has no way of using rubber in manufacturing, so for 1950, 189,000 tons went to Russian industries as against 35,000 tons in a normal prewar year.

Russia also took 42,500,000 pounds of wool in 1950 and 2,000,000 pounds of cotton, 700 tons of tin. Practically all of this from British and Commonwealth sources.

Little Czechoslovakia got 13,127 tons of copper from Belgium Congo in 1950; 7,000 tons of zinc, 1,100 tons of lead, all from Belgium.

The Belgians sold Russia more than \$8,000,000 worth of machinery and machine tools and equipment in 1950.

The British shipped \$28,000,000 of machinery and machine tools to the Soviet Union in 1950.

Vast quantities of steel and steel scrap have been sent to the Soviet Union through Germany, and through Hong Kong to China.

WE ARE MAKING ALL THE SACRIFICES

Our military spending for the 1951 calendar year is expected to reach \$40,000,000,000 and in 1952, \$53,000,000,000. This will represent probably 28 percent of our national income and if we were to add to it other indirect figures which are going into the support of European economy, the figures would probably be 33½ percent.

"Defense in the cold war," issued by the study group of the Royal Institute of International Affairs gives percentage on defense expenditures of Europe in 1949 and 1950 as expressed in percentages of national income. The highest is the United Kingdom with 7.4 percent. The lowest is Denmark with 1.9 percent. Others are Norway, 2.5 percent, Belgium, 2.5 percent, Italy 3.8 percent and France 5 percent. I do not have the new European figures, but they cannot be much more, and do not approach our new percentages. Even then, most foreign outlays for defense are connected with European adventures in protecting their colonial interests and not in protecting Europe.

NONAGGRESSION PACTS WITH ECONOMIC AND POLITICAL CLAUSES STILL IN EFFECT

Mr. President, I want to note here that both England and France have separate economic and military pacts with Russia. In March 1949 I put both of these treaties, these pacts, with Russia, into the RECORD. They are nonaggression pacts, military and economic pacts. I refer only to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, where they are included. But I want to quote briefly some articles included in these treaties, each one of them practically the same in language. The one with France was signed by Molotov and Bidoux. The one with England was signed by Anthony Eden and Molotov. The one with England reads:

Article 6. The high contracting parties agree to render one another all possible economic assistance after the war.

Mr. President, these pacts are in full force and effect for another 12 years or so, and no attempt has been made by either France or England to cancel them.

I read article 7:

Each high contracting party undertakes not to conclude any alliance and not to take part in any coalition directed against the other high contracting party.

CONFLICT OF ALLIANCES

Mr. President, when the junior Senator from Nevada brought out the existence of these pacts in 1949, 2 years ago, at once the British and the French denied any conflict with the Atlantic Pact, although they read startlingly like the Atlantic Pact. Of course, our State Department laughed the matter off. They said there was no reason why the other nations could not sign a pact with us even though they had a similar pact with Russia. Since that time we have

noticed in the press that Russia has been questioning regarding these pacts both France and England by reason of the fact that they signed a similar pact with us. The Russians have said France and England violated their pacts with Russia. They have both separately denied that they intended to violate the pacts with Russia. So that up to this date the pacts are still in good standing.

I shall read two articles from the pact between France and Russia. Article 5:

The High Contracting Parties undertake not to conclude any alliance and not to take part in any coalition directed against either of the High Contracting Parties.

Article 6:

The High Contracting Parties agree to render each other every possible economic assistance after the war with the view to assisting and facilitating reconstruction of both countries and in order to contribute to the cause of world prosperity.

Those high-sounding phrases were included in the Atlantic Pact.

LET US ACTIVELY LIVE IN THE "AIR AGE"

Mr. President, we must channel our resources primarily into long-range air power giving us command of the air clear around the globe. This air power should be based on our own continent, inaccessible to the enemy's land power. Such strategy can be implemented only by airmen whose lifetime experience and military philosophy are attuned to the realities of the air age. Only then will this nation feel that UMT will be fruitful and justified.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this time an excerpt from the publication Air Force of February 1951. Under the heading "The airman's bookshelf," there appears a review of the book, Key to Survival, written by Alexander P. de Seversky.

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

Major Seversky's Air Power: Key to Survival discusses this subject in a dynamic manner. He presents a powerful argument that this nation could never be victorious in a war with Russia if our strategy is predicated upon the defeat of the land armies of Russia and the occupation of her land masses. He proves also that neither can naval power achieve such a victory. Seversky does not maintain that naval power is obsolete or obsolescent. He understands and argues forcibly that this nation must possess adequate naval power to meet Russia's threat on the ocean. He is also cognizant of the vital fact that the sea lanes must be kept open to insure the movement of critical materials from remote spots of the world to feed our gigantic industrial and economic establishment.

The effectiveness of air power has been materially enhanced in recent years by the development of the atomic bomb. Russia possesses that bomb. What her stockpile is we do not know. It is obvious, however, that, given time, she will have one of adequate proportions to cripple our industrial establishment. She possesses the planes to carry those bombs from her bases to the critical targets in this country. As Seversky points out, no force, no matter what its size, operating either on land or water, can prevent the employment of Russian air power. It is

equally obvious that no land force of Russia and her satellites can prevent the employment of our air power against the war-making potential of Russia.

Mr. MALONE. Part of the excerpt is as follows:

Major Seversky's Air Power: Key to Survival discusses this subject to a dynamic manner. He presents a powerful argument that this Nation could never be victorious in a war with Russia if our strategy is predicated upon the defeat of the land armies of Russia and the occupation of her land masses.

Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks an excerpt from the publication United States Air Services, of January 1951. The article appears under the heading "Seversky says General Eaker is the Mahan of air power." The subheading is "In radio interview he analyzes what Seversky is attempting to do."

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

The basic theme of Seversky's book is that a preponderant American air force can keep the world at peace better than any other military instrument. It will support and uphold a strong diplomatic line against Russia and world communism.

If, by design or mistake, the Russians should initiate a third world war, the efficient retaliation of a powerful long-range air striking force equipped with atom bombs can destroy Russia's weapons-making capacity and make it impossible for her to carry large-scale warfare to her neighbors and, more particularly, prevent her destruction of our cities and our weapons-making capacity.

The second basic element in his reasoning is that no nation can economically afford to support the world's largest army, the world's largest navy, and the world's largest air force. History, he says, has demonstrated that the nations which have controlled the world and kept the world's peace have determined which of these three elements is predominant in the particular century or age in question and concentrated on that. The outstanding example, of course, is Great Britain, with the world's greatest fleet, which kept the peace in the nineteenth century. Seversky points out that it was demonstrated in the Second World War and it is even more true now, when inventions and recent technical developments have made possible the intercontinental bomber and at a rate not too far in the future the intercontinental missile, that the predominant military weapon is a strategic air force.

SERVICE COMPETITION BAD STRATEGY

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, under the conditions created by the faulty National Defense Act of 1947, our military leadership cannot provide our country with a sound strategy for victory. Instead, the three military services have embarked on a spending orgy, each one competing with the others, squeezing every dollar they can out of our inflated and tottering national economy.

The youth entrusted to these hands will not learn the art of modern warfare. They will be taught the almost obsolete art of bayoneting and deck scrubbing. Each youngster will be looked upon as a potential salesman for the special interest of his particular branch. Radio listeners have already heard the competitive hucksters of each

service enticing our youth by playing up its unique advantages.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point an excerpt from an article published in the New York Journal-American of Sunday, March 11, 1951, entitled "De Seversky Calls Bigger United States Force for Europe a Trap." The article is written by Maj. Alexander P. de Seversky.

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

BASIC STRATEGY

What is at stake in the debate is the nature of basic American strategy. The decision to be made is whether our industrial potentials and limited manpower shall be channeled into old-style ground warfare, in which the enemy enjoys all the advantages—or invested in air strategy, in which we can attain clean-cut supremacy both in numbers and quality.

The arguments advanced in favor of more American troops for Europe have little relation to the real problem. Indeed, they have raised a smokescreen of irrelevancies behind which the strategic core of the issue has been hidden from public view.

BOOSTING MORALE

We are told, for instance, that four more divisions will boost European morale by demonstrating America's will to fight for freedom. But in the light of our sacrifices in Korea, the American declaration of a national emergency, our vastly expanded military budgets, why should our will to oppose aggression be in doubt?

I submit that any European who still doubts it will not be convinced by the arrival of a few more divisions. Stalin has, and for years must continue to have, overwhelming superiority on the ground. To suppose that America would not fight if he slaughtered two divisions, but only if he slaughtered six, makes no sense.

Behind the beguiling talk of "only a few more divisions" is the plan—already adopted by our high command without consulting Congress and the people—which is bound to degenerate into a show-down on the ground against the Soviet and satellite armies. Though billed as "balanced forces," that plan still looks upon air power as an auxiliary to soften the enemy at home and to provide "air artillery" support for our foot soldiers.

The tragic reality is that America is being committed to an outmoded and fallacious strategy, because it is the only kind our military mentors understand. Like the French generals who staked their country on the Maginot line after 1918, our generals are making the commitment in a spirit of patriotic devotion.

We have been assured that 3,500,000 men would be enough unless the world situation deteriorated sharply. Almost at once, however, Gen. J. Lawton Collins took the stand to announce that the figure would have to be expanded within 6 months. That's the tip-off. We are preparing to fight a new war with the methods of the last, although history proves that such "frozen thinking" is fatal. More and more millions will be funneled into the hopeless attempt to match Moscow's teeming manpower on the ground.

GROUND GENERAL

The very make-up of our high command makes such strategy inevitable. Secretary of Defense Marshall is a ground general. On June 21, 1943, he declared: "Your adversary may be hammered to his knees by bombing, but he will recover unless the knock-out blow is delivered by the Army." The fact that

Japan, having been knocked from the skies, surrendered with an army of 6,000,000 well-equipped men still intact, apparently made little impression on General Marshall. Only last week in his speech at Columbia University before the Institute of Arts and Sciences, he said, "The experience of battle * * * points to the continued and decisive role of ground forces."

The Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, General Bradley, wrote last year that he is "convinced beyond any reasonable doubt" that "we shall once more be forced to gain the inevitable victory over our dead bodies—those of our soldiers on the ground." And the Chief of Staff of the Army, naturally, is no less sold on bayonet warfare. All of General Collins' statements revolve around his certainty that "the doughboy is the final answer."

OTHERS GO ALONG

The other two members of the high command, representing the Navy and the Air Force, are in a minority and, in the nature of a military body, bound to go along with the majority concepts. Thus while the dispute rages around irrelevant matters like those four divisions, the life-and-death issue of a correct strategy is shoved out of sight.

I am not accusing our leadership of some mischievous conspiracy. The conspiracy is of another kind—like that of a fond mother who believes that castor oil is a cure-all, and administers it to her child in ever larger doses, thinly disguised with orange juice. Her intentions are the best, but her child will die all the same if his abdominal pains are due to acute appendicitis.

We are being coaxed and threatened and argued into putting more and more of our resources and manhood into surface force, for the kind of war in which we cannot hope to win under modern conditions. Our leaders do not grasp the possibilities of airpower geared to take control of the air clear around the globe, bypassing the surface strength of the Soviets.

POPULATION FACTOR

The optimistic references to a population of 200 or 300 millions in the western bloc are meaningless. This represents potential troops—but the Soviet Union has huge and superbly equipped armies already in being, supported by tactical aviation as good as ours and much larger in quantity. It is childish to suppose that Moscow will allow us to create West European forces capable of crossing out her dominance of the continent, when it has the power to nip the enterprise in the bud. How an additional four divisions put into the inextricable trap will deter Soviet aggression defies explanation.

After the war, we threw away our gun. Soviet Russia held on to hers. Now we propose to stoop down and pick up the discarded weapon. Why should the Kremlin let us do this—unless we have a powerful deterrent force elsewhere to stop them from putting a bullet through our forehead?

DETERRENT FORCE

The deterrent force can only be American strategic air power, operating directly from our continent—from bases, that is to say, inaccessible to the Kremlin's land might and tactical air force. Only under this protection can European capacity for defense be revived.

But today our strategic Air Force does not have the magnitude to serve as a real deterrent. Though properly conceived, and armed with atom bombs, it is no more than a token force. It will remain only a token force as long as we persist in dividing our potential three ways for so-called balanced forces—instead of applying the major portion to air power on the common-sense basis that first things must come first. Only when such an American Air Force is in ex-

istence will European rearmament be at all possible.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point an article by Maj. Alexander de Seversky, which is headed "Major de Seversky praises MacArthur on stalemate warning," published in the New York Journal-American of Sunday, March 18, 1951. He also describes our untenable position and the methods we are using in Asia and contemplate using in Europe.

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

PRaises MACARTHUR ON STALEMATE WARNING
(By Maj. Alexander P. de Seversky, internationally famous airplane designer and aviation authority)

The prospect of a permanent stalemate in Korea is highly unpleasant for our country. But Gen. Douglas MacArthur's blunt warning, on March 7, that this is the best we can expect was both courageous and necessary. There is no profit in self-delusion.

After the high sacrifice of American blood, the stalemate leaves our major available forces pinned down at the end of a 5,000-mile limb across the Pacific—with the peninsula we aimed to protect devastated and its people reduced to wretchedness.

Before the story is told, we may have as many as 500,000 men committed to Korea merely to stabilize the impasse; perhaps another million and larger air contingents will have to be held in reserve in Japan.

And all these forces will have to be supplied and maintained in combat readiness by a great naval armada at a cost of billions of dollars.

No matter how it is explained, a stalemate thus amounts to a victory for the Communists. Kremlin strategy is to disperse American manpower all over the earth, and weaken American economy in the process. Korea is the first installment on that strategy.

UNTENABLE POSITION

I for one do not believe that Moscow was taken unawares by our decision to fight in Korea, or that Malik's absence from the UN Security Council on the day of decision was a Soviet blunder. It was all, I am convinced, part of the larger Soviet design. Mistaken diplomacy had put us in an untenable position in Korea. Moscow took advantage of this, leaving us no choice—short of a final showdown—but to lose face or fall on our face. We chose the latter.

The purpose of air force as a strategic weapon is to destroy the enemy's ability to wage war by destroying his industrial sinews. In Korea we could not do this. The weapons and forces thrown against us were being created elsewhere—in China, Manchuria, and Russia—under the cloak of a bogus neutrality or, in MacArthur's phrase, "privileged sanctuary."

We could use our air monopoly only to attack the opposing forces as they approached the battle areas. The enemy lines of communication became the decisive factor. This will remain true as long as political considerations prevent us from projecting our air power beyond the Yalu River.

BEATING EXPLAINED

As long as we are not allowed to strike at the sources of enemy strength, the effectiveness of our Air Force is in direct proportion to the length of the enemy lines of communication. In other words, the shorter those lines, the shorter the time during which enemy forces are exposed to air punishment in transit from the sanctuary to the battle

lines. This explains the beating we took when the Allied armies rolled up to the Yalu River.

We helped the enemy at that point by enabling him to fight virtually without lines of communication. In effect our Air Force was put out of business, having been deprived of its only legitimate target. Our planes could merely support the ground troops in battle—the function in which air support is least efficient. At the Yalu River the contest was on even terms, with the numerical superiority of the Chinese telling the story. Only when we retreated, again extending the enemy communication lines, did we retrieve the precious elbow room for our air forces to do their job.

PAID FOR LESSON

These are the ABC's of aerial war, but unhappily we had to pay with thousands of casualties for an elementary lesson in the use of air power.

The stalemate is inherent in the artificially limited theater of action. As we move northward we must reach a point at which any further advance works in the enemy's favor by shortening his communications. True, we can then concentrate more air power on the shorter lines. But there is a point of saturation when additional air force gives diminishing returns. Besides, with the distance reduced, the enemy can evade overhead action in the night hours to reinforce his battle front.

TWO CHOICES

Thus a line of stabilization is reached, with a constant rate of attrition on both sides. And the enemy is better able to absorb this attrition. The stalemate works in his favor, moreover, because it leaves the initiative entirely on the Communist side. The Kremlin will have two choices:

1. To pin down enough of its puppet forces to keep the stalemate in being, and start aggression somewhere else. It has plenty of satellite manpower for this purpose.

2. To use the stalemate period to build up power for a showdown—not only more ground troops but a large tactical air force and perhaps a flotilla of submarines "lend-leased" to the Chinese. The training of an air force has doubtless been under way since June; while every day more Red jet planes appear in the Manchurian skies. When the accumulated force is judged to be sufficient, another attempt to destroy the UN armies in Korea can be made.

RETREAT TOO RAPID

That is exactly what was attempted in the Battle of the Yalu River. It failed only because our retreat was too rapid and our air action too severe. Even then, our forces were roadbound, with vehicles bumper-to-bumper for miles. We would have been sitting ducks for hostile tactical air force. The enemy, we must assume, has learned the lesson. If he chooses another battle of extermination, we must expect he will have an air arm, and will be able to cut off evacuation and supply by sea.

Even if Communist air power is not as large or as good as ours, it will engage our air forces; and with the air elements locked in mortal combat, superior ground strength will become decisive. Of the choices open to the Politburo, the second—another build-up for a final offensive—seems more likely now that Stalin, in his recent interview, has staked his personal prestige on a Korean victory.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point excerpts from an article entitled "Maginot Mentality," written by Viscount Trenchard, Marshal

of the RAF. The subheading is "The West are putting too much manpower and material into defense and not giving enough priority to a fleet of long-range aircraft, the striking power of which would deter any aggressor."

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

MAGINOT MENTALITY—"THE WEST ARE PUTTING TOO MUCH MANPOWER AND MATERIAL INTO DEFENSE AND NOT GIVING ENOUGH PRIORITY TO A FLEET OF LONG-RANGE AIRCRAFT, THE STRIKING POWER OF WHICH WOULD DETER ANY AGGRESSOR," SAYS MARSHAL OF THE ROYAL AIR FORCE, VISCOUNT TRENCHARD

I have listened to many discussions and read a number of articles on plans that are being made for defense in order to prevent war, or, should war come, to ensure that the civilized powers are not placed at a disadvantage.

Much is being said about the Atlantic Pact, the Brussels Pact, and arrangements for the defense of the Far East, Korea, Formosa, Malaya, and the Middle East. Papers and periodicals publish large numbers of maps of various parts of the world illustrating the positions of overseas bases, the dispositions of potential enemy forces and sources of raw material; for maps have always influenced military thought and planning, and they always will.

At the end of the nineteenth and beginning of the twentieth century, maps in British schools showed Great Britain in the center, America on the left and Europe and Asia on the right. Moreover, the Mercator projection (which shows the whole world on a flat surface, thus distorting the relative size of the countries) was very misleading.

OLD MAPS USELESS

With the rise of aviation and consequent discussions on the use of air power, it was apparent that the old maps were not only inaccurate, but gave a completely wrong military impression. In fact, the study of aerial warfare has made it necessary to alter our conventional ideas of the map of the world.

When I was Chief of the Air Staff, 30 years ago, I obtained a map with the American continent in the center, instead of Britain. This gave me quite a different idea of the world from a military point of view.

Many years later I found that the Brookings Institute at Washington, United States of America, had published a map of the world divided into two hemispheres. This showed that the land hemisphere, embracing all Europe, Asia, Africa, North America, and the greater part of South America, contained 94 percent of the world's population and 98 percent of its industrial activity, whereas only 6 percent of the population and 2 percent industrial activity are to be found in the water hemisphere.

This, in my opinion, is a more accurate conception of reality than is provided by the old Mercator maps, to which we have all been so long accustomed, and it proves that to all intents and purposes of strategy we have only to deal with one hemisphere.

I feel that the services and political authorities have not yet fully realized how air power has altered the world; how distances have shortened. Space on this planet has been conquered; there is no such thing today. It does not make sense to talk about the Atlantic Pact, the Brussels Pact, or the Middle East or Far East. It is now one world.

During the 1914-18 war, defensive warfare became so formidable that trench warfare was forced on the opposing armies, and because of this many people thought that this form of combat had come to stay. So

much was it believed that the French built their Maginot Line and we fortified Singapore, Hong Kong, and other places without making aerodromes; yet the next war proved all these defensive measures to be quite useless. This was due in a large part to the development of air power.

During the 1933-45 war, we learned that it was essential to have aerodromes surrounding all the enemies' territory at strategic points, from which bombing raids could be carried out. This was necessary because of the comparatively limited range of fighter aircraft providing cover, but we are under no such limitations today. I have said that space has been conquered on this planet. We can now build, and have built, fighter and bomber aircraft with a range of 5,000 miles and more. These machines can carry a load of bombs or an atom bomb to any part of the land hemisphere.

A RUDE AWAKENING

In the 1939-45 war it took hundreds of aircraft to do the work which one can do today carrying the atom bomb. It is no exaggeration to say that one or two bombers can do the damage a thousand did on Cologne, or Hamburg—and can travel 10 times the distance to do it.

It has been said, perhaps with truth, that the military staffs of all nations always make their plans and prepare for the last war. As far as I can see, that is what is being done now; we are preparing to fight the next war on the basis of 1939-45—like the Maginot line after the 1914-18 war. If this is so, and a third world war comes, I fear we shall have a rude awakening.

In the last great war air bases were fought for all over the world. In the islands of the Pacific, in North Africa, in southern Europe, and many other places, with all that it meant in transporting millions of men to hold air bases or islands; the millions of tons of war material, the thousands of ships to carry them and the ships to protect the transports from submarines. It was necessary to have the air bases to provide cover for the ships and armies. But with the tremendous increase in range and striking power of modern aircraft, these scattered bases are unnecessary, and to plan on the lines of the 1939-45 war over again is to be caught in a vicious circle.

Yet we are still talking of balanced forces between the navy, army, and air force—which presumably means that we intend to use ships and their escort vessels, that we mean to maintain garrisons in far-distant places, and keep those garrisons supplied with millions of tons of war material, and that the ships and garrisons will have to be protected from the hazards of submarines and air attacks on their lines of communication throughout the world.

The western democracies are at a disadvantage with regard to manpower for armies. They are at a disadvantage economically in that they have high standards of life to maintain. Can the western peoples keep up their standard of life and provide sufficient of their balanced forces in all parts of the world to repulse aggression at any point chosen by the Communists? The answer is "No."

VITAL FRONT

Can the western democracies build up an invincible fleet of long-range aircraft whose striking power would deter any aggressor? Could this fleet actually repulse aggression with few or no ground troops to help it? The answer to the first question is "Yes," and to the second question "Yes"—after the 3 or 4 years it would take to build the necessary aircraft.

I do not suggest that we should withdraw our troops from Germany and Austria; indeed, it is essential to maintain and even

build up our position in Europe; on that vital front we cannot afford to yield an inch. Moreover, at the present moment we have not the long-range aircraft and therefore it is necessary to have a strong army and tactical air forces on the Continent while we are building a powerful air fleet.

Europe; on that vital front we cannot afford to yield an inch. Moreover at the present moment we have not the long-range aircraft and therefore it is necessary to have a strong army and tactical air forces on the Continent while we are building a powerful air fleet.

The next few years should be a period of transition during which time we should place the weight of our defensive preparation on the side of long-range aircraft, and thus, as our air power increases, the strain of maintaining large ground forces overseas would be progressively reduced.

My object in writing this article is to insure that we begin to build these essential type of machines now, and not wait, as we did in 1939, until after war has started. Then we were fortunate in being granted time, but in the next war, time may not be on our side.

I would recommend that those who are prepared to consider these matters should read the new book, *Air Power: Key To Survival*, by Major de Serversky (Simon & Schuster, New York, 1950). This book is nearer to my own views on defense questions than anything I have heard or read, in this country or any other, about the future of world defense.

The peoples of the West are at an advantage in that they have a high standard of general education and technical development. They can maintain their standard of life and at the same time develop one type of force which can strike anywhere on the earth. By the might of her navy, nineteenth-century Britain ruled the majority of the world, and by the might of an air fleet of 10 times the range and 500 times the striking power of the last war, western civilization can face and overcome the menace from the East.

If we wholeheartedly and unreservedly put our weight into producing the machines to be operated from home bases in Britain and the United States of America, this would give us far greater security than establishing or maintaining these far-distant bases, which are only moderately safe in the world today.

By this means we should save untold manpower and material, and the saving thus achieved could be put into the provision of more and more long-range aircraft. It is the greater range of aircraft and not the atom bomb that has changed warfare.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, the global and national intent of the measures introduced in Congress by the operatives of the administration is clear. In this connection I call attention to a pamphlet entitled "The Plan To Enslave Congress and You," by Upton Close and John Howland Snow, and I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD the marked excerpts on pages 71 and 72, inclusive.

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

VI. ITS GLOBAL AND NATIONAL INTENT

WHAT THIS IS ALL LEADING TO IS SHOWN BY CERTAIN KEY MEASURES

1. The declaration that world government is the fundamental purpose of American foreign policy. Resolutions to this end were presented in the House of Representatives in June 1949 by 91 Members, including a majority of the Foreign Affairs Committee.

(This move was hand in glove with the Humber, or similar, resolution which had been adopted by the legislatures of 21 States. These State resolutions call for a constitutional convention. The purpose of this convention is to amend the Constitution of the United States to make possible the world government. This would end the independent existence of the United States.)¹

2. The "reciprocal" Trade Agreements Act, the International Trade Organization (whose text of agreement was withheld from the Congress for at least 2 years), and all corollary international charters, agreements, treaties, etc., that began with the master lend-lease agreement. This gradually lowers American standards to those of the rest of the world.

3. The Full Employment Act of 1950 (H. R. 1177) and the Employment Guarantee Act (H. R. 436), sponsored by Representatives PATMAN and KEARNS. These two bills go hand in hand with S. 2337, noted on page 35 herein. S. 2337 provides that illness or disability may be certified by a doctor, or by any qualified Government official.² Under its provisions, an unemployed citizen is no longer honestly described as "unemployed"—he is a "reserve worker." To receive compensation, he "complies with all of the rules and regulations issued by the [executive controlled] Employment Service."³ He is, further, subject to "measures designed to facilitate [his] orderly and economic transfer * * * from one geographical area to another as the general welfare may require."⁴

4. The over-all bill of (executive) dictatorship, H. R. 2756. This is known as the Spence bill. Here are fascism, socialism, national socialism, and communism, all wrapped in one. Any of the labels is appropriate. It is of this bill that Dr. Edwin G. Nourse, shortly after resigning his chairmanship of the President's Council of Economic Advisers, wrote:

It "provided for promotion of production and supply, priorities and allocations, price control and decontrol, and 'the adjustment of wages, salaries, and other benefits through collective bargaining.' It was widely hailed by those who believed in it as a new action program by government to carry the Employment Act into effect. Those who feared this bill branded it as the opening wedge to nationalization of industry and eventual state socialism" (Colliers, February 18, 1950).

These over-all measures rapidly advance a master plan intended to make the central government the material godfather of us all.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, those excerpts include references to four important resolutions and bills—special legislation—designed to transfer power from the legislative branch, to the execu-

tive. Included among them are the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act and the International Trade Organization Charter. This agreement was withheld from the Congress for at least 2 years. The excerpts also refer to all corollary international charters, agreements, treaties, and so forth, beginning with the master lend-lease agreement.

Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD, as a part of my remarks, excerpts from pages 73 and 74 of the same pamphlet.

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

VII. THE MANIPULATION OF MONEY, DEBT, AND TAXES

AMOUNT OF DEBT LOADED ON AMERICAN TAXPAYERS THROUGH THE MANIPULATION OF CONGRESS

The relative cost of government when it was in the hands of elected representatives of the people, and since it has become the exclusive affair of an Executive cabal, now becomes painfully clear.

The Federal Government cost its citizens \$179,620,113,645 to operate from the date of its birth in 1789 to June 30, 1941. (This sum includes the cost of all wars up to 1941, including both the Civil War and World War I. It includes the losses incurred from Europe's repudiation of that war's debts. It includes the billions spent by the Roosevelt regime's antidepression measures which, according to Mr. Roosevelt's own words, reached the ultimate limit for national debt.)

Thirty-two Presidents headed a representative Government that expended just under \$180,000,000,000 in a hundred and fifty-two years.

Then the Executive cabal took over. We learned about "democracy" and the Socialist welfare state. Since 1945, one President (Truman) has headed the executive branch of a political authority that has cost the people \$191,081,394,191—in less than 5 years.—(Statistics by researchers Harry S. Barger and Paul O. Peters.)

Compared with 1929 the population had increased 22 percent, and the situation was as follows:

The people paid to "Government" 82 times what they paid in 1929;

"Government" spent 94 times what it spent in 1929;

The public debt was 139 times what it was in 1929.

This picture means national bankruptcy. By political propagandists it is lightly dismissed as "modern deficit finance."

"THE DOLLAR OF —"

Under certain conditions, said Mr. Truman in his 1950 state of the Union message, "the real income of the average family in the year A. D. 2000 would be about three times what it is today." The press figured this would give the average family \$12,600 a year—based on the dollar of 1948.

The phrase "based on the dollar of 1948" is the key. The dollar, one sees, is like wine. It is now identified by year.

Some wine is made to sparkle by artificial carbonation. Currencies are like that. The carbonation of money is inflation. The France Chambre des Députés once made its fellow-citizens dizzy with paper money called assignats, then wiped out the French middle class (including, incidentally, themselves) in the ensuing crash. Everyone had a lot of fun—until the crash.

The identical process is in operation here; so far it has reached only the giddy stage.

Hence the term "1948 dollar." In the absence (since 1934) of what should be a standard dollar, a standard of comparison has to be arbitrarily made.

As a matter of fact, Mr. Truman's average family income (\$12,600 as figured by the press) can be created overnight, and "in terms of the 1948 dollar." All the Executive cabal has to do is inject more dollar carbonation. All it has to do is increase "deficit finance" (progressive bankruptcy). To do this it creates more paper money or it expands bank-credit money, or both.

Nature then takes care of the matter and history repeats itself. The pressure gets too great, the cork goes off with a bang, and the carbonated wine foams out. The empty bottle is all that remains.

That is the way it is with savings, values, and banks.

The people are left with the hang-over.

It is the lesson of all the "managed currencies" of history, throughout all recorded time.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD, as a part of my remarks, an excerpt from the book *Air Power: Key to Survival*, by Maj. Alexander P. de Seversky. The excerpts which I wish to have printed in the RECORD appear on pages 49, 50, and 51.

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

The dominant current conception of security through a balanced force operating from a chain of bases means only one thing: an effort to perpetuate the methods and the weapons of the last war. It is our own Maginot line.

I have before me a batch of enthusiastic articles seeking to sell the official program to the American people. All of them talk about the new strategy and ingenious innovations. But in the end they describe a slightly refurbished version of World War II. The suppositious novelties are in the improved weapons rather than in the fundamental strategy.

Here is the essence of their forecasts: Great West European and American land forces equipped with tactical aviation will try to stem the tide of the Red army on the Elbe or on the Rhine. A ring of bases around the Eurasian continent will be in part prepared in advance, in part conquered by land-sea-air teams at the outbreak of war. Thus our present bombardment aircraft—still overwhelmingly of the B-29 and B-50 types, which is to say of a 2,000-mile striking radius—will be put into position to hammer at the strategic vitals of the enemy.

Meanwhile a mighty Navy cruising under an umbrella of its own air power will keep the sea lanes open for a continuous flow of supplies to the far-flung network of bases. When the enemy has been sufficiently softened, ground forces will move in for the kill, fighting every inch of the way against the opposing armies.

But what would happen if the Red tide of 300 or 500 divisions refuses to be dammed on the Rhine by the hoped for 45 allied divisions and overflows to the Atlantic? What if those outlying bases, dependent on long supply lines but open to massed attack by the whole opposing air power from its home bases, should be obliterated? Such disquieting questions are rarely asked and never answered in the officially inspired articles.

I submit that there is nothing new in this picture projected from Washington. Indeed, insofar as it ignores the defeat of Japan without a major land battle or invasion, it is a long step backward from the experience of the last war.

¹ Georgia was one of those States. In January of 1946 its general assembly adopted House Resolution 96, which called for constitutional convention for such purpose. The illusion lasted 4 years—almost to the day. In January 1950 the sovereign State of Georgia adopted H. R. 146, and declared that said resolution of 1946 be now repudiated and that the General Assembly of Georgia go on record as opposing the principles of world federation. As far as the State of Georgia is concerned, this action has saved the sovereign existence of these United States. Informed Georgians had laid careful documentation of the fraud before the often-amazed men who had believed that such a convention should be held. H. R. 146 was introduced by Representatives Aycock, Blitch, Hood, McCracken, Smith, and Twitty.

² Secs. 105a and 203.

³ Sec. 102b.

⁴ Sec. 301 (23).

Intellectually, the current strategy is at the stage where World War II began. We are witnessing the Maginot line mentality at work, imposing the American equivalent of the super trench upon the country.

The proposed use of improved weapons and explosives—atom bombs, jet propulsion, rockets, guided missiles, etc.—changes the tactics, not the strategy. The enhanced weapons are as secondary as the fact that the Maginot line was technically more efficient than a World War I trench. We are still involved in a division of national effort to provide the largest armies, navies, and air forces at the same time—with minimal reference to their real functions. The kind of conservatism that denied priority to bombers as late as 1942 still prevails.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed as a part of my remarks excerpts from pages 29 to 35 of the book, the Key to Peace, by Clarence Manion.

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

Our forefathers were wise enough to see that this indestructible soul was the eternal quality that all Americans—indeed that all men everywhere—had and have in common with one another. Far from making a new God out of society the American Revolution was an official public acknowledgment of the one true preexisting God, the Creator of all men and source of all the rights of men. While the Europeans were sowing the materialistic winds of their political and economic storms, our founding fathers were building Americanism upon the firm foundations of religious faith. When the French revolutionaries were hammering men into mere matter, the American revolutionaries were exalting and safeguarding man's spirit. The European system was molding men into masses and classes at the same time that the American system was dedicating itself to the task of preserving the integrity of the individual personality.

DEATHLESS DECLARATION

So that there could be no possible mistake about its object and purpose, our founding fathers caused the American Republic officially and with the first breath of its new life to declare:

"We hold these truths to be self-evident; that all men are created equal; that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights; that among these are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. That to secure these rights, governments are instituted among men, deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed."

Here is the distilled essence of Americanism as stated in the first official document of the new United States of America, the Declaration of Independence. These are the eternal principles upon which our Puritans, Cavaliers, Catholics, Protestants, Jews, gentiles, French, Germans, Dutch, Swedes, Scotch, Irish, and others came together on a permanent and peaceful basis. Because each of them was equal before God, all of these people were made equal before the law of the land. Because their rights were bestowed by their Heavenly Creator, no power on earth could take those rights away. Since God had created each of them as individuals with personal and immortal destinies, no man, majority, or government could hereafter treat or regard any of them as an indistinguishable part of a class, collective or group.

REVOLUTION STILL WORKING

These are the basic articles of our American faith. They constitute the axes upon which the wheels of our dynamic American Revolution go round and round even to this hour. In other parts of the world the wheels

of materialistic skepticism still whirl in the opposite direction. The two revolutionary forces are violently opposed to one another. Each tends to draw first into its orbit and then into its vortex all political, economic, and social movements as rapidly as they appear in any part of the world. At this time their fight for world supremacy is more bitter than ever before, and there is universal consciousness of the fact that one or the other of these two forces eventually must triumph.

SUICIDAL ENTRAPMENT

In America today the grinding noise of the turning European wheel is ever more and more audible. Sparks from its materialistic engine fall constantly on all parts of the United States. Here on our very own soil fanatical firebrands of Europeanism are constantly directing these sparks to the more inflammable portions of our American social order; to minority groups, to labor, to capital, to consumers, and to producers, to the little fellows, to the special interests, to the "haves" and to the "have nots."

In our confusion we give the firebrands an initial and partial success by fighting back with their own choice of weapons, namely, "class consciousness." We let them skillfully trap us into a defense of or an attack upon these "classes" as such, instead of striking at the firebrands themselves with the sharp and devastating weapon forged in our own Revolution and unheated before the world in the American Declaration of Independence. That weapon is the personal God-given integrity of each freeman in the American classless society.

Not because he is a Jew, gentile, white, black, consumer, producer, farmer, merchant, laborer or capitalist, but because he is a man with a personal immortal destiny, each of our citizens is entitled to the equal protection of American Government and to the equal respect of his fellow Americans. Constant frustration of this basic American doctrine reiterates the disintegrating centrifugal forces of Europeanism by a positive acceleration of our own centripetal machine. No informed American needs to concede anything to any one of the many insidious forms of European collectivism. Any such concession reverses the unanimous verdict of all of our ancestors.

FOUNDERS FARSIGHTED

History shows that in all its forms collectivism corrodes the nature of men at the same time that it poisons the whole stream of civilization. It is a fanatical and futile effort to substitute a man-made concept for the God-made man.

In their own time our shrewd revolutionary forefathers saw this basic issue of personal rights as clearly as the regulated and regimented Englishman undoubtedly sees it today. The United States was consequently born of the conviction that human rights are worth their price. For the basic all-important natural right of the individual person against his own Government it was necessary in 1776 to pay the high price of a bloody revolution.

It so happens that in making this purchase we incidentally cornered the world market on those same rights of the individual against his Government, which now and always constitute the sole and only insurance against despotism.

NO COMPETITION

With one or two highly debatable exceptions, ours is the only country in the whole world in which the individual man holds substantial, natural personal rights he can require everybody, including his government, to respect and observe. This is the goal for which the founding fathers risked their lives, their fortunes, and their sacred honor in their fateful and deathless Declaration of Independence. To attain the great

objective it was necessary for them to bypass contemporary corruption of English constitutional law and drive straight through Magna Carta all the way back to the Book of Genesis:

"And God created man in his own image, male and female, He created them."

Many of our American conditions and institutions are a great deal less than perfect. There are inequities and injustices in our country that we can and must remedy. But there is nothing wrong in the United States that an Europeanism can correct or that a firm and fearless application of the principles of our Declaration of Independence cannot cure.

DEMONSTRATED EFFECTIVENESS

All of the foregoing is mere conclusion of fact. Available statistics simply demonstrate that Europe is now and has long been basically deficient in what it takes to contain a large and diversified population in reasonable contentment. Figures likewise show that America has been a magnet for all kinds of people of every race and circumstance and that the same force that drew them here, managed to hold them together in peace and order after they got here. But we must quickly know more than this if we are to preserve this magnetic ingredient of the American system and at the same time, prevent the utter collapse of European civilization.

Why does the American system succeed where the European system fails? If we can answer this question scientifically without rhapsodical guesswork, we can save and improve our fabled way of life and at the same time regenerate the civilization of Europe with a sustained transfusion of basic American principles.

MORALITY AND FAITH

Our American forefathers knew that God must be in the government of any people in order to insure them against despotism. This shrewd and practical formula for the protection of human liberty became an integral part of the American political tradition. In that tradition liberty is always honored as a soft, sweet breath of heaven, just as every form of despotism is despised as a blast from hell. For 300 years after America was discovered, many varieties of people came here in search of personal liberty. All of them were scrupulous in their official reliance upon God as the source and stem of that precious objective.

CONCLUSION

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, in conclusion, I wish to say that it must be recognized that the United States of America is stumbling along in the dark. Congress scarcely recognizes that it has transferred to the Executive most of the real authority and the real responsibility given to Congress, the legislative branch of the Government, by the Constitution of the United States. One of the principal ways we have done this is by passing and extending the 1934 Trade Agreements Act which transfer to the executive branch of the Government the power to regulate the national economy. The 1934 Trade Agreements Act is at this moment, before one of the most important committees of the Senate, for renewal for 3 years. It seems impossible that anyone should misunderstand the dangers inherent in a further extension of that act.

The survival of the United States will be decided right here in the Congress of the United States. Let the Congress re-assume its constitutional responsibilities; let the Congress again exercise all of its powers which were assigned to it from

the beginnings of our country, and there will be no doubt about the survival of the United States.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD, as a part of my remarks, an excerpt from the pamphlet *Foreign Trade—Fair and Reasonable Competition Against Free Trade*. The portion I wish to have printed at this point in the RECORD appears on pages 3 and 4.

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

FOREIGN TRADE—FAIR AND REASONABLE COMPETITION AGAINST FREE TRADE

SUMMARY

(Remarks of Hon. GEORGE W. MALONE, of Nevada)

The two vital functions of government were pointedly separated and delegated by the Constitution of the United States:

A. To the Congress of the United States, the legislative branch: The regulation of the national economy through its jurisdiction over foreign commerce by adjusting tariffs and import fees, and other factors.

B. To the President, the executive branch: The fixing of the foreign policy.

First. Congress should immediately recover its constitutional responsibility to regulate foreign trade through the adjustment of tariffs and import fees—through the simple expedient of allowing the 1934 Trade Agreements Act (so-called Reciprocal Trade Act) to expire on June 12, 1951.

Second. The flexible provision, section 336 of the 1930 Tariff Act, is in full force and effect on all products not covered by any trade agreement.

In the event that Congress does not extend the 1934 Trade Agreements Act the flexible provision of the 1930 Tariff Act will again become operative. Under this provision the Tariff Commission may raise or lower tariffs or import fees 50 percent, after proper hearings, to equalize differences in cost of production in the United States and in the principal competing countries.

Third. The very fact that an industrially inexperienced State Department may tamper with any tariff or import fee at any time endangers the floor under wages and investments—and prevents the flow of venture capital into the business stream of the Nation even in time of emergency, since investors know that when the emergency is over the investment is destroyed through foreign sweatshop labor competition.

They are wrecking the national economy of this Nation under the cover of war.

Fourth. The expiration of the 1934 Trade Agreements Act in no way affects the so-called trade agreements already made and in effect for any definite period, and they continue in effect following that definite period unless and until 6 months' notice of cancellation is formally given.

Fifth. The haphazard lowering of the floor under wages and investments represented by the tariffs and import fees destroys the American workingman and shifts his job to foreign soil. As a result many of our mines, mills, and factories have been closed, our fuel production curtailed, and farm production saved only by subsidies.

Sixth. "Reciprocal trade" is a misnomer. Trade agreements are not made under the act. They are agreements with a foreign nation to lower tariffs and import fees. Such foreign nation then resorts to import quotas, embargoes, specifications, and manipulation of their currencies to void the benefits given the United States. "Reciprocal trade" was a catch phrase to sell free trade to the American people and wreck the national economy.

Seventh. The use of the most-favored-nation clause under which concessions made to any single nation are immediately extended to all others is diametrically opposed to the principle of reciprocity, if any in fact existed.

Under the 1934 Trade Agreements Act the State Department may select the industries that are to survive—and those to be sacrificed on the altar of "one economic world."

Eighth. Only recurring "emergencies" have averted a complete collapse of our national economy under the 1934 Trade Agreements Act as administered by the State Department. In peacetime the products of low-wage-living-standard labor come in unchecked and displace American workers, thus destroying the American market.

Ninth. With the lapse of the 1934 Trade Agreements Act the flexible provision of the 1930 Tariff Act takes over. Congress can then improve its operation and the trade agreements already in effect through the offered amendment, Senate bill 981, under which a market is immediately established for all foreign goods on the basis of fair and reasonable competition.

Any improvement in their wage-living standards would be recognized by a corresponding reduction in the tariff or import fee and when their standards approximate our own then the common objective of free trade would be the almost immediate and automatic result.

Tenth. Under the flexible import fee principle as laid down in the 1930 Tariff Act and in the offered amendment, Senate bill 981, there is no consideration of a high or a low tariff or import fee.

The principle of "fair and reasonable" competition is the sole criterion representing the differential of cost of production due to the difference in the wage-living standards, inflation, manipulation of currencies, and other pertinent factors. The bill immediately establishes an American market for foreign goods on a definite basis, reestablishing the principle of a floor under wages and investments.

Karl Marx on free trade—1848

Karl Marx, the outstanding Communist revolutionist of all time, made a very significant address more than 102 years ago on the subject of free trade before the Democratic Club, Brussels, Belgium, January 9, 1848. He said at that time:

"In his celebrated work upon political economy, he [Ricardo, the leading economist of his time] says: 'If instead of growing our own corn * * * we discover a new market from which we can supply ourselves * * * at a cheaper price, wages will fall and profits rise. The fall in the price of agricultural produce reduces the wages, not only of the laborer employed in cultivating the soil, but also of all those employed in commerce or manufacture.'

"Besides this, the protective system helps to develop free competition within a nation. Hence we see that in countries where the bourgeoisie is beginning to make itself felt as a class, in Germany for example, it makes great efforts to obtain protective duties. They serve the bourgeoisie as weapons against feudalism and absolute monarchy, as a means for the concentration of its own powers for the realization of free trade within the country.

"But, generally speaking, the protective system in these days is conservative, while the free-trade system works destructively. It breaks up old nationalities and carries antagonism of proletariat and bourgeoisie to the uttermost point. In a word, the free-trade system hastens the social revolution. In this revolutionary sense alone, gentlemen, I am in favor of free trade."

The principle has not changed in the 102 years since the outstanding Communist of all time said in effect that free trade destroys the workingman, and now, since the invest-

ment in industry has risen from a few dollars per employed man to an average of approximately \$10,000, the investor is an equal victim.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD, as a part of my remarks, the statement I made in regard to Senate bill 1, the Universal Military Training and Service Act of 1951, at the hearings held before the Preparedness Subcommittee of the Committee on Armed Services of the United States Senate, Eighty-second Congress, first session. Those hearings were held from January 10 to February 2, 1951. My statement may be found on pages 1171-1173.

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

STATEMENT OF HON. GEORGE W. MALONE, UNITED STATES SENATOR FROM THE STATE OF NEVADA

UNIVERSAL MILITARY TRAINING VERSUS UNIVERSAL MILITARY SERVICE

Senator MALONE. Mr. Chairman, I would like to say, since the hearings are closing today, that I am disturbed by the change in the principle between the original Russell-Malone bill introduced as S. 1 and the Marshall-Rosenberg substitute. Mr. Chairman, since I was one of the sponsors of the universal military training bill, and since the substitute known as the universal military service bill has not even a remote resemblance to the original bill, I am compelled to appear in opposition to it.

CHANGES TRAINED CITIZENS' RESERVE TO A PROFESSIONAL ARMY

The substitute completely changes the principle of the proposed military training from a trained citizens' reserve army under the UMT to a professional army under a universal military service bill.

The Defense Department conscription plan changes a civilian Reserve training policy of 4 to 6 months, or whatever the committee may have finally established, providing for alternate educational programs in colleges, academies, or officer training schools, or whatever scientific training might have been chosen or to be selected, to a 27 months' continuous active service followed by 69 months' Inactive Reserve duty or a total of 8 years' obligation for the entire service. The Marshall-Rosenberg substitute for the Russell-Malone bill apparently has the blessing of the State Department.

MAY TRAIN ARMY IN ANY NATION ANY PLACE

The Marshall-Rosenberg substitute provides for 27 months' continuous service, and that the President may send them anywhere to any nation outside of the United States for training or fighting at his discretion without consulting Congress further.

Senator JOHNSON. Training in the United States, but service can be anywhere.

Senator MALONE. I understand that nothing in the bill prohibits the President from sending the inducted troops to train or fight anywhere at any time without further approval of Congress.

DESTROYS CIVILIAN TRAINING UNITS

Then automatically he enters the Reserve for approximately 6 years, after his 27 months' service. The changes destroy the National Guard and class A Organized Reserve; certainly it would tend to destroy the National Guard. The original bill would have preserved the civilian training units.

No recruits will be available to National Guard and Organized Reserves for 27 months. The civilian components will shrink to almost nothing in that time.

Practically all Reserves except Army reserves and one-third the National Guard have already been called to duty.

We will have a regular armed force of 3,500,000 with no Organized Reserves from June 30, 1952, and thereafter. This big professional army will be too small to scare or fight Russia but it will denude our labor market and our colleges and cost billions we do not have.

The Marshall-Rosenberg substitute professional defense force will contain an estimated 1,400,000 ground troops. These cost \$5,000 per year per man.

Present cost of National Guard men and class A Reserves in \$601 per year per man.

THE TRAINED CIVILIAN ARMY METHOD

If all eligibles are inducted for Army training as proposed by the Defense Department bill and on completion of training one-half are chosen by lot or selection board for duty in the National Guard and Organized Reserves, the following results will obtain:

June 30, 1952

	Regular Army Infantry	Civilian components
Number.....	1,000,000	400,000
Cost.....	\$5,000,000,000	\$240,000,000

Saving \$1,760,000,000 over cost of 1,400,000 Regulars.

Four hundred thousand men would have been sent home to families, jobs, and schools and for duty in the Organized Reserves.

This process can be continued until the Reserve force in being is 1,000,000, 2,000,000, or 3,000,000, whatever Congress thinks the threat requires.

These men will be stationed all over the United States, where they will be immediately available in the event of air-borne raid or atom bombing.

Thus, we can build more long-range defensive strength against communism for less money and we can keep a large proportion of young Americans at home, on the job, and in school.

THE PEOPLE CONFUSED!

The country is entirely confused about the Marshall-Rosenberg substitute while still retaining Senate bill 1. My recent mail indicates the people believe that the substitute upon which the hearings have been held is the original Russell-Malone American Legion or veterans' bill, which several of us joined in introducing.

This is the third time I have joined in the introduction of the universal military training bill, but I find now the hearings are not being held on the universal military training bill that was originally introduced at all. The hearings are being held on the substitute universal military service bill which, while retaining the Senate bill 1 designation, changes the entire policy and procedure and character of the Army.

The completely different principle established by the substitute universal military service bill can be changed by this committee following the hearings, and of course they can report the original bill to the Senate floor if they so desire, and I am hopeful that they will do just that.

Senator JOHNSON. The Chair would like to interject that any misapprehension the people have been laboring under is not due to anything the committee did or failed to do. We had 10 days of hearings before we had a hearing on any bill. We had hearings on the general manpower problem. At the end of that 10-day period the Department of Defense finally, at the urging of the chairman of this committee, brought forth a bill, at which time it was announced on the floor of the Senate, and in the committee, that this bill would be introduced by request.

We have taken testimony on that bill, introduced by request, since that time.

It is true that the American Legion and the veterans' organizations have come here and testified on this bill, introduced as an amendment by request, and have embraced it and endorsed it, but we have never left the impression or never intended to or never wanted to convey the information to the country that we were holding hearings on the original S. 1.

Senator MALONE. Mr. Chairman, I am sure that you, the chairman, had never had any idea of any misrepresentation; but I will call to the attention of the chairman that the Russell-Malone universal military training bill was introduced on the first day bills were accepted on the Senate floor, and was before this committee from the beginning before any hearings were started, but the Marshall-Rosenberg bill was immediately substituted and no hearings were ever held on the Russell-Malone bill.

NOT IN ACCORD WITH THE SUBSTITUTE

Mr. Chairman, I considered it important to clarify the matter from my own personal standpoint, and to say that I am not in accord with the bill upon which hearings are now being held.

The committee, of course, may, if it so desires, revert to the original Russell-Malone universal military training bill, which the veterans of this Nation have supported in principle for 25 years.

Mr. Chairman, since the principle of S. 1, which I joined in introducing, has been changed from a trained citizen's reserve army to a professional army status, and that 18-year-old boys are to be inducted for 27 months' actual service plus 69 months' Reserve status, instead of a 4 to 6 months' training period, and then left at home until actually needed, I felt constrained to appear in opposition to it.

The bill under consideration by the subcommittee is not the Russell-Malone universal military training bill represented in S. 1, but it is the Marshall-Rosenberg bill supported by the State Department.

Senator JOHNSON. Thank you a lot, sir.
Senator MALONE. Thank you very much.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD, as a part of my remarks, a statement of mine quoted in the Julius Klein Newsletter, a review dealing with national and international events.

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

WAR COLLEGE PLAN FOR KOREA IGNORED BY ADMINISTRATION

(By Hon. GEORGE W. MALONE, United States Senator from Nevada)

When there was Communist aggression in Korea last June, Truman was handed an intelligent plan by which we could punish the aggressors. It was a smart plan, prepared in our War College by cool heads and sharp brains. Under this plan we would not send ground troops into South Korea. Instead, we would blockade Korea and begin systematic destruction of the industry and transport of North Korea.

True, the Communists could push into South Korea, but then what would be their situation? An enemy which they could not reach would be standing off in safety pounding them to death. The United States would be in the smart position of being able to punish without being made to suffer; the Communists would be in the stupid position of having to take punishment from a foe which they could not reach.

This plan was urged upon Truman, but he followed the counsel of Marshall and Ache-

son, who advised him to send in the ground troops; and thus the Unholy Three committed this nation to the stupid position and left the smart position to the Moscow strategists.

The Americans who have lost their lives and limbs in the Korean ground fighting are sacrifices to the stupidity of Truman and Marshall and Acheson.

This act alone should prove that the President should not have the sole authority to send an unlimited number of troops anywhere without Congress issuing approval.

With such failures in leadership it is hardly surprising that a neoisolationism, born of despondency, is spreading among the American people. The voices of Joseph P. Kennedy and Herbert Hoover, crying retreat, are falling on receptive ears. But, there is still time to save Western Europe and perhaps Asia; the world is not yet lost, if only men of vision can be brought to power in Washington.

We need not withdraw from Europe to the extent of inviting Stalin to take over. We can use our strong air power, Navy and submarine fleets to defend any area of the world which is vital to our own ultimate security and well-being, with Europe and Asia furnishing the foot soldiers in those areas.

Just as in Korea, Truman, Marshall, and Acheson are wrong when they propose to safeguard Western Europe with American ground divisions.

Western Europe is only an enlarged Korea. Korea is a peninsula of Manchuria—and Europe is a peninsula of Russia. And now that Russia has cut Europe in half, and there has been a Russo-Chinese consolidation, no intelligent military man believes that an invasion of Western Europe can be prevented by ground armies.

How then do we prevent an invasion of Europe and a consolidation of all Europe against us?

Here is the plan presented by me in the Senate on December 14 and more fully detailed in my address to the Senate on February 5:

"1. We name those areas the integrity of which is important to our ultimate security, and we say to any aggressive nation: 'This far and no further. If you step over the line, we will loose on you from the air—upon your industrial centers, your sources of supply, your supply lines, your war-making machines—everything at our command.' We would destroy any nation's war-making capacity which sought to move into any areas whose integrity was considered important to our ultimate safety. We thus cover with a Monroe Doctrine all territory we wish to deny to the enemy. The necessary foot soldiers would be set up by the area being defended.

"2. We would select the necessary bases for strategic areas and there erect our air power and submarine bases.

"3. We then concentrate American resources and ingenuity on the creation of unchallengeable air and sea power. If we maintain this position, we can win any war with Russia or any group of nations.

"4. Forthwith stop assistance of every nature to the Communist nations and to nations in any way assisting Russia, her captive nations, and Communist China in the consolidation of Soviet gains and to prepare for world war III.

"Officially inform both France and England that they must immediately terminate the economic and military pacts which they maintain separately with Soviet Russia.

"5. Give no more money, as loans and gifts to any government as such—if necessary such loans might be made to private business in strategic areas without weakening our own economy, in the same manner and on the same terms as the RFC loans funds to private business in this country in times of stress.

"Further assistance to European nations would be predicated upon an economic union or a United States of Europe—and a free exchange of their currencies.

"6. Oppose the recognition of Communist China by the United Nations with every means at our command.

"7. Forthwith stop supporting colonial slavery in any form, anywhere.

"8. Protect and strengthen our own national economy in the interest of world security through the adoption of the flexible import fee principle as a floor under wages and investments in place of the 1934 Trade Agreements Act. Congress should reclaim its constitutional responsibility and authority which it has transferred to the executive branch of the Government.

"9. Clean up our own Government, throw out the Communists, Communist associates, adherents to foreign ideologies, persons of abnormal moral weakness, and other dangerous security risks.

"10. Start an immediate investigation through the Armed Services Committees of both Houses of Congress, to determine why we are not prepared to fight a war after the expenditure of nearly \$60,000,000,000 since 1945."

If, after we implement this plan, Russia should march across Western Europe, we will have Russia at the same disadvantage that we would have had the Communists in Korea if we had sent our air power and submarines instead of our ground troops.

We will be able to assault all the sources of Russian power, yet Russia will lack the means to retaliate in kind or degree.

We will have forced Russia into an atomic war where we hold the advantages, instead of allowing Russia to force us into a ground war where she holds the advantages.

With such a plan, freemen can again take hope.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider executive business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CASE in the chair). If there be no reports of committees, the clerk will proceed to state the nominations on the Executive Calendar.

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Richard C. Patterson, Jr., to be Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Switzerland.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

FEDERAL RESERVE SYSTEM

The legislative clerk read the nomination of William McChesney Martin, Jr., of New York, to be a member of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Alan T. Waterman, of Connecticut, to be Director of the National Science Foundation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

COLLECTOR OF CUSTOMS

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Deane E. Walker to be collector

of customs for customs collection district No. 40, with headquarters at Indianapolis, Ind.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

POSTMASTERS

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations of postmasters.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the postmaster nominations are confirmed en bloc.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I ask that the President be immediately notified of all these confirmations.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, that will be done.

RECESS

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I now move, as in legislative session, that the Senate stand in recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 7 o'clock and 38 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Thursday, March 22, 1951, at 12 o'clock meridian.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate March 21 (legislative day of March 16), 1951:

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

Richard C. Patterson, Jr., of New York, to be Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Switzerland.

FEDERAL RESERVE SYSTEM

William McChesney Martin, Jr., of New York, to be a member of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System for the unexpired term of 14 years from February 1, 1942.

NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION

Alan T. Waterman, of Connecticut, to be the Director of the National Science Foundation for a term of 6 years.

COLLECTOR OF CUSTOMS

Deane E. Walker to be collector of customs for customs collection district No. 40, with headquarters at Indianapolis, Ind.

POSTMASTERS

KANSAS

Max E. McRae, Altamont.
Lloyd E. Ashton, Fairview.
Charles E. Schneider, Glasco.
Marvin I. Lawrence, Scott City.
Daniel H. Pollet, Sedan.
John R. Fogleman, Ulysses.

MINNESOTA

Arthur J. Breen, Bemidji.
Carl F. Ardin, Cook.

NEW YORK

Fletcher R. Ward, Bemus Point.
Charles K. Myers, Frewsburg.
Robert Axter Gokey, Herrings.
Francis J. Mahoney, Highland Falls.
Lawrence J. Ewart, Ogdensburg.

PENNSYLVANIA

Clair E. Johnson, Beech Creek.
Fred E. Slick, New Florence.

SOUTH CAROLINA

Mattie Gertrude McCall, Little Rock.

IN THE ARMY

The following-named persons for appointment in the Regular Army of the United States in the grades and corps specified, under the provisions of section 506 of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947 (Public Law 381, 80th Cong.), title II of the act of August 5, 1947

(Public Law 365, 80th Cong.), Public Law 36, Eightieth Congress, as amended by Public Law 514, Eighty-first Congress, and Public Law 625, Eightieth Congress, subject to physical qualification:

To be lieutenant colonel

John F. Kellogg, Jr., MC, [REDACTED]

To be majors

Arren C. Buchanan, Jr., MC, [REDACTED]
Joseph W. Cooch, MC, [REDACTED]
James R. Drake, MC, [REDACTED]
Charles F. Kramer, MC, [REDACTED]
Francisco T. Roque, MC, [REDACTED]
Peter S. Scoles, MC, [REDACTED]
Charles E. Tegtmeyer, MC, [REDACTED]

To be captains

James P. Albrite, MC, [REDACTED]
Cora L. Allebach, ANC, [REDACTED]
Margaret F. Alt, WMSC, [REDACTED]
Louise S. Andersland, WMSC, [REDACTED]
Robena C. Anderson, ANC, [REDACTED]
Louise P. Appel, ANC, [REDACTED]
Dorothy M. Atwood, ANC, [REDACTED]
Hazel Belsit, ANC, [REDACTED]
Bernice D. Brandt, ANC, [REDACTED]
Mary Breazeale, WMSC, [REDACTED]
Rachel V. Briggs, ANC, [REDACTED]
Trevia B. Brookens, ANC, [REDACTED]
Mary L. Burrows, ANC, [REDACTED]
Marjorie J. K. Burts, ANC, [REDACTED]
Samuel W. Caldwell, MC, [REDACTED]
Helen L. Callentine, ANC, [REDACTED]
Irving H. Canfield, MC, [REDACTED]
Margaret R. Cannon, ANC, [REDACTED]
Gracie L. Chapman, ANC, [REDACTED]
Louise M. Clifford, ANC, [REDACTED]
Ruth L. Craig, ANC, [REDACTED]
Bess Crim, ANC, [REDACTED]
Geneva H. Culpepper, ANC, [REDACTED]
Mabel E. Dayton, ANC, [REDACTED]
Pamela E. Duer, WMSC, [REDACTED]
Anita M. Dumas, ANC, [REDACTED]
Anna D'Zurko, ANC, [REDACTED]
Bernice E. Epps, ANC, [REDACTED]
Hazel E. Evans, ANC, [REDACTED]
Adele F. Foreman, ANC, [REDACTED]
Margaret A. Fournelle, ANC, [REDACTED]
Bruna G. Fusi, ANC, [REDACTED]
John F. Geer, DC, [REDACTED]
Julia T. Graves, ANC, [REDACTED]
Alice Gunlogson, ANC, [REDACTED]
Pauline A. C. Gustafson, ANC, [REDACTED]
Thomas A. Haedicke, MC, [REDACTED]
Laura R. Hagen, ANC, [REDACTED]
Helen Harnett, ANC, [REDACTED]
Dorothy B. Harper, ANC, [REDACTED]
Helen G. Hayworth, ANC, [REDACTED]
Sylvia E. Hendrickson, ANC, [REDACTED]
Mary I. Hogan, ANC, [REDACTED]
Rose E. Houck, ANC, [REDACTED]
Ernest E. House, DC.
Ruth Ivey, ANC, [REDACTED]
Catherine T. Jennings, ANC, [REDACTED]
Wanda Jensen, ANC, [REDACTED]
Gladys E. Johnson, ANC, [REDACTED]
Pauline V. Johnston, ANC, [REDACTED]
Dorothy M. Kaiser, WMSC, [REDACTED]
Kathren L. Kaufman, ANC, [REDACTED]
Eva T. Kotowski, ANC, [REDACTED]
Elsie Krchnavi, ANC, [REDACTED]
Joyce J. Kruse, ANC, [REDACTED]
Hazel L. Langdon, ANC, [REDACTED]
Majorie J. Lindau, ANC, [REDACTED]
Eileen L. McCarthy, ANC, [REDACTED]
John B. McClellan, MC, [REDACTED]
Annie M. McCraw, ANC, [REDACTED]
B. Virginia McGlamery, ANC, [REDACTED]
Venona M. McGuire, ANC, [REDACTED]
Mona M. McMahon, ANC, [REDACTED]
Betty E. Messersmith, ANC, [REDACTED]
Alberta J. Miller, ANC, [REDACTED]
Freda L. Monske, ANC, [REDACTED]
Lenore L. Murphy, ANC, [REDACTED]
Margaret M. Murphy, ANC, [REDACTED]
Mary E. Murphy, ANC, [REDACTED]
Florence R. Nelson, ANC, [REDACTED]
Mary Nepsha, ANC, [REDACTED]
Irene Newman, ANC, [REDACTED]
Margaret A. Nice, ANC, [REDACTED]
Hazel S. Nicholas, ANC, [REDACTED]

Esther C. O'Neill, ANC, [REDACTED]
 Victoria R. Pavlowski, ANC, [REDACTED]
 Martha S. Pearce, ANC, [REDACTED]
 Lillie C. W. Penn, ANC, [REDACTED]
 Constance M. Perfett, ANC, [REDACTED]
 Rose L. Ponticello, ANC, [REDACTED]
 Anna M. Potochnik, ANC, [REDACTED]
 Nancy A. Probasco, ANC, [REDACTED]
 Ruth M. Roberts, ANC, [REDACTED]
 Ernestine Robertson, ANC, [REDACTED]
 Cecelia D. Romeyn, ANC, [REDACTED]
 Anne Rose, ANC, [REDACTED]
 Margaret C. Ross, ANC, [REDACTED]
 Andrew C. Ruoff III, MC, [REDACTED]
 Jean G. Russo, ANC, [REDACTED]
 Ruth P. Satterfield, ANC, [REDACTED]
 Amanda E. Schuchmann, ANC, [REDACTED]
 Estelle Smith, ANC, [REDACTED]
 Florence R. Smithers, ANC, [REDACTED]
 Margaret C. Stafford, ANC, [REDACTED]
 Donald J. Styer, DC, [REDACTED]
 Ruth M. Swanson, ANC, [REDACTED]
 Ethel M. Sylvester, ANC, [REDACTED]
 Helen C. Tannehill, ANC, [REDACTED]
 Anna L. Taylor, ANC, [REDACTED]
 Inez A. Taylor, ANC, [REDACTED]
 Agatha B. Teasley, ANC, [REDACTED]
 Nellie R. Tubellis, ANC, [REDACTED]
 Alice E. VanWart, ANC, [REDACTED]
 Stefano Vivona, MC, [REDACTED]
 Catherine U. Voetsch, ANC, [REDACTED]
 Eleanor F. Waite, ANC, [REDACTED]
 Margaret D. Wallner, ANC, [REDACTED]
 Rebecca Webber, ANC, [REDACTED]
 Zada V. Whiteman, ANC, [REDACTED]
 Jane A. Wilkinson, ANC, [REDACTED]
 Sude A. Wilkinson, ANC, [REDACTED]
 Anna R. Worthington, ANC, [REDACTED]
 Martha J. Yancey, ANC, [REDACTED]

To be first lieutenants

Cecil R. Albright, DC, [REDACTED]
 Marshall E. Bailey, JAGC, [REDACTED]
 Joseph J. Barone, DC, [REDACTED]
 Jeanne R. Bowdish, WMSC, [REDACTED]
 Mildred E. Breimyer, WMSC, [REDACTED]
 Jeanette V. Caldwell, ANC, [REDACTED]
 Richard E. Dierking, DC, [REDACTED]
 Mary C. Driscoll, WMSC, [REDACTED]
 Mary E. Frazee, WMSC, [REDACTED]
 Guy A. Hamlin, JAGC, [REDACTED]
 Robert E. Holzgrafe, MC, [REDACTED]
 John F. Johnson, DC, [REDACTED]
 John C. Lanham, JAGC, [REDACTED]
 Donald V. Leddy, MC, [REDACTED]
 John A. Lighthall, JAGC, [REDACTED]
 Robert R. Mallory, JAGC, [REDACTED]
 Edmund J. Morgan, Jr., [REDACTED]
 John L. Naler, JAGC, [REDACTED]
 Marie L. Pearce, ANC, [REDACTED]
 Edwin R. Priest, MC, [REDACTED]
 Elizabeth F. Purcell, ANC, [REDACTED]
 Gracie V. Roberts, ANC, [REDACTED]
 Catherine M. Ruane, WMSC, [REDACTED]
 Leon C. Rudy, DC, [REDACTED]
 Arthur R. Slade, Jr., JAGC, [REDACTED]
 William S. Spicer, Jr., [REDACTED]
 Ralph H. Sunderman, DC, [REDACTED]
 William A. Watt, JAGC, [REDACTED]
 Anita Weber, ANC, [REDACTED]
 Virgil Woods, DC, [REDACTED]
 Charles K. Wright, Jr., JAGC, [REDACTED]

To be second lieutenant

Charlotte V. R. McLain, WAC, [REDACTED]

The following-named persons for appointment in the Regular Army of the United States in the grades specified under the provisions of section 506 of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947 (Public Law 381, 80th Cong.), subject to physical qualification:

To be first lieutenants

Ollie L. Tracy, [REDACTED]
 Raymond C. Wilson, [REDACTED]

To be second lieutenants

William A. Alfante, Jr.
 Robert J. Andrews, [REDACTED]
 Harold T. Babb
 Samuel J. Bateman, Jr., [REDACTED]
 John B. Bristow, [REDACTED]
 Alvin W. Granade, [REDACTED]

Kenneth R. Ingold.
 Richard L. Jones, [REDACTED]
 Harry L. Kellinger, [REDACTED]
 Ernest N. King, [REDACTED]
 James E. Kingman, [REDACTED]
 Henry K. Mattern, [REDACTED]
 Roy E. Platt, Jr., [REDACTED]
 James L. Reavis.
 Kenneth G. Stauffer, [REDACTED]
 Cyril N. Volk, [REDACTED]
 Charles F. West, [REDACTED]
 Allen W. Wiegand, [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, Eightieth Congress), subject to designation as distinguished military graduates, and subject to physical qualification:

Joseph R. Carvajal, [REDACTED]
 Harry Feinstein.
 Barney L. Garrett III.
 Harlan E. Kamm, [REDACTED]
 Albert F. Kee.
 Raymond F. Korber.
 Elvin F. Kromer, Jr.
 Paul G. Martin.
 Will H. Perry, Jr., [REDACTED]
 Robert D. Porter, [REDACTED]
 George C. Rybak, [REDACTED]
 Kenneth A. Sawyer, [REDACTED]
 James C. Sindt, [REDACTED]

The following-named distinguished military students for appointment in the Regular Army of the United States, effective June 15, 1951, 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:

Raymond E. Arnold, [REDACTED]	Miles T. Jones
Edward B. Baffico, Jr. [REDACTED]	Billy D. Lee
Harold L. Baker, [REDACTED]	Daniel D. Lee
[REDACTED]	Harry E. Lewis, Jr.
Emmett W. Bowers	Robert W. McDaniel
Robert A. Burns	Lawrence G. Means
Donald B. Carmichael	Ray R. Miller
John F. Conlee	William H. Olson, Jr.
Bernard W. Dibbert, [REDACTED]	Robert M. Penor
George M. Donovan, [REDACTED]	James E. Ramsey, [REDACTED]
Howard D. Edwards, Jr. [REDACTED]	Wright S. Skinner, Jr.
George V. Ellis	Ivan L. Slavich, Jr. [REDACTED]
Byron J. Epstein	Harry F. Stewart, Jr., [REDACTED]
Emory M. Folmar	John J. Stipetic
John O. Girardeau	Donald C. Thorn
Frederick J. Gormley	Joseph D. Walding
Raymond D. Hall	John C. Webber
Wallace Hooper, Jr.	Paul A. Whetstone
Clifford G. Houchin	Thomas B. Wynegar
Graham H. Howison	Richard E. Zumbsteg

that God so loved the world that He gave His only begotten Son, that whosoever believeth in Him shall not perish but have everlasting life. How we thank Thee for the promise that Thou hast given us of eternal life. We pray that Thou wilt help each one of us to appropriate Him and may each know that that only comes when we do have Him in our hearts. How we thank Thee for this body of men here, that they are willing to begin the day with Thee, seeking Thy guidance and wisdom. How we thank Thee for the Nation, our Nation, a Christian nation. We thank Thee, Our Father, that Thou hast loved us all these many years. We thank Thee that in spite of the chaos that exists around the world today, yet we know that we can depend on Thee and that Thou wilt lead us through these days. We know these men are depending on Thee. So we pray that Thou wilt lead and guide and direct them in all of their deliberations. We thank Thee, our Father, for Thou hast promised in Thy word that we who humble ourselves and confess our sins are acceptable unto Thee. So we know that these men are depending on Thee to do Thy bidding during these days. We know their dependence is upon Thee. We pray for Thy blessings, our Father, for the President of our land, and we realize his great responsibility. So we pray that Thou wilt lead and guide and direct him in all of his thinking in the affairs of this Nation. We thank Thee for this body of men here, for the Speaker of the House, and for every Representative. We thank Thee for our own Representative from Binghamton, EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. How we thank Thee for him and his clean-cut stand for the things that are right. We thank Thee for him and for all he is doing for our district. We thank Thee for the Congress and the Senate, and we pray that Thou wilt lead and guide and give wisdom to those men as they make our laws and formulate the policies of our Nation. Guide and direct and bless them, and give them the real wisdom from on high. Thou hast promised us to give us wisdom when we ask it of Thee. We know that they are depending on Thee. These things we ask all in the name of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ. Amen.

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

ADJOURNMENT OF THE HOUSE FROM
 MARCH 22 TO APRIL 2, 1951

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, I offer a privileged resolution (H. Con. Res. 83) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the concurrent resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That when the House adjourns on Thursday, March 22, 1951, it stand adjourned until 12 o'clock meridian, Monday, April 2, 1951.

The concurrent resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SPEAKER EMPOWERED TO DECLARE
 RECESS ON APRIL 2, 1951

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that it may be in order at any time on Monday, April 2,

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WEDNESDAY, MARCH 21, 1951

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

Rev. M. C. Patterson, Practical Bible Training School, Binghamton, N. Y., offered the following prayer:

Our Gracious and Heavenly Father, we come into Thy presence this morning grateful for all of the blessings of life, for we realize that every blessing comes from above. How we thank Thee today for the simplicity of the Gospel. We thank Thee that we have a Saviour who loves each and every one of us. We thank Thee that we all read in the Scripture

1951, for the Speaker to declare a recess subject to the call of the Chair.

Mr. Speaker, I make that request in order to announce also for the information of the Members that on Monday, April 2, 1951, the President of the Republic of France will be received in this Chamber in a joint meeting of the two Houses of Congress. This meeting will take place shortly after the convening on that date.

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

There was no objection.

THE LATE THOMAS G. BURCH

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, it becomes my sad duty and privilege this morning to announce the death of the Honorable Thomas G. Burch, former Member of this House who represented the Fifth Congressional District of Virginia in the House of Representatives with distinction and honor for many years. He was elected to the Seventy-second Congress in 1930 and served continuously from that time until he was appointed to the United States Senate to succeed the late Honorable Carter Glass. He served for many years as chairman of the Post Office and Civil Service Committee of the House and had a place deeply imbedded in the affections of Members of this House on both sides of the aisle. He served a long life in political activities, both in the State and in the Nation, for many, many years, and had the unique distinction of having the respect and affection of all of his colleagues, and no enmities existing in his home State. He served in the United States Senate a part of the unexpired term of the late Carter Glass; and, notwithstanding the insistence of the people of the State of Virginia, declined to stand for reelection in the Senate and retired from that position voluntarily. Tom Burch was one of the distinguished statesmen that Virginia has produced. He served his people with great usefulness and effectiveness, and the people of Virginia have lost a very great and important citizen.

I extend my sympathy to his wife and family and to his hosts of friends in the Commonwealth of Virginia.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. GARY].

Mr. GARY. Mr. Speaker, I am deeply shocked and grieved to hear of the death of Tom Burch. I shall never forget when I came to this body about 6 years ago how he took me under his wing, guided my footsteps, and aided me as a young Congressman in the discharge of my duties. He arranged for me to be a member of his committee, the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service. I served with him there where I was privileged to witness his great capabilities. He was a true friend of the postal service, and that service will show the imprint of his handiwork for years to come.

I share with his wife and family and friends their deep loss, and mourn with them over his untimely death.

TREASURY AND POST OFFICE DEPARTMENTS AND EXPORT-IMPORT BANK OF WASHINGTON APPROPRIATION BILL, 1952

Mr. GARY. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 3282) making appropriations for the Treasury and Post Office Departments and funds available for the Export-Import Bank of Washington for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 3282, with Mr. SMITH of Virginia in the chair. The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. When the Committee rose on yesterday there was under consideration the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORD]. Without objection, the Clerk will again report the amendment.

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. FORD: Page 3, line 4, strike out "\$50,000,000" and insert "\$49,000,000."

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

Mr. Chairman, I arise to say a further word about the action of the Committee yesterday in reducing the amount of appropriation for the Bureau of Disbursement by \$450,000. Yesterday I made a brief comment on the record of this Division in reducing its costs.

Let me point out today that, unlike many other Government agencies, as stressed by our chairman yesterday, the Division of Disbursement cannot reduce its volume of work because prompt payment must be made on all vouchers certified to it by the agencies served. This work includes payments for veterans' pensions, veterans' compensation and subsistence, social security, and other recurring charges, as well as the salaries of civilian employees of the Government. Its work also includes miscellaneous payments on such vouchers as income-tax refunds, bills of contractors, railroads, and so forth. Obviously the Division by its own internal action, cannot reduce the amount of work to be performed for others, which next year will exceed 202,000,000 payments, collections, and so forth. The unit cost applied to the number of items for 1952 is based on the unit cost prevailing for 1950. Since then the salaries paid to employees have increased because of Public Law 429, Eighty-first Congress, and the cost of supplies consumed in the writing of checks, quite a sizable item, reflects that enormous rise in price with which we are all familiar in the seemingly never-ending spiral.

At the height of World War II, or the fiscal year 1945, the average unit cost was 6½ cents per item. For 1952 the unit cost, projected by its cost accounts, is less than 6¼ cents. During the inter-

vening 6 years the average salary paid to employees writing checks increased from \$2,114 to \$2,943. This was not through spendthrift action initiated by the Division, but as a result of legislation passed by the Congress.

The additional pay scale amounted to an increase of 40 percent more pay for employees, while the output has risen year after year from 39,000 units per man in 1945 to 59,000 per man in 1952. This is an accomplishment which compares most favorably with that of any industrial enterprise in the United States.

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

Mr. CANFIELD. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. CRAWFORD. What information, if any, did the committee gather from the managers of this division as to the actual work turned out by the employees of the division? In other words, how much loafing on the job occurs, if any? How many hours do they actually work in the division? What do they do while they are on the job? What did the Appropriations Committee get in the way of information dealing with that phase of the work?

Mr. CANFIELD. Our committee feels that this is perhaps one of the cleanest and most efficient outfits in the entire Government. Paul Banning, the head of that division, has come before us year after year to show savings. I have just reported for the benefit of the House the fact that the output per man has increased from 39,000 units in 1945 to 59,000 units in the current year.

Mr. CRAWFORD. I paid attention to that discussion yesterday as well as what the gentleman has just said.

Mr. CANFIELD. That was not stressed too much yesterday, I am sorry to say.

Mr. CRAWFORD. What I am getting at is, what are the low-down facts on these divisions? The gentleman knows as well as I know that there is all kinds of loafing in many of these departments. There is no question about it.

Mr. CANFIELD. Not in the Division of Disbursements in the United States Treasury, which is doing one of the best jobs any bureau in our Government is doing.

Mr. CRAWFORD. I should like to see the proof of that.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed out of order, and to revise and extend my remarks and have them appear in the Appendix of the Record.

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

There was no objection.

[Mr. BROWN of Ohio addressed the Committee. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

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

Mr. Chairman, I am taking this time merely to correct a statement which the gentleman from Michigan made yesterday, which I am sure the gentleman would like to have corrected. He stated

that the President had only recommended \$49,000,000 for this item, and, as a matter of fact, as the item is set up in the budget it does appear that the President recommended only \$49,118,000. That does not include, however, the item below of \$3,782,000 which is the amount that the Bureau pays the Post Office Department for the sale of bonds and stamps. When you add those two amounts together it makes a total of \$52,000,000 that the President requested, rather than \$49,000,000. I know the gentleman did not want to misinform the House, and I simply make that statement for the record.

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

Mr. GARY. I yield.

Mr. FORD. I think in my remarks of yesterday I did state that the budget estimate was \$52,900,000. I did, however, point out the fact that on page 317, I believe it is, of the appendix of the budget it was \$49,118,000. I could not at the time find where the addition—between \$49,118,000 and \$52,900,000 appeared in the budget.

Mr. GARY. If the gentleman will look at page 803 of the budget he will see there the figure of \$49,118,000. Immediately below that is an item: Allocation to the Post Office Department—and that shows an allocation of \$3,782,000 to the Post Office Department. Those two items have been combined into one item in the bill, which makes the total amount requested by the President \$52,900,000.

Mr. FORD. Then it would appear that there was an error in the appendix of the budget as printed; is that correct?

Mr. GARY. I have not examined the appendix, but the facts are as I have stated them. I know the gentleman did not want to mislead the House, and I simply wanted to give him the proper information.

Mr. FORD. So we are dealing with a budget item of \$52,900,000, which the committee cut by \$2,900,000, and my amendment would cut it an additional \$1,000,000; is that correct?

Mr. GARY. That is correct. The item as requested by the Bureau of the Budget and recommended by the President in total is \$52,900,000. The committee cut it \$2,900,000; and the \$50,000,000 allowed by the committee is \$250,000 less than the Bureau had last year.

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

Mr. GARY. I yield.

Mr. GROSS. Did the appropriation subcommittee make any investigation of the Bureau of the Public Debt and the Treasury Department concerning overlapping in the handling of savings bonds?

Mr. GARY. They are one and the same. The Bureau of the Public Debt is the branch of the Treasury Department which has charge of the sale of savings bonds.

Mr. GROSS. You have had advertising men set up in the Treasury Department and other agencies in the Treasury and you also have savings bonds handled under the Bureau of Public Debt.

Mr. GARY. The Bureau of Public Debt is part of the Treasury Department; it always has been in the Treasury Department and it is the branch of the Treasury Department that handles the sale of bonds.

Mr. GROSS. I understand that, but you have overlapping and duplication of effort, do you not?

Mr. GARY. Not that I know of. If anyone will point it out to our committee, show us where there is overlapping and duplication we shall be very glad to see that it is promptly eliminated.

Mr. GROSS. Another question: You have in the Treasury Department, as I understand a savings bond department and an advertising department; is not that true?

Mr. GARY. No; that is all under the Bureau of Public Debt.

Mr. GROSS. All right; you have it in the Bureau of Public Debt. Is that right?

Mr. GARY. They have a special division for the promotion of savings bonds; yes.

Mr. GROSS. And I ask if it is not true that private advertising agencies do a lot of work gratis, free?

Mr. GARY. Yes; and they do it under the direction of the Bureau of Public Debt. They do it because they are asked to do it by the Bureau of Public Debt. This free advertising has to be solicited. The facts are that although we appropriate only \$50,000,000 for this Bureau we are getting hundreds of millions of dollars in free advertising for the sale of bonds, which is contributed by private sources. These contributions are solicited by this very Bureau.

Mr. GROSS. Yes; and with all the copy written and handed to the Treasury Department.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last four words.

Mr. Chairman, I sat in the House here yesterday and could not help but note the resistance that was offered by the committee, not only on one side but on both sides of the aisle, to every amendment which was proposed to reduce the expenditures of Government in these two particular agencies. To my mind, and this is no reflection upon the committee, because I greatly admire and respect my warm and able friend from Virginia [Mr. GARY], as well as the views of a warm and distinguished friend from New Jersey [Mr. CANFIELD], in their efforts to sustain the action of the subcommittee in the amounts they recommend to the House for passage. But we were told that if these amounts were cut it might affect the functions of Government and greatly throw out of balance and out of gear the orderly running of the Government agencies in question.

To my mind those cuts, the total of which will perhaps only amount to a few million dollars, must almost look humorous to the ordinary taxpayer of the country, commendable as they are, and much as I shall continue to support the amendments to reduce cost in Government.

How does that compare with the fact that in 10 years' time while our population was increasing 15 percent one de-

partment of our Government, the Department of State, had its appropriations increased from \$20,000,000 to \$361,000,000 or 1,800 percent; and five departments of the Government and the independent agencies increased in the same period of time, 1940 to 1950, from \$3,500,000,000 to over \$11,000,000,000—not millions, but billions.

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

Mr. DONDERO. I yield.

Mr. HALLECK. I think it would be useful if the gentleman would read the figures that he has there with respect to these various departments, read them now.

Mr. DONDERO. I had not intended to do that, but I will. I shall give them in round figures. The Department of Commerce in 1940 had appropriations of \$75,000,000; the figures for that department in 1950 were \$863,000,000. The Department of the Interior in 1940 had \$71,000,000; in 1950, \$568,000,000. The Department of Labor had \$18,000,000 in 1940; it had \$257,000,000 in 1950. The Department of Justice had \$50,000,000 in 1940, and \$131,000,000 in 1950. The Department of State, as I have already indicated, had \$20,000,000 in 1940 and \$361,000,000 in 1950; and the independent agencies of the Government increased from \$3,269,000,000 in 1940 to \$9,000,000,000 in 1950. This makes an increase from \$3,500,000,000 to \$11,214,000,000 in 10 years.

Our Government is becoming top heavy and that growth is entirely out of line with the growth of population in the Nation. We have only increased about 15 percent in population in that 10-year period, and yet we have increased the cost of government more than 10 times in some departments of Government. It is clearly out of line.

One thing referred to yesterday that attracted my attention was the sale of Government bonds by the public—people disposing of them, cashing them, especially E bonds. In 1950 the people sold or cashed nearly \$250,000,000 of bonds more than they purchased. I wonder if the \$90,000,000 in 1 month this year of E bonds which the people sold over the amount purchased were sold because of economic conditions on the part of the holders of those bonds or because the people of the country are losing faith and confidence in the fiscal affairs of their Government.

Everyday our people are urged over the ether waves—by radio, press, and mail—to buy savings bonds of the Government. They are urged to save and sacrifice. Yet the Government under the present administration will not do what it asks our people to do. It neither economizes nor sacrifices. I just wonder.

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

Mr. DONDERO. I yield to the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. BAILEY. I would like to ask the distinguished gentleman from Michigan if he is going to carry these ideas of economy into the St. Lawrence seaway project?

Mr. DONDERO. I would because that project will pay for itself, and these matters do not pay for themselves.

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

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

Mr. TABER. Is it not a fact that the way to restore confidence on the part of the public in Government bonds is to reduce the appropriations to the point where the budget is balanced and we can then face the people square-toed?

Mr. DONDERO. There is no question about that. I believe this Government can run without a payroll involving 2,250,000 people.

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

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman may be permitted to proceed for one additional minute.

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

There was no objection.

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

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

Mr. JAVITS. Would the gentleman agree with me, however, that in view of the fact we have to enforce economy, with which I agree, we will have to do it selectively? In other words, you cannot cut everything across the board and, therefore, the committee ought to realize it has to explain every item and cannot put it on the basis: "Well, we have done the best we can." Each and every Member should realize that if we want to do the job intelligently and fairly he has to be on the floor in order to pass on every item.

Mr. DONDERO. I am not impressed with the argument that if you cut one of these items a few thousand dollars it is going to destroy the function and efficiency of the agency. I do not believe that is true, because we are now conducting our Government under a very top-heavy program.

Mr. JAVITS. But we ought to be selective.

Mr. DONDERO. I think it should be across the board and it should be done in larger amounts than we are doing now if we are going to convince the American people with our desire for economy.

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

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. GARY) there were—ayes 92, noes 38.

Mr. GARY. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were refused.

So the amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

BUREAU OF CUSTOMS
SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For expenses necessary for collecting the revenue from customs, enforcement of navigation laws under section 102, Reorganization Plan No. III of 1946, and of other laws enforced by the Bureau of Customs, and the detection and prevention of frauds, including not to exceed \$100,000 for the securing

of information and evidence; transportation and transfer of customs receipts from points where there are no Government depositories; examination of estimates of appropriations in the field; expenses of attendance at meetings of organizations concerned with the purposes of this appropriation; purchase of 100 passenger motor vehicles for replacement only; expenses of seizure, custody, and disposal of property; arms and ammunition; and not to exceed \$1,000,000 for personal services in the District of Columbia exclusive of 10 persons from the field force authorized to be detailed under law (19 U. S. C. 1525); \$37,500,000.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. GOSSETT: Page 4, line 19, strike out "\$37,500,000" and insert "\$36,825,000."

Mr. GOSSETT. Mr. Chairman, in offering this amendment I want to state that I in nowise criticize the very fine committee that brought in this bill. I agree with the gentleman from Michigan who has just spoken that the members of that committee are able and conscientious. Also I am not here to unduly belabor and criticize the bureaucrats.

A bureaucrat is an ordinary American who is given a job at the head of a Government agency. All Americans are promoters. He immediately begins to want to do a bigger and better job and will spend all of the money the Congress gives him. Then he will come in with a bigger program for the ensuing year.

Now, the greatest danger to this country, I think we all know, is fiscal and spiritual. The greatest peril to this country is not external aggression, it is not communism, it is destroying the credit of the Nation and the value of the American dollar. It is yielding to pressure for the sake of expediency. It is not only a question of holding appropriations within bounds. It may become a question of cutting out some of the things that we consider to be essential activities and functions of government.

The amendment that I am offering here is one simply to hold the Bureau of Customs to the appropriation they got in the last fiscal year, 1951. There happens to have been a committee of management councilors, the McKenzie Co., that made an investigation of this particular agency. Furthermore, a committee of the Civil Service Committee of the House made an investigation of this particular agency, and both reports say that by an improvement in the procedures, this particular Bureau could save a tremendous amount of money. So I am urging as a matter of principle that we hold the Bureau of Customs to the amount of money that we gave them last year; in other words, to reduce by \$675,000 the item of \$37,500,000, and make it read \$36,825,000. That is the way it read in last year's appropriation bill.

I think perhaps the item could be cut considerably more, although I am in no position to sustain any further cuts; I am no expert on it. But, as a matter of principle, this Bureau ought to be able to operate on the amount of money they got last year. There are a lot of duplicating services between the Bureau of

Customs, the Immigration Service, and the Harbor Police. We have in this bill increased the Coast Guard appropriations by \$15,000,000 or \$20,000,000. The Coast Guard patrols the harbors and could collaborate and help the Bureau of Customs in some of its duties and functions.

So I beg of you, in the interest of national economy which means national security to hold down this bureau to the amount of money that it used in the last fiscal year, or that we appropriated for it.

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

Mr. Chairman, I agree with the distinguished gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DONDERO] that many cuts can be effected by the Congress in the appropriation bills this year. I am sorry that our particular bill, the bill providing funds for the Treasury Department and the Post Office Department had to be the first bill to be considered.

The gentleman from Michigan read a report of the discrepancies between appropriations in 1940 and those in 1952. There is one he did not read, and that is the appropriation for the legislative branch. In 1940 the appropriation for the legislative branch was \$24,324,851, and for 1952 the appropriation requested is \$73,334,906, three times the cost of 1940.

The Bureau of Customs is an important revenue producing and enforcement agency of the Treasury Department. Last year, it collected over \$400,000,000. This year it will probably collect over \$600,000,000. It enforces the many provisions of the Tariff Act, guards against the smuggling of narcotics and other contraband into the United States, and protects American industry from unfair competition from foreign merchandise. It also cooperates with the Agriculture, Commerce, Justice, and State Departments, and Atomic Energy Commission in enforcing laws and regulations of those agencies. Customs is a protective screen at our land, sea, and air frontiers. It has a special job to do in ship searches in cooperation with the Coast Guard, a highly sensitive undertaking in these days.

The Bureau of Customs' request for \$38,300,000 for 1952 was reduced \$800,000 by the House committee, leaving \$37,500,000 as the minimum recommendation sufficient for effective operation. It was with great reluctance that any reduction was made in the amount requested by this Bureau because of the serious and important workload with which it is faced.

Since 1947, the first normal postwar year, increasing imports into the United States have resulted in a 90-percent increase in the transactions handled by this Bureau. In other words, Customs workload has almost doubled in less than 4 years.

It would be reasonable to assume that personnel employed by the Bureau has therefore greatly increased. Actually, however, present employment is lower—5 percent lower—than it averaged in 1947. In other words, employment was reduced 5 percent, while workload rose 90 percent.

Customs has already cleaned house. In 1947, at the insistence of this Appropriations Committee, this Bureau undertook a full fledged management improvement program. A management engineering firm, McKinsey & Co. of New York, was hired to make a stem-to-stern study of the organization, procedures, and policies of the Bureau. The company rendered a nine-volume report containing approximately 180 recommendations for improvements and changes. Under the able leadership and guidance of the Secretary of the Treasury and Commissioner Frank Dow, these recommendations were evaluated and simplifications or improvements in service have either been effectuated or are in the process of being put into effect. These improvements assisted the importing public, facilitated the travel of tourists crossing our borders, and increased efficiency within the Customs organization. In addition, a proposed bill has been submitted to the Congress which recommends legislative simplification of customs procedures. Your committee hopes that this bill will receive favorable consideration by the House at an early date.

Despite these improvements, during the past 9 months the impact of increased workload has been so great that Customs has been swamped all over the country. Imported merchandise has accumulated on docks, piers, and in warehouses resulting in delays to importers. In some instances, serious losses to American businessmen and lawsuits have resulted. Defense production may even have been affected. The Appropriations Committee has received complaints from importing groups and from domestic producers.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New Jersey has expired.

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five additional minutes.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. CANFIELD. These complaints have not been directed at the way Customs attempts to perform its job, but all agree that Customs needs additional manpower. Among those urging additional staff for Customs are the Commerce and Industry Association of New York, National Council of American Importers, Port of New York Authority, Customs Brokers and Forwarders Association of America, etc. The National Council of American Importers, after making a Nation-wide survey, has recommended that Customs should have \$42,000,000 for fiscal year 1952.

So serious is the situation, that a supplemental appropriation was made to Customs in January of this year to provide 207 more employees. At the present time, Customs is recruiting the manpower Congress authorized. Moreover, imports continue to increase and more than 600,000 transactions on which importers may owe additional amounts of money are backlogged. This condition cannot continue without seriously embarrassing the Federal Government and

causing increasingly great hardships to industry.

The action of your Appropriations Committee is designed to hold the line at the level of employment presently authorized for Customs. To reduce the appropriations available to Customs below this level would aggravate an already serious situation. This Bureau must enforce the tariff laws and collect the revenue on importations, many of which are destined for defense production. They must therefore have the personnel and supplies to handle these imports without unnecessary delay to American industry.

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

Mr. CANFIELD. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. RABAUT. I want to commend the gentleman upon the extreme truth of his statement. The Detroit Board of Commerce has brought the same subject to my attention. I made a survey of the entire department in Detroit. It is true, the work load has increased tremendously, and the personnel is below what it was before.

Further, if the Congress wants to inform itself on the situation, the Customs Bureau is intimately connected with the apprehension of the dope conditions in the country, and seeks to stop it. It is a great enforcement agency in that regard, and is very helpful in checking the traffic and apprehending those in the traffic in cooperation with the FBI.

If this Congress does not think that the people are interested in dope traffic and crime, read yesterday's paper, where it stated that shopping was stopped in New York because of the Kefauver investigation in that city.

The gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. CANFIELD] has made a wonderful statement, and I want to commend him for it. I want to commend him for his defense of the department.

Mr. CANFIELD. Not only that, may I say to the gentleman from Michigan, but the mothers of the city of Baltimore met in a mass meeting last night to urge our Federal and local governments to do more than they are doing to stop this great menace of drug addictions.

May I say also that customs has a very sensitive undertaking in these days preventing fissionable material from going out of the United States, and preventing certain types of material from coming into the United States.

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

Mr. CANFIELD. I yield.

Mr. GOSSETT. So much has been said here about the narcotic business. Do we not have a Bureau of Narcotics, whose primary duty it is to enforce the narcotic laws?

Mr. CANFIELD. Yes; and that is within the confines of the continental limits of the United States. The gentleman understands that the customs service searches the ships that come to the United States ports.

Mr. GOSSETT. Does the gentleman know of any case in the last year where any customs official has apprehended violators of the narcotic laws?

Mr. CANFIELD. Scores and scores of them. The gentleman can read the New York metropolitan newspapers to verify that.

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

Mr. CANFIELD. I yield to the gentleman from New York, who knows the story on that.

Mr. ROONEY. The customs service in the port of New York is continually making apprehensions with regard to narcotics.

Mr. CANFIELD. Yes; almost every other week.

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

Mr. Chairman, there is no question but what this amendment needs to be adopted. The committee itself has put its finger on the real why and wherefore as to why things are not taken care of and why they are not able to get along with the help which has been provided. I turn to page 8 of the committee report and I read:

The committee is greatly concerned over the management-improvement program in the Bureau and is convinced that there is not enough energy being expended to put long needed operating reforms into effect.

There you have the story.

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

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Mr. RABAUT. How much did the committee cut them?

Mr. TABER. Just a little bit.

Mr. RABAUT. How much is it in amount?

Mr. TABER. I have the figure here. They cut it \$800,000.

Mr. RABAUT. That is the answer.

Mr. TABER. This amendment only puts them back to this year. All they need to do is to follow the advice of the committee, and have some efficiency in their operating and we will not have any trouble about them getting along with the money which will be provided by this amendment.

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

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Mr. ROONEY. Does the gentleman presume to know more about this appropriation for the Bureau of Customs than his colleague the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. CANFIELD], who has served on this subcommittee for a number of years, who has done a fine and intelligent job, who was the subcommittee chairman during the Eightieth Congress with regard to this bill, and who is now in complete agreement on this item with his chairman, the gentleman from Virginia? Why does the gentleman presume to know more about this than those two gentlemen who were in attendance at the hearings on this item?

Mr. TABER. I do not presume to know. I take the committee's word, and as I read it to you, it does not agree with the position that they are taking. Why do they not take what the committee says instead of going back on what the committee says? Why do they not accept what the committee says and accept this amendment? It does not make sense.

Mr. ROONEY. Why does not the gentleman take the word and advice of the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. CANFIELD] with regard to it?

Mr. TABER. Because he said in one place they are not operating with proper administrative reforms and then in another he tries to give them more money than they are getting. The two do not go together. The committee cannot cut here in good faith, in my opinion, and urge the larger appropriation. I believe that we need in the House and in the Congress to show some evidence of ability to read and understand what the committee says.

Mr. ROONEY. Surely the gentleman is not impugning the good faith of the gentleman from New Jersey?

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

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Mr. KEATING. I would like to give a little solace to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. CANFIELD]. In his remarks he said he thought it was unfortunate that the Treasury and Post Office bill was the first one to come before us. I believe, and I think the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] may agree, that this particular subcommittee in trying to sustain this bill are unfortunate in having the bill come before us first because if I correctly appraise the temper of the House today, it is that they are going to cut all of these appropriation bills which show the need for cutting, and this action today of this committee should be a warning to all other subcommittees to do their cutting and bring these bills down in line, before they are brought to the floor of the House for action. I feel sure the gentleman from New York would echo those sentiments.

Mr. TABER. I feel that that is absolutely necessary and that we should not go ahead and provide more money than is necessary for these agencies.

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

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. We of the full committee cannot agree 100 percent with any bill brought in by another subcommittee which calls for an addition above last year of \$88,000,000. That is my contention.

Mr. TABER. I think that is right.

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

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Mr. CANFIELD. The gentleman from New York [Mr. KEATING] is offering me solace. I do not have to have any solace. I was chairman of this subcommittee in the Eightieth Congress, and I and my committee were responsible for the 10 percent cut in the Customs appropriation and the investigation by the McKenzie Co. We made the cut of 10 percent and made them like it. Since that time they have reorientated themselves and done a job. Today I know they are backlogged and need additional help.

Mr. TABER. If they had done a job the committee would not have to say what I just read.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment.

Mr. Chairman, if the last speech had not been made by a man whose great ability and entire familiarity with matters pertaining to appropriations I know, I would not be taking the floor to express my surprise. The gentleman from New York has written perhaps as many phrases and paragraphs in reports as any man in this House; he has done admirable service in this House. But what is going on here today is just a blunderbuss cut any place where anybody happens to strike regardless of the justice and regardless of the effort and regardless of the opinion of the Members who are familiar with and have devoted themselves to the proposition.

Further, over and above that, this bill has run the gantlet of the full committee. Downstairs there was no attempt made to cut this bill. To come here on the floor and have different Members nick it here and nick it there just for the purpose of politics is something that should not be tolerated and should not be continued in serious matters of appropriations, done for the purpose of misleading the people of the United States of America.

Now, let us get right down to facts. We had an experience of this kind once before, but when we came back here in the Eighty-first Congress we had deficiency bills every day in the week, due to cuts that had been made in the Republican Eightieth Congress, purporting to be, at the time that they were made, a service to the people, only to emerge as an empty gesture to fool the taxpayers of America. It is on the record in black and white, passed by this House in the Eightieth Congress and corrected by this same House in the Eighty-first Congress when the agencies of the Government had to be continued and there was no other way to continue them than to give them the money necessary for the business at hand.

I am afraid, Mr. Chairman, we are stooping to the same thing again in this Congress, and I beg the people of America to watch what will be done in the Senate and how these bills will come back to this floor and how they will eventually be passed in honor and in decency to continue the agencies of the Government.

Mr. COX. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the paragraph.

Mr. Chairman, if "the little nicking here and the little nicking there" spoken of by the gentleman from Michigan, has so disturbed him as he has evidenced here on the floor, then when he sees "the nicking here and the nicking there" that is going to take place on later bills it will be enough to drive him crazy.

Mr. Chairman, I take it that the committee will accept the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas and that other amendments will be adopted. But I have taken the floor to counsel my like-minded friends now on the march to observe caution and moderation. Public opinion is involved; and while they have the support of public opinion at the moment, it is a fickle thing and it might desert them. No indication of vengeance must be shown.

And to those who give blind support to the regime now in control but in retreat and whose ranks, I may say to the gentleman from Michigan, are going to grow thinner and thinner as this campaign for the salvation of the country progresses, that what he is witnessing here on the floor this morning, which causes him such indignation, is but a mild expression of the wrath that has been built up in the bosoms of loyal, rationalistic thinking people who have seen their country brought to the brink of ruin by those who have held to the doctrine that the more the Government spends the more it has to spend—people whose thinking has been a little different from the thinking of the Socialist Government of England and the advanced Socialist Government of Russia.

There is no particular feeling in this House against the Treasury Department; yet no one would contend that it is the depository of all wisdom. The Treasury Department has done a reasonably good job, but that it is greatly overstuffed there can hardly be any doubt.

As I stated, what we are doing here this morning is but an indication of what is to follow. Wait until we reach the State Department, the cost of administration of which has run up in the past 10 years from \$20,000,000 to \$360,000,000, and witness the disrobing of an aggregation of frauds that will take place.

The fight for good government has just begun. I believe it is the will of this Congress to do that which is necessary to save this country from complete wrack and ruin.

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment.

Mr. Chairman, my beloved friend from Georgia yesterday, as I understand it—and I just thought we might throw a little levity into this because we are getting so serious—spoke something about a honeymoon being ended. When I note the crossing of the aisle here and the conferences that are being held, it is my opinion that the honeymoon has just begun.

I trust that in your temporary enjoyment you are very happy and contented.

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

Mr. Chairman, possibly adding something further to the levity of the moment, and possibly adding something on the serious side also, may I say only that if there has been some determination demonstrated here in the House of Representatives to achieve economy in Government, justified economy, then I trust it shall not be a honeymoon soon to be ended. Rather, I hope it points the way to a continuing determination for economy which will be carried on all through this Congress as we appropriate the people's money for the necessities of the Federal Government.

Some reference was made by the gentleman from Michigan to certain cuts that were made by the Eightieth Congress. As the majority leader of that Congress I am still happy to observe that we cut the proposed budgets in those two sessions of the Congress something

over \$7,000,000,000. It is true that subsequent deficiency appropriation bills did indicate a few mistakes were made, but the sum total of the deficiencies subsequently made did not begin to approach the cuts that were made in those budgets in the Eightieth Congress.

By the same token, let us not be too thin-skinned about making some cuts in these proposed budgets, because if we have to we can supply whatever is needed by proper deficiency appropriations. But at the same time as we make these cuts, let us not say to the people who are going to spend the money: Just go ahead, pour it down the rat hole anyway because all you have to do is to come to the Congress when you want some more. That may not work.

Let us say to them: You people who are running the Government of the United States, who are spending the people's money, tighten up your belts like you are calling on the people of the country to tighten their belts. Why? To meet the increased cost of living and to meet the increased burden of taxes that will be constantly heaped upon them as long as the Government of the United States continues to spend money the way it has. What manner of Government is it that says to the people: "You have got to get along with less," and then demonstrates such a thin-skinned attitude in saying to the people of the Government who spend the people's money: "You do not have to get along on less." I would say to them as we say to the people in the country, we have all got to tighten our belts; we must tighten our belts if confiscatory taxes are to be avoided, if the value of the dollar is to be preserved and if we are to prevent runaway inflation.

As far as the Committee on Appropriations is concerned, no one appreciates more than I the high-minded and fine work that is done by the members of that great committee; the long hours and days that they sit in hearings listening to the witnesses before them. For the work that they do, certainly they are to be commended; but there are other great committees in the House who likewise spend many days in hearings and who become expert about the matters that come before them. Sometimes they are not quite in step with the membership over-all of the House of Representatives. I have served on legislative committees, and I have come in here with my committee presenting a matter believing that we were expert in it and that the House of Representatives as a whole should not pass any further judgment upon it. But I have been stepped on a time or two, just like the Committee on Appropriations, now and then, just cannot always sustain the position it takes. Certainly no one means a personal thing in the attitude he takes on appropriation bills; that would be the last thing anyone would do. Certainly it is no lack of confidence in our great Committee on Appropriations or the men who make it up. For the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. GARY] and the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. CANFIELD] I have the greatest respect and admiration, but as a Member of this body, with my responsibility to the people I represent in my

State and Nation, I am going to exercise my judgment here.

Some reference has been made to so-called blunderbuss operations. I think that was made by the gentleman from Michigan. Now I have been here on the floor, I have heard these amendments explained by each of the Members who have proposed them, and I must say I am convinced that they have given thought to every one of them. They have demonstrated a knowledge of what they are proposing and talking about. They know what the problem is. It is evident to me that a lot of work has been done in connection with these proposed amendments. It is not a blunderbuss operation. On the contrary, these amendments have been carefully thought out and well presented, and the arguments for them well presented. The best evidence of that fact, in my opinion, is that the amendments have been adopted, and I trust they will be sustained. I agree with the gentleman from Georgia that whatever is done ought to be done carefully and with due consideration, but, at the same time, let us not hesitate to do whatever is necessary to be done.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, with reference to the statement made by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. RABAUT] as to blunderbuss operation these amendments have been rifle-shot procedure, directed to specific situations where savings can be made without injuring any service. I might add, and most respectfully, that I do not accept the gentleman's statement that those who want to cut these appropriations are acting from political motives. It may be that we have the desire of our people for economy in mind. It is my purpose to go home this Easter vacation and I would like to tell the home folks, the people who pay for the bills, that I voted to go along with their hope there would be a cutting of expenditures. They pay the bills. They have the right to demand economy on the part of their servants as prices go ever higher. That is not necessarily political, though continued wasteful or even unnecessary spending may and it should have political results. I cannot understand why the gentleman made that charge, not only against those on the left but those in his own party who have been voting for cuts. Please sometime give us consideration for trying to do our duty.

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

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. RABAUT. The shoulders of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. RABAUT] are broad, but I stand in the unique position of having succeeded in passing one of the biggest cuts in appropriation in the bill last year through an amendment reducing appropriations in the sum of at least \$550,000,000.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. The gentleman was not acting politically then, was he?

Mr. RABAUT. No.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Why not, then, concede to us the same privilege, the same good intentions now.

Mr. RABAUT. Because I thought I knew something about it, and over and above that cut the committee had reduced appropriations in the committee of \$3,200,000,000. So, if there are spend-thrifts, look elsewhere. I have been cutting appropriations for years; and I want to say further that my particular subcommittee made the greatest percentage cut last year.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Now, I will frankly admit that I do not know everything about these appropriation bills, but here is one thing I do know. If we are going to make appropriations we have to have the money or have some idea of where it can be obtained. If one knows how much he has in his pocket he knows how much he can spend, how much he should spend, regardless of who wants what.

Permit me now to refer to the remark made yesterday by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. COX] to the effect that the New Deal honeymoon was over.

Permit me to congratulate the Speaker, our respected and beloved Speaker, on his well-known sportsmanship when this morning he came before the House and congratulated us, those of us who advocate this program of living within our income, on the fact that this program of spending and taxing, and much of the time for things that are not needed, is over. The Speaker, if I understood him, wished us joy. That we will have if we finally manage to live within our income. The Speaker exhibited his usual sportsmanlike attitude. Not only that, but a high degree of knowledge of what the people intend to have—economy—the people are sick and tired of the present administration's way of doing things.

Another thing that is encouraging to me is that when the prayer was offered this morning by our visiting chaplain, he did offer a prayer not only for the Speaker and Members of the House but the chaplain made special mention of one of our Members, after congratulating the House upon having the gentleman from New York [Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL], a gentleman whom I greatly admire, with us as a colleague. Some of my colleagues expressed the thought that the rest of us should have been mentioned, but I call their attention to this fact, and it is a fact, that apparently the chaplain did not consider it necessary to pray for or congratulate the people upon the presence of the rest of us, except as a group. Evidently the chaplain lives in the congressional district of our colleague and having personal knowledge of the gentleman's worth and service wished to express his appreciation of our colleague's service to his district and the Nation.

Let us now proceed with our economy drive.

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

Mr. Chairman, commenting on the last statement of my friend, the gentleman from Michigan, I think rather than praying for any Member of this House

the country needs to be prayed for because the country is being preyed upon.

Yesterday at a meeting of the Hardy subcommittee, it was brought out that three gentlemen in Hazleton, Pa., got the green light from the National Production Authority to borrow \$7,800,000 on an investment of \$600. As a result of that hearing, page one of every newspaper in the country is carrying the story of the agencies of Government permitting this crowd to get from the Government almost \$8,000,000 on an investment of \$600. You can understand readily why the American people have the impression that we are running a screwy business down here.

I have great respect for the chairman of this subcommittee, the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. GARY]. As a matter of fact, I know he is an outstanding gentleman. I was in his Sunday school class 20 years ago in the city of Richmond. I have great respect for the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. CANFIELD]. I know they are both honorable gentlemen, but I am sure they do not know all the answers.

We need to do some cutting here. Why? Because all over this country little companies are going busted since they cannot stand the gaff, they cannot pay the freight. Our Washington fiscal policy is too heavy a load to carry.

I have here in my hand a collection of auction notices. They represent only a very small fraction of the total number of businesses that have gone under the hammer in the last few months. Every one of these is a small business plant. They have gone down into bankruptcy or into voluntary liquidation because they could not get materials, or because they could not make ends meet under our present tax program, or because they simply got fed up with working under a system which crushes all incentive by making it risky to expand and unprofitable to keep going.

Every one of the sales that I have here involves plants using fine machinery. These plants have now gone out of existence. Their machinery may be used elsewhere, but every time that this happens a part of the American way of life is destroyed. We believe in small businesses. We like to see them established and we like to see them grow. Small businesses that grow are part of the opportunity system.

We have created in our country today a taxation program which makes it almost impossible to attract investors. They are not going to risk losing their savings when they know that they are going to be taxed out of any profit they may happen to make. They are not going to keep small businesses going when they cannot get materials.

This is our biggest industrial problem today. We need the skills and specialized abilities of our small plants to meet the defense requirements of our country. But we are not lifting a finger to keep them in operation. We have not set up a coherent, sensible plan to keep them supplied with their requirements for existence. Until we make up our minds to do these things, until we work out a tax program which encourages investment instead of one that kills it, we

are going to have more and more of these auction notices. Let us not sell America under the hammer. We must work this problem out, and soon.

I say what we are doing here today in cutting appropriations, call it politics if you will, is good politics. It is good politics for Members of Congress to re-examine every appropriation and let the people back home know at least that as far as the elected Representatives here in Washington are concerned, we are not being extravagant and are not making these loans and are not approving expenditures which are excessive, and which are way out of line with all reason. You have these little businesses in your community which just cannot stand up under all this. I say that what we are doing here, Republicans and Democrats alike, is entirely in order. We are spending too much money. I say not only should we examine the nondefense departments, we should also examine the defense departments. When I go to a restaurant downtown and see a liveried chauffeur take five or six brass hats down to the Occidental Restaurant or to the Mayflower Hotel, or some other place, at the taxpayers' expense, my blood boils because I know the taxpayers are being taken for a ride. I say it is too expensive for some of these military people to call a boy into the service and within 36 hours send him to New York and to Seattle, Wash., and to Norfolk, Va., and then back to Seattle, Wash., and then back to New York. What kind of dizzy business is that? Is that adding anything to the sum total of benefit to the country? Is this defense or is it a comedy of errors? A terrific waste of taxpayers' money.

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

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

Mr. Chairman, I do not believe any Member would quibble about the right of any Member of the Congress, whether he be a member of the Committee on Appropriations, or any standing legislative committee, to offer an amendment on legislation or on an appropriation bill. But I do know, as a member of this Committee on Appropriations for the past 5 years that it is not an easy job to sit in a subcommittee for 7 or 8 weeks attempting to do the best job that you can, questioning every witness who appears before the committee and attempting to make a cut where it is possible without denying sufficient funds to that particular agency which would enable them to operate properly and efficiently in the next fiscal year.

In regard to what has just been said by my good friend, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BENDER], about the complaints of small businesses going under in this country, I believe the main reason they are going out of business is because of the emergency program we are going into at the present time. The last figure I have from the Department of Commerce was that 99 percent of all the defense contracts that have been let out up to this date have been given to big business while we in the Congress have not done a single thing about it. The same situation existed when we got in the last war in 1941. At that time 99 percent of

all defense contracts was being given to big business and it was not until the Congress in 1941 established a smaller war plants corporation that the small businesses of this country got a decent, fair break. They are not getting any break now, nor will they get any break in the future unless we as Members of Congress enact legislation similar to that which we enacted in the last World War to see to it that some of these prime contracts which are given to big business at the present time are broken up and distributed to the smaller plants. In that way we can guarantee to them sufficient business to keep them going. When they get these contracts they will get the material to perform the work and produce the goods as big business gets its material at the present time.

A lot of bouquets have been thrown at my good friend the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. CANFIELD], and my good friend, the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. GARY]. I can honestly say, knowing Mr. CANFIELD as I have for the last 11 years, that I have never met a more conscientious individual on either side of the House. As a member of the Committee on Appropriations I remember him well as chairman of this very same subcommittee during the Eightieth Congress. I think he made a splendid case here this afternoon against this cut when he said it was at his instigation as chairman of the committee that he started the so-called McKinsey investigation. It was because of that investigation that a number of jobs were eliminated and that that particular department in the Customs Service is getting some efficiency. So far as my friend, the gentleman from Virginia is concerned, there is no man in the House who is more economy-minded than he is.

But, Mr. Chairman, we are up against some impossible things here. In my own committee it was only a year ago last August that the House of Representatives—not this Congress, but during the last Congress—unanimously, not only authorized an expenditure of \$150,000,000 for hospital construction all over the country, but by-passed the Committee on Appropriations. The House not only authorized it but appropriated \$150,000,000. They raised that authorization from \$75,000,000 to \$150,000,000. It was only a few months ago that we completed action on the amendment to the old Social Security Act. These things are before us now. We have to pay for these things. It was only a short time ago that you raised the minimum wages in this country from 40 cents to 75 cents an hour. It takes money to do all these things. But many of these bills were passed by the House unanimously, as was the case in regard to the hospital-construction bill.

I think it is a good bureau. I think it is needed. The results that have been shown in the past 3 or 4 years have not been equaled by any other agency in this Government.

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

Mr. FOGARTY. In just a moment.

Mr. JUDD. I would like the gentleman to yield for a correction.

Mr. FOGARTY. Only last fall when you people passed the Federal impact area aid bill for school construction I opposed the amendment on the floor; but you overrode me by a vote of 4 to 1, when you increased the authorization from \$12,000,000 to \$21,000,000.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Rhode Island has expired.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for two additional minutes.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. FOGARTY. That amendment was passed by this last Congress by a vote of 4 to 1 when I opposed the amendment; and as a result we have in this bill about \$75,000,000 for school construction in areas like the atomic-energy plant in North Carolina and in Paducah, Ky., and in all these Federal-impact areas; and that is an expense that you Members put on the Appropriations Committee by your action only last December.

Those are some of the things that we are up against. I do not believe there is a member of the Committee on Appropriations of the 50 who constitute its membership serving now who want to vote to increase any budget estimate which was sent up here for fiscal 1952; I think they all want to show some cuts. I think they are doing a good job. It is a hard job; it is not an easy job, and I think that these men sitting on this subcommittee really know what is going on in these departments, because it is their job to question these agencies and to eliminate unessential jobs wherever they find them.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield now?

Mr. FOGARTY. I yield.

Mr. JUDD. I just wanted to comment on the gentleman's statement that the bill expanding the Hill-Burton program of Federal aid for hospital construction was passed unanimously; as a matter of fact, a good many of us opposed it and spoke against it, not because we were not in favor of the objectives of the program but because we thought we could not afford it. It is my recollection that almost 100 Members of the House voted against it. Its passage did cause a material expansion of the program and, as the gentleman has described, we now find ourselves bound by the action of a previous Congress.

Mr. FOGARTY. That is right, but there was no record vote, no division vote.

Mr. JUDD. Yes; there was a record vote. I have a vivid recollection because I was reminded of it several times in the last campaign.

Mr. FOGARTY. The gentleman may be right and I may be wrong; I will accept the gentleman's memory.

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

Mr. FOGARTY. I yield.

Mr. HALLECK. The gentleman spoke about the Smaller War Plants Corpora-

tion set up during World War II. I might suggest to the gentleman that the House Small Business Committee, of which I am a member, has proposed legislation, and there is also legislation before the Banking and Currency Committee, to do very much the same thing under the present situation. I trust the gentleman will join with me in trying to get hearings before that committee.

Mr. FOGARTY. I will do everything I possibly can. The figures I quoted as 98 percent were figures I got from the report that was issued by the gentleman's committee about a month ago.

In regards to the statement I made on the vote for hospital construction, I find after looking at the record that there was a record vote on October 3, 1949, under suspension of the rules in the House. The vote was 237 for authorizing \$150,000,000 a year for 5 years for the construction of hospitals and only 43 against. That is the record.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I enjoyed listening to the remarks of my good friend the economist and gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BENDER]. It is seldom that I have had occasion to agree with him on this floor on any subject.

Mr. Chairman, if we are to follow the senseless method of alleged economy that is being pursued here today we are on the march to wreck the very security of this Nation. You would not dare stand up here and vote to cut appropriations for the Federal Bureau of Investigation, and you have no more right to cripple and viciously cut this appropriation for the customs service. You propose to cut a million dollars out of this item in the face of the unanimous agreement of all the members of the subcommittee, both minority and majority, who sat for 6 weeks from 10 o'clock every morning until 4 or 5 o'clock every afternoon, who really know the facts and details with regard to this matter. In what sort of business is the customs service engaged? Why, in the fiscal year 1950 there was collected for the account of the taxpayers of this Nation \$422,650,329 in customs receipts as shown in the table at page 59 of the hearings. The total appropriations recommended by this committee for the coming fiscal year for the customs service is in the amount of \$37,500,000.

Do you not realize that this further cut of \$1,000,000 beyond the \$300,000 cut recommended and approved by the full Committee on Appropriations would actually cripple this service insofar as the ports are concerned, not only where the ships dock but where the airplanes land and trains arrive, but also the borders which have to be guarded and protected?

In what sort of business is the Bureau of Customs engaged? During the 6 months' period from July to December 1950, 49,717,640 persons entered the United States. During the first 6 months of the fiscal year 1951 over 13,737,000 carriers of persons or merchandise entered the United States by plane, by ship, by auto, and so forth. There were over

630,000 formal entries declared during that same 6-month period. There were packages examined in the public stores of the service to the extent of over 351,000. I have given you just part of the workload of this bureau as shown in the committee hearings.

Is it sensible economy to cut this appropriation and cripple the Bureau of Customs which protects our borders against contraband, against dope, against narcotics, an agency which is responsible for over \$422,000,000 a year in customs receipts? You can call it politics, you can call it whatever you want, but, Mr. Chairman, with a possible war on the horizon and the matter of the security of our great ports involved, if it is good sense to vote for this amendment I just do not know what it is all about.

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

Mr. Chairman, I want to explain to the House what has been done by the committee with respect to the Bureau of Customs. The customs receipts for this fiscal year to date are \$445,837,631.22. There are still 3 months remaining. This compares with \$422,650,000 for the entire year 1950. It is estimated that there will be a further increase of receipts for 1952.

The congestion and delays at the ports became so bad this year that the committee received numerous requests from all over the United States to increase the customs force. In response to that demand we brought in a supplemental assessment recently to increase the force for the balance of fiscal 1951 because the emergency was so great we did not feel we could wait until 1952. At that time the Bureau of Customs requested 311 additional employees to handle this additional workload. The committee allowed them 207, which was approved by both Houses of the Congress.

The Bureau requested 109 additional personnel for 1952. We did not allow the additional personnel in this bill. We struck out all additional personnel. We did allow them to project the 207 additional employees which were authorized in the supplemental assessment into 1952. Naturally that resulted in some increase in the appropriation because those 207 employees will be paid only for several months of service in 1951. When we projected them into 1952 on a 12 months' basis it meant an increase.

That is the only additional amount that our committee has allowed for 1952, merely the projection into 1952 of those additional employees which have already been authorized by the Congress in a supplemental assessment heretofore passed by both Houses of the Congress.

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

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

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Nevertheless, the gentleman will agree that if the House accepts the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas, it will give to the Bureau of Customs exactly the same amount of money that it had available for 1951.

Mr. GARY. That is correct, but it will not permit them to carry over into 1952 the personnel which was authorized in order that it might clear the congestion at the ports.

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

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

Mr. HINSHAW. We held some hearings in my committee on the subject of the export of strategic materials and the control thereof. It seems to me, if I remember correctly, that it was up to the Customs Department to cooperate with the Commerce Department in preventing the export of strategic materials; is that correct?

Mr. GARY. That is unquestionably true. That is one of the major functions they are performing now, preventing strategic materials from being shipped into the iron-curtain countries.

Mr. HINSHAW. That is my understanding of it; and if that is the case, and considering all the ways there are of smuggling goods out of the United States—

Mr. GARY. And smuggling goods into the United States without the payment of duty, if the gentleman will permit me to interrupt.

Mr. HINSHAW. The gentleman has mentioned that subject. I was bringing up a different subject. If that is one of the things necessary to the welfare of our country, it is quite possible that we might need some additional customs employees.

Mr. GARY. I think the committee has cut this appropriation as far as the facts justify.

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

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

Mr. Chairman, the proposed budget not only can be, but, of necessity, it must be cut. I cannot help but take the floor for a minute or two because of the remark made about the use of a blunderbuss, which I take to mean that when we fire we do not know where we hit. Now, the fact is that if we had a line-item budget of this great United States so that we could determine who should be hired and retained and fired, it would probably reach from here to Philadelphia, and might even extend to the moon. There is not one mind here capable, with the time at hand, to read it in all its detail.

We must rely on individuals whose ability and knowledge we respect and who are personally studying a small part of that budget.

Mr. Chairman, I am happy to go across the aisle and join hands with the gentleman from Texas. I am all for the wedding previously mentioned and all for the honeymoon at the taxpayers' benefit. In fact, I first registered as an elector in what is the opposition party of this House because I felt that a political technique when it was new born in 1932 had to be opposed. The evidence I have at hand that my decision was correct is overpowering today. For that reason, I want to call to your mind and say to you that perhaps the budget cut now under

consideration and many others to come, is not enough and that it should be deeper. The political technique that we have been operating under for about 20 years was prophesied by Lord Macauley as the philosophy that would destroy us in the twentieth century when we would follow economic demagogues.

If we want to know what government is costing through secret taxes, income taxes, excise taxes, and others, the only way an honest man can determine that question is to divide the heads of families in the respective communities into the amounts spent by the various agencies of the Government. I live in a medium-sized city. As the average head of a family in my city I now pay over \$300 a year for city government, and every year they ask for more. Every year, because of matching programs and "gimme" programs, they get more. As an average head of a family in my home county, I pay about \$450 a year taxes. Every year they want more because of matching programs and "gimme" programs, and every year they get more. As the average head of a family in the great State of California, I am expected to pay about \$1,000 a year. Every year they want more because of matching programs and "gimme" programs and every year they tax more. As much as 85 percent of some of our State budgets are now expended for relief and schools alone. I have been in school rooms, gentlemen, that cost 15 times as much as the homes in which the children live, who spend a few hours in the class room. As an average head of a family last year, the National Government collected from me the amount of \$1,285, as it did from every other family in America. After that gentlemen, this National Government spent \$1,000 per family more than it was able to collect in taxes after our policemen went to Korea last year.

Mr. Chairman, we now propose to spend about \$125,000,000,000 for local, State, and National Government in the coming year. That, sir, is over one-half of the total national income. It is little wonder that there is a wedding across the aisle of this House. It is to be hoped that the honeymoon will be long and extended. If men are to remain free, they must live according to laws and not executive decrees. My party, the organized opposition party, must oppose legislation and appropriations which are improper or which cannot be understood. This is not a privilege, but a duty in the interest of the economy of the country and the welfare of the Nation. If the organized opposition under present-day circumstances cannot receive assistance from across the aisle so that new equitable rights in an industrial and peacetime economy can be defined, then Mr. Chairman, we are lost through demagoguery.

Mr. Chairman, free government is lost when Representatives in this House, knowing the circumstances and the necessity for opposition, regardless of party alinement, refuse to oppose. The very man who purportedly speaks for the majority party as its national leader told us a year ago that he was going to increase the national income to \$300,000,000,000 and the annual average sal-

ary to \$3,500. He knew that many Americans would credit him with being a statesman and that his purpose was to increase the national income to that extent. He did not mention the fact that he was proposing and stimulating a tax burden approaching the sum of about \$3,000 for many families in America. He did not admit that he was Lord Macauley's demagog, decreasing the value of the dollar for political purposes.

Yes; the wedding is taking place. It is real. It is necessary. I joined the opposition party and am going to stay in it for the very sound and good reason that you no longer have an executive head exercising the power of the majority party. Our Executive is the titular head of pressure-group government. He has stolen the machinery of the majority party from its national level to the local precincts. He basks in the sunlight of its fine old traditions and sound principles. But the demagog in power operates with a dogma, which says that the American people are no longer fit to be free; a dogma which says it is all right to covet your neighbor's goods so long as you do it by pressure groups, power-seeking labor leaders and political machinery; a dogma that says it is all right to steal provided you use only economic force and operate through bureaus or demagogues and chicanery.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. Gossett].

The question was taken; and the Chair being in doubt, the Committee divided, and there were—ayes 82, noes 51.

Mr. GARY. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered; and the Chairman appointed as tellers Mr. GARY and Mr. Gossett.

The Committee again divided; and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 118, noes 70.

So the amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

BUREAU OF INTERNAL REVENUE
SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses in assessment and collection of internal-revenue taxes; administration of the internal-revenue laws; discharge of functions imposed upon the Commissioner of Internal Revenue by or pursuant to other laws; investigations concerning the enrollment or disbarment of practitioners before the Treasury Department in internal-revenue matters; and acquisition, operation, maintenance, and repair of property under title III of the Liquor Law Repeal and Enforcement Act (40 U. S. C. 304f-m), including expenses, when specifically authorized by the Commissioner, of attendance at meetings of organizations concerned with internal-revenue matters; purchase (not to exceed 300 for replacement only) and hire of passenger motor vehicles; examination of estimates of appropriations in the field services as authorized by section 15 of the act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a), and of expert witnesses at such rates as may be determined by the Commissioner of Internal Revenue; expenses of seizure, custody, and disposal of property; purchase of chemical analyses and expenses of testimony thereon; ammunition; securing of information and evidence; and not to exceed \$500,000 for detecting and bringing to trial persons guilty of violating the internal-revenue laws or conniving at the same, as authorized by law

(26 U. S. C. 3792); \$252,000,000: *Provided*, That the amount for personal services in the District of Columbia shall not exceed \$17,700,000.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. WIGGLESWORTH: On page 5, line 20, after the semicolon, strike out "\$252,000,000" and insert "\$249,000,000."

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Chairman, listening to some of my good friends on my right this morning, I would think that some of the amendments discussed were amendments designed to wipe out the various agencies concerned. As a matter of fact, no amendment adopted today has amounted to more than a trifling reduction in terms of percentage.

There are several over-all considerations of vital importance at this time.

The Congress is confronted by an over-all budget request from the President of the United States amounting to some \$98 billion in authorized expenditure and to some \$71 billion in actual expenditure, the largest budget ever presented to the Congress except in time of war.

If that program is not substantially reduced it may contribute to a drastic nationwide inflation and play directly into the hands of the Communist government in Russia.

The first appropriation bill which is now under consideration recommends a reduction in Presidential recommendations only to the extent of a little over 1 percent, and provides for actual increases as compared with funds available in the current fiscal year amounting to some \$38 million.

As to this particular item, if I read page 210 of the hearings correctly, there was requested an increase as compared to the present fiscal year from \$246,800,000 to \$255,500,000 or some \$9,000,000. Yet, when I turn to the report of the committee, at page 9, I find that after a reduction of \$3,500,000 recommended by the committee, this Bureau will have \$10,454,000 more than it had in the current fiscal year.

In other words the committee recommendation allows the Bureau \$1,500,000 more than the \$9,000,000 increase which it requested, and this amount can clearly be deducted.

Now I know my good friend, the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. GARY] for whom I have both high regard and affection, will tell you that the more personnel employed in this Bureau the more money you are going to collect. But, Mr. Chairman, there must be some limitation.

In the fiscal year 1949 this Bureau got along with a personnel of 50,600. We gave them an increase of almost 4,000 for the fiscal year 1950, raising the personnel to 54,411. Then for the current fiscal year we increased the number to almost 57,000, a figure which in my judgment was unjustified when granted.

The appropriation for the Bureau has increased from \$230,400,000 in 1949 to \$246,800,000 in 1950 and \$252,000,000 if the committee recommendation be approved for the fiscal year 1952.

The cut which the committee proposes plus the additional cut that I recommend

would amount together to only a 2½ percent over-all reduction in the request by the Bureau. It would still leave the Bureau with some \$7,500,000 more than it had for the current fiscal year, as compared with the increase apparently requested of \$9,000,000. It seems to me that the various plans which the Secretary has in mind for simplification and for modernization should make it possible to easily absorb this reduction and obtain the same or more work with the personnel provided.

I hope, Mr. Chairman, that the committee will see fit to approve this reduction in the amount recommended for the Bureau.

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

Mr. Chairman, I happen to be on the subcommittee to investigate the workings of the Internal Revenue Bureau. They have 2,500 racketeering cases under investigation. In 500 of these cases \$58,000,000 of revenue is involved. The investigation of racketeers which has been brought out by the Kefauver committee extremely important, very time consuming, and needs more agents. This amendment for a cut of \$3,000,000 would result in the cutting off of 850 agents.

We have had before us in the full Ways and Means Committee the Alcohol Tax Unit. We are talking, as you know, about raising the tax on hard liquor—at least the President recommended it—from \$9 to \$12. This will encourage bootlegging. I personally think it is too great a rise, but the Alcohol Tax Unit said that they needed a hundred more agents in order to carry out the extra work that might be thrown on them on account of this increase in the tax.

I have voted for economy right down the line, and I have gone along with you on every one of these amendments today and yesterday, but these people are the people who are going to raise the revenue to run the expanded needs of Government. I think, however, that if we cut this unit by cutting out these 850 agents it is false economy because we are not going to get the revenue we need. We in the Ways and Means Committee are sweating every day trying to find sources of revenue which will not injure the economy too much. If we do not raise it, and the only way we can collect what is due is through having sufficient agents, certainly we are just going to have to raise more taxes on everybody.

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

Mr. KEAN. I yield.

Mr. CANFIELD. The gentleman, of course, knows that the committee itself has approved a cut of \$3,500,000. That is roughly the equivalent of 900 man-years, and the Bureau translates that into 1,100 positions; so this new cut means that some 2,000-plus men will be dropped from enforcement.

Mr. KEAN. I think that is false economy. I hope this amendment is defeated.

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

Mr. KEAN. I yield.

Mr. FORAND. Does not the gentleman recall that when witnesses from the

Bureau of Internal Revenue were before our committee, especially when they were discussing this possibility of additional moonshiners, that it was pointed out to us they today had some 500 fewer enforcement officers than they had 10 years ago?

Mr. KEAN. I recall that.

Mr. FORAND. And also I am sure the gentleman recalls that when we put those additional enforcement officers in the Bureau of Internal Revenue the record shows that we collected \$20 for every \$1 invested.

Mr. KEAN. Exactly; that is what the record shows.

Mr. FORAND. Under those circumstances does not the gentleman agree with me that it would be very foolish for us to cut this figure instead of giving the Bureau of Internal Revenue the increase they need?

Mr. KEAN. That is why I am here today.

Mr. FORAND. I congratulate the gentleman.

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

Mr. Chairman, it is the responsibility of the Committee on Ways and Means, under the Rules of the House, to maintain scrutiny over administration of the internal revenue laws. During the past fiscal year, the Bureau of Internal Revenue had available approximately 20,000 revenue agents, deputy collectors, and auditors engaged in the examination of tax returns. Even so, they were able to examine only about 4,500,000 returns out of the 90,000,000 returns covering all kinds of taxes filed with the Bureau.

In recent weeks there has been considerable criticism in the press relating to charges made in Congress and elsewhere that the Bureau of Internal Revenue is not devoting sufficient time and effort to checking income tax returns. Surely, any cut in the appropriation for the Bureau of Internal Revenue would make certain that the Bureau of Internal Revenue would be able to examine fewer returns and devote less time to collecting the taxes that are rightfully due to the Government.

Commissioner of Internal Revenue Schoeneman has estimated that an additional \$1,000,000,000 to \$1,500,000,000 could be collected if the Bureau of Internal Revenue had sufficient enforcement personnel.

We now have appointed a subcommittee of the Committee on Ways and Means to maintain constant review of the administration of the tax laws. Doubtless, efficiencies and economies can be made. However, strong as I am for economy in government, and I believe everyone knows my reputation in this respect, I believe it would be indeed penny-wise and pound-foolish for us to attempt to reduce the appropriation for the Bureau of Internal Revenue.

At the present time each agent collects on the average additional tax of \$87,000 per year which otherwise would be lost to the Government, and the salary of each agent is only about \$4,500. We can estimate, therefore, that for every one of the agents which it would be necessary for the Bureau of Internal Revenue to remove from its rolls as a result

of this proposed reduction, the Government would lose approximately \$80,000.

I sincerely trust that this amendment, and any other amendment to reduce the appropriation for the Bureau of Internal Revenue below the \$252,000,000 contained in the bill will be defeated.

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

Mr. DOUGHTON. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. COX. Mr. Chairman, I ask the gentleman to yield so that I might inquire of the gentleman from Massachusetts, author of the pending amendment, in view of the position taken by the gentleman from North Carolina and from what he has said, if he will not give consideration to asking unanimous consent to withdraw his amendment? I hope he will. I can do nothing more than suggest what I think is a wise thing to do.

Mr. KING. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pending amendment.

Mr. Chairman, first I want to compliment the distinguished gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. KEAN] for taking the floor as he did and attempting under very short notice to make clear the problems confronting this department that we members of the Committee on Ways and Means have forcibly brought to our attention almost daily. The gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. KEAN] is a member of a subcommittee that has been created by the Committee on Ways and Means to go thoroughly into the revenue procedures of the Government. To date about all the evidence in the aggregate that has been brought to our attention indicates, as the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means [Mr. DOUGHTON] has stated, that rather than reduce this Bureau's appropriations there is every reason to believe at this time that probably it should be increased.

I do not need to state that it is not my habit to find fault with the great Committee on Appropriations. I, like the chairman, want to compliment the committee on the work it has done and intends to do, but I must say that it would be bad news indeed, in the face of the record that we have made in the Committee on Ways and Means, to find the House in a mood to reduce the allowances for the Bureau of Internal Revenue.

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

Mr. KING. I yield to the gentleman from Rhode Island.

Mr. FORAND. I want to call particularly to the attention of the membership of the House that the gentleman from California is chairman of that subcommittee that is following the activities of the Bureau of Internal Revenue and is in a position to know exactly what the troubles are that are developing. His committee is following this very, very religiously because, as a member of the Committee on Ways and Means, he realizes the difficulty the entire committee is having. Most of you know that for the last 2 months or so the Committee on Ways and Means has been in session mornings and afternoons listening to testimony from people in all categories of life who come to us and tell us they admit

that we need additional revenue, but, of course, we always get that additional phrase, "but do not tax us." However, we have a very onerous responsibility, and we have come to the conclusion, informally in the committee, that additional agents are needed in the Bureau. Additional positions are needed for the returns to be audited. The record shows, as the gentleman from California will agree with me, I am sure, that only a very small percentage of the returns are audited each year.

Mr. KING. That is correct.

Mr. FORAND. But progress has been made during the last year or so by the introduction of electric machines, and so forth, so that approximately 1 out of 10 returns in the lower brackets is being audited. I believe that is correct.

Mr. KING. That is correct.

Mr. FORAND. As you go up the scale in the various other categories, a few more, a little higher percentage, are being audited, and I believe we were told that all returns in excess of \$25,000 are being audited each year now.

Mr. KING. That is correct.

Mr. FORAND. Does the gentleman recall exactly what the statement was concerning the possibility that within a very short time every person's return will be audited at least once every 2 or 3 years?

Mr. KING. I think that is correct. I am not certain as to the term, whether it was 2 or 3 years.

Mr. FORAND. At any rate, great progress is made in that direction, is it not?

Mr. KING. Yes.

Mr. FORAND. Under those circumstances, I believe instead of hampering the Bureau by curtailing the appropriation we should be a little more generous and say, "Go ahead, fellows; clean up this mess and get in this money that should be paid into the Treasury."

Mr. KING. I agree with the gentleman.

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

Mr. KING. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. CANFIELD. In 1946 the Bureau had 59,693 employees and the collections then were \$40,558,000,000. Currently, 1951, the Bureau has 58,415 employees and the collections are \$47,883,000,000.

Mr. KING. What does that seem to indicate, may I ask the gentleman?

Mr. CANFIELD. A better job being performed all along the line.

Mr. KING. Correct.

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

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WIGGLESWORTH].

The amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

BUREAU OF NARCOTICS
SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For expenses necessary to enforce sections 2550-2565; 2567-2571; 2590-2603; 3220-3228; 3230-3238 of the Internal Revenue Code; the Narcotic Drugs Import and Export Act, as amended (21 U. S. C. 171-184); the act of June 14, 1930 (5 U. S. C. 282-282c and 21 U. S. C. 197-198) and the Opium Poppy Control Act of 1942 (21 U. S. C. 188-188n), including services as authorized by section 15

of the act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a); purchase of chemical analyses and testimony thereon; expenses of seizure, custody, and disposal of property; hire of passenger motor vehicles; arms and ammunition; not to exceed \$10,000 for the collection and dissemination of information and appeal for law observance and law enforcement, including cost of printing; securing of information and evidence; and not to exceed \$10,000 for services or information looking toward the apprehension of narcotic law violators who are fugitives from justice; \$2,025,000.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. FALLON: Page 7, line 2, strike out "\$2,025,000" and insert "\$2,100,000."

Mr. FALLON. Mr. Chairman, ordinarily I would feel embarrassed in offering an amendment to increase an appropriation bill after what has transpired in the House in the past several days. But I am not embarrassed in asking for this additional \$75,000 in the enforcement and investigation of the drug traffic. Just yesterday, in the Baltimore Sun paper an article appeared by Mr. Anslinger in which he said that the narcotic traffic and the illegal use of it had reached an epidemic stage. He went on to say that 2 years ago in the hospital in Lexington, Ky., there were three boys under 21 years of age being treated for the use of narcotics. Today there are over 200 patients under 21 years of age.

I can see the necessity and the wisdom of cutting many of the items in the budget, but I feel that there can be no maximum set in enforcing our drug laws. I know of three incidents that have happened in connection with the criminal courts in Baltimore since January 1. One was an armed hold-up of a loan company. When the boys were apprehended, it was found that two of them had records for the use of narcotics. Just 2 weeks ago there was a murder and a suicide. The murderer had a history of the use of narcotics. When a boy was apprehended for raping a 13-year-old girl 2 weeks ago they found marihuana cigarettes in his pocket.

I could go on and on and cite to you a number of cases in other cities, crimes of passion and others, but I do not want to take the time of the committee.

At Fort Bragg just last week 20 boys in one company were hospitalized for the use of narcotics. The Narcotics Division has been asked to send men to investigate these Army camps, but they do not have the men to spare. When a dope raid is made on one of these dens it is just a flash in the pan. They go in and get these people, get the stuff, and bring it out. It takes only an hour or an hour and a half, but that is the result of perhaps months and months of investigative work. It takes a number of agents to do that.

I think this \$75,000 is really a capital investment in the people of this country. I think it is unwise not to give this additional money, not only because you save the money in the Public Health Service work but because you have a stake in broken hearts and broken homes, which in many cases are irreparable.

I may say to the chairman of the committee that in his State of Virginia there is one narcotics agent. To the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. STAGGERS] that in his State of West Virginia there is one agent. In the city of Baltimore, the second largest port of entry in the United States, in fact, in the whole State of Maryland, with over 2,000,000 people, there are only two narcotics investigators. Yet in the same State there are probably hundreds of people looking for illicit whisky. In this case we are trying to save humanity, we are trying to make an investment in the youth of this country. Think of the increase from 3 cases in Lexington, Ky., 2 years ago, to 200 cases today is the best evidence that this amendment should be adopted.

Mr. Chairman, I do not know of any time I ever took the floor of this House that I ever made a greater contribution to the humanity of this country than at this time.

Mr. GARY. Mr. Chairman, may I say that this amendment appeals to me very strongly, for the simple fact, as I stated in my opening remarks, that this narcotics situation is reaching alarming proportions.

It does give me some sense of gratification, however, that this amendment is offered, because apparently up until this point the Members of the House have felt that our committee was not trying to reduce the budget.

We gave this Bureau all the money we felt we could consistently give them in view of our present fiscal situation. We allowed the Bureau of Narcotics last year \$1,850,000. That was reduced to \$1,845,000 under the general order directing the Bureau of the Budget to cut \$650,000,000 from the entire budget. Two million one hundred thousand dollars was requested for 1952, an increase of \$180,000 over the 1951 appropriation as reduced. We reduced their request \$75,000. We felt that that was very fair treatment.

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

Mr. GARY. I yield.

Mr. HALLECK. Is it not true, also, that the local enforcement officers in the municipalities, the counties, and the States have the primary responsibility for controlling the matter of sale of narcotics, and so forth?

Mr. GARY. That is correct.

Mr. HALLECK. And whatever might be done at the Federal level could not cope with the problem unless the enforcement officers on the local level assume their responsibility.

Mr. GARY. The Commissioner of Narcotics is a very able public servant. His Bureau works very closely with the local officers in enforcing the narcotic laws. Just a few days ago there was a large raid of dope peddlers made here in the city of Washington. That raid was conducted jointly by the local police officers and representatives of the Bureau of Narcotics. They work together very closely in handling these raids. We do have the local officers in addition to the Bureau.

I am very sympathetic with this amendment and yet, as I say, we have

a very acute fiscal situation. We felt this cut was fair.

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

Mr. GARY. I yield.

Mr. CANFIELD. Is it not true that Dr. Anslinger's appeal in this hour is for stronger and stricter Federal and State and local laws, so that the penalties given to these people who sell narcotics will be real penalties.

Mr. GARY. That is true. He has done a magnificent job. He has not only tried to fight the problem in this country, but several years ago our committee allowed him additional funds so that he could send agents abroad to work with the enforcement agents there. They have broken up a great many of the large dope rings in foreign countries that were sending narcotics into the United States.

Mr. CANFIELD. There are too many sizable communities in the United States that do not have effective local narcotic laws and should have them to cooperate with the 220 men in this Bureau, which is a very small number of men at the Federal level.

Mr. GARY. I think that is true. It is a very serious problem. The use of marijuana, the increase of addictions among the teen-agers, and the increased use of heroin are creating an alarming situation in this country.

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

Mr. GARY. I yield.

Mr. FALLON. Is it not true in most of these raids, and particularly the one in Washington last week, that that is the result of months and months of investigation by our Federal agents?

Mr. GARY. Such raids are usually the result of months of investigation by both Federal and State agencies working very closely together in the enforcement of the act.

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

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, probably everyone who has knowledge of conditions in some of the larger cities will agree that the trade in drugs is increasing and an increasingly large number of our young people are being injuriously affected by it. I am wondering now, though, whether having started on a little economy drive we are about to go in the other direction—and increase the amounts made in the bill. Permit me to quote part of a letter which came to me, not directly from the Chicago Crime Commission, but from one who is aware of conditions in Chicago, which calls attention to the fact that the difficulty in Chicago, at least, may be due not to a lack of funds but to a lack of disposition on the part of those who are charged with the administration of the program there to perform their duty, and possibly a tenderness on the part of enforcing officers toward some of those who are carrying on that trade.

Permit me to read:

You asked me what the Government could do to help in this city that it wasn't doing now. Specifically, let me say to you that the Narcotic Bureau maintained by the Gov-

ernment in Chicago is probably about only 20 percent efficient if that much. In other words, I don't think they do one-fifth of the work they should do and I don't think the man in charge, whose name is Artis, cares much. He appears to be interested only in keeping his job. Since he has been in Chicago the number of dope addicts has increased tenfold. In other words, when he came here there were probably about 1,000 addicts in Chicago. Today there are not less than 10,000, and if Mr. Artis stays there will probably be 20,000 in another year as he is doing nothing to stop the sale of dope, in my opinion. Every once in a while he makes a splurge and there are a few arrests, but he is a long way from being successful in enforcing the Harrison Narcotic Act in Chicago.

The people are crying for help. I do know that the local officials are putting up a splendid campaign against the dope peddlers, but so far have not been very successful as more and more of our high-school students are becoming addicts every day.

Up to a few months ago the Government provided hospital facilities for addicts volunteering to take the cure, but the Government hospital at Lexington, Ky., has been closed to Chicago patients for some time and Chicago has no hospital facilities to take care of voluntary patients who are suffering from the use of narcotics.

What we need in addition to better enforcement is a Government subsidy for hospitalization of our young folks who are victims of the Government's failure to keep heroin out of this city. The police say tremendous quantities of this outlawed drug has come into this city in the past 2 years, and undoubtedly it comes from Red China and other territories behind the iron curtain, and no doubt Mr. Bridge's longshoremen help smuggle it into this country.

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

Mr. Chairman, I have sat here and listened to the advice given by various Members on this particular subject. I want to say at the beginning I am in favor of the amendment, for this reason: I think, with all due respect to the Members of the House, that I know a little bit more about narcotics and the narcotic cases than the average Member of Congress for the simple reason that for several years I was law-enforcement agent employed by the United States Treasury. I lived with some of the culprits with whom Mr. Anslinger has to deal; I know what these culprits will do and the extent to which they will go to get narcotics. I also know what the peddlers or the pushers, as they are known in the underworld, will do to get customers. They will invade our universities and our high schools, and they will also trespass upon our doctors.

Another thing that I think should be taken into consideration while we are looking over this particular section of the bill is the salaries paid in the Narcotics Bureau. The average narcotic agent is the lowest-paid law-enforcement officer of the entire Government. His salary is not by any means comparable with those of the FBI, yet he does exactly the same kind of work that an FBI agent does. For instance, I can remember when I worked in New York as a narcotic agent and especially in Harlem, the East Side, and in Chinatown for about \$2,000 a year while other law-enforcement agents of the Government started at approximately \$3,200 a

year. Make a comparison of the salaries the narcotics agents get today with those paid the FBI or agents of some of the other investigative agencies of the Government and you will understand why this amendment should prevail.

In closing, Mr. Chairman, let me say that I support this amendment, and I hope that the Members of the House will see fit to do so.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Maryland.

The amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

BUREAU OF THE MINT
SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses at the mints at Philadelphia, Pa., San Francisco, Calif., and Denver, Colo.; the assay offices at New York, N. Y., and Seattle, Wash.; the bullion depositories at Fort Knox, Ky., and West Point, N. Y., and the Office of the Director of the Mint, and for carrying out the provisions of the Gold Reserve Act of 1934 and the Silver Purchase Act of 1934, including arms and ammunition, purchase and maintenance of uniforms and accessories for guards, purchase of one passenger motor vehicle (for replacement only), cases and enameling for medals manufactured, loss on sale of sweeps arising from the treatment of bullion and the manufacture of coins, not to exceed \$1,000 for the expenses of the annual assay commission, and not to exceed \$1,000 for acquisition, at the dollar face amount or otherwise, of specimen and rare coins, including United States and foreign gold coins and pieces of gold used as, or in lieu of, money, and ores for addition to the Government's collection; \$4,500,000.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. COLMER: Page 10, line 3, strike out "\$4,500,000" and insert "\$4,300,000."

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Chairman, this amendment, in brief, would strike \$200,000 from this item. In substantiation of the reason for this amendment I call the committee's attention to the fact that in fiscal year 1951 the Mint turned out approximately a billion coins at a cost of \$3,800,000. The budget estimate for the fiscal year 1952 is an increase to \$5,190,000. The committee in its wisdom saw fit to cut that \$690,000.

I think it is only fair, in behalf of the committee, to point out that was done, but the fact remains, and it is a striking fact, that at the appropriation level for 1951 of \$3,800,000 with which they were to produce 650,000,000 coins they actually more than doubled their production as the hearings show at pages 309 and 310. However, the Bureau says it cannot be expected to sustain this high yield and indicate that a supplemental appropriation of \$330,000 will be necessary to put them through 1951. Now the fact remains that despite a slackening in production in the second half of 1951 they produced with that \$3,800,000 approximately 1,100,000,000 coins.

Let me say in this connection I realize it is very difficult for the committee or for any Member of the Congress to pose as an expert on a proposition of this sort; yet my figures are taken from a record that was made by the Bureau be-

fore the committee itself. But if they can produce over a billion coins in fiscal 1951 with \$3,800,000, they can certainly produce another billion coins in this year with \$4,300,000 which my amendment would give them. In other words, there would be a substantial increase over last year.

Mr. Chairman, while I am on the subject, I want to direct myself now to the over-all picture for just a moment. In the well of this House today and yesterday a great deal has been said about politics, about coalitions and about what is being done there. Let me say in this connection that so far as I am concerned, as a Representative, one Member of the 435 of this body, I am going to work with whomever I can in order to try to balance this budget and to keep this country on an even keel.

It does not take a smart man—if it did I would not be presumptuous enough to make the utterance—to know, much less a Member of Congress, that we cannot go on and on and on indefinitely spending, spending and spending.

I hold in my hand a copy of the United States News, a very valuable and reliable magazine published here in the city of Washington for March 11. I call attention to a graphic picture of the value of a dollar, which in 1900 was worth 100 cents. In 1915 that dollar had shrunk to 77 cents, in 1930 it had shrunk to 46 cents, in 1951, this little picture down here represents the value of the dollar, it had shrunk to 31 cents. There is an illustration that anybody can understand.

What does that mean for the future of this country? What does that mean for the old-age pensioner? What does that mean to Members of Congress who are looking forward to a modest pension some day? What does that mean to the wage earner and to the future sound fiscal policy of this Nation?

We are worried about Russia, and we have reason to worry about Russia. Some of us have been contending for more than 5 years that Russia's real policy and strategy is to destroy this country by destroying its economy and its sound fiscal policy. We cannot go on indefinitely that way, as I stated.

In connection with this little item here, I am not asking you to go back to fiscal 1951, to \$3,800,000. I am asking you by my amendment to go to \$4,300,000, which is a substantial increase over what it was last year. We all realize that with this kind of cheap money that has been discussed there is more and more money in circulation and I recognize, as the committee recognizes the necessity for additional coins.

We put into circulation over 1,000,000,000 coins in fiscal 1951. Under this I contend that we can put into circulation, and the record will bear me out in it, as well as the hearings, another billion or more coins at a saving over what the bill provides of \$200,000, which would be still an increase of several hundred thousand dollars over what it was last year.

I have no fault to find with this Committee on Appropriations. There have been a lot of compliments paid the committee here today, and they have done

a good job. They have cut this some. But here is what we are up against, and here is what the committee is up against. The Committee on Appropriations sits down there and works day in and day out holding these hearings, and they do a good job, and they have done a good job on this bill. But they only have the opportunity of hearing one side of the question. They hear only the representatives of the Bureau seeking the money. They do not have the experts that the Department has who come before the committee and present their side of the case. I think the committee should be congratulated upon doing as well as they do under the circumstances.

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

Mr. COLMER. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. CANFIELD. The gentleman is absolutely right in the statement he has just made about the lack of experts, and it is a most unfortunate thing, not only for the Congress of the United States but for the taxpayers of our country as a whole.

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

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

Mr. CANNON. The Committee on Appropriations has the best experts that can be secured; the best trained and the most efficient that could possibly be supplied, and no member of the committee is denied any information which he requires in answering or cross-examining the representatives of the departments.

Mr. COLMER. I certainly had no idea of reflecting upon the experts of the staff of the committee. They are excellent. The trouble, Mr. Chairman, I think is, and what I tried to convey, that you do not have enough of them to compete and to fight with, if I may go that strong, the experts that the departments have, and I think that that goes for every committee in this Congress. I think that if the committees of the Congress did have more staffs, not better ones but more, that we would be in a much better position to cope with the demands of the departments uptown.

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

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman be permitted to proceed for one additional minute.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. CANNON. The number of experts at the command of the Committee on Appropriations is unlimited. If we have one investigation, we have the experts necessary to handle it, men particularly qualified by that feature of the work. If we have 10 investigations, we have 10 such groups. They are available in unlimited number. That is the advantage of our system. It is elastic. It can be expanded or contracted. Where you have a year-round set of experts, when you have additional work you cannot expand them; there are not enough

to go around; where you have no work you cannot dismiss them as we can. No criticism has ever been made within our committee of anyone failing to secure any information which was desired upon any question of appropriations or any question considered by our committee.

Mr. COLMER. The fact remains we can save \$200,000 by this amendment and still save over a half a million over the committee bill.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, it is not my purpose to get into this controversy, except to say this: I have been here a good many years and I know something about how these departments and these bureaus work. As a matter of fact, there are some very able and honest Americans in these bureaus who would like to do the right thing for their Government and for the people at large, but I am told by some of the most reliable people in these bureaus that for six months before an appropriation bill is coming out, before they are to be heard, they start in doing nothing except building up a case against the Committee on Appropriations. Now, that is not the fault of the Committee on Appropriations, but it is the system of bureaucracy at work within to constantly expand and get all the money it can get. I always felt that if you spent a billion dollars, if that would cover it, to get the right kind of people in these bureaus investigating from one end of the year to the other, you would save many billions of dollars for this Government.

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

Mr. REED of New York. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. CANNON. It is not necessary to spend extraordinary amounts for this purpose. Our system is not only the most efficient and the most effective, our experts are not only the best trained that can be secured, but we secure them at a minimum of expense, which in itself is not a matter to be neglected.

Most of our experts are trained by the FBI. I think it will be generally conceded that there are no better trained men in the world. They are available to us at any time, and we use them the year around. Every summer when vacation comes, if there is a vacation, in anticipation of the time when we will be absent we order investigations into every department which any member of the committee or anyone outside the committee thinks ought to be investigated, and during the summer while we are away these experts are at work. When we come back the reports are ready for us. It is done efficiently and at a minimum of expense.

Mr. REED of New York. In answer to that, the best evidence of the fact that the job is not properly done is the amount of fat that is in these budgets, and which a lot of people even on the gentleman's own side of the House are now trying to remove from the budget. So that even though you may have the experts, they are not getting at the bottom of this problem at all.

The point is that there is a lot of fat that is not being taken out of these bills.

The people of this country are taxed now and are going to be taxed more, and they are protesting. They want cuts in these appropriations. You are certainly not getting them under the present system, except as you people on this side are coming out of your own committee and suggesting amendments here to reduce the appropriations.

Mr. CANNON. If there are any facts which the gentleman would like to have, if he will indicate them, we will supply them for him.

Mr. REED of New York. I am not on the Appropriations Committee, I am on the Ways and Means Committee. We are trying to raise money, but we cannot keep up with you in spending money.

Mr. CANNON. The gentleman is getting away from the question. The question is whether the members of the Committee on Appropriations have all the facts needed to enable them to write a good bill.

Mr. REED of New York. I am not getting away from the question at all, I am getting right at the meat of this situation. That is why the gentleman is excited about it.

Mr. CANNON. The gentleman says we do not have the facts, that we would not have the items in the bill if we did have the facts. The items are in the bill not because of lack of information, but because both the Democrats and the Republicans on the subcommittee, with all the facts before them, unanimously agreed to put them in the bill.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REED of New York. I yield.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I can tell the gentleman from Missouri where the evidence is and he can find it himself. Go around to any department and see all those employees sitting around idle. Go in a cafeteria in the Pentagon Building. The dean of the House pointed that out the other day. When he points it out, surely anyone can find it. The gentleman can find all the facts he wants all over, in every department.

Mr. CANNON. And we did find all the facts requested, and on those facts the members of the subcommittee, of the gentleman's party, voted unanimously with the members of my party on every item in this bill.

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

Mr. Chairman, the report on all bills reported by the subcommittees of the Committee on Appropriations have been practically unanimous. This means that the members of the committee on that side of the aisle as well as the members of the committee on this side of the aisle have after full hearings agreed on the bill as finally drafted and reported. I know of only one instance within a year in which we have had a minority report accompanying the majority report.

Incidentally, it is to be noted that during the entire consideration of this bill the minority members of the subcommittee have consistently voted with the majority members of the subcommittee on all amendments.

And every item reported in the bill has been unanimously reported by the

subcommittee with a full understanding of all the essential facts.

Every subcommittee in formulating its bill has had the advantage of full reports on all salient features of the bill from the committee's investigatory staff headed by men from the Federal Bureau of Investigation.

There is no bureau or agency of investigation anywhere which can supply men as carefully trained, and as expert in all fields of investigation as those we get from the Federal Bureau. In the last 2 years no member of the Committee on Appropriations or anyone else has asked for any facts which were not secured and no complaint has been made at any time that the information thus secured was inadequate or inaccurate. We have the most effective system of investigation that could be devised, and at the lowest cost for which it could be provided. If you need an accountant, we can get the best there is. If you need a scientist we have the best available. If you need a detective we can get you the ablest that can be secured in the United States.

There is a sort of vogue going around that we do not spend enough money on our staff; that we ought to have permanent investigators and ought to pay them higher salaries. There are always people who do not want to use a spade unless it is gold plated.

What happens when you put men permanently on the staff? They get careless. They get lazy. They develop friendships with the departments. If you get misfits it is hard to fire them. They develop a camaraderie with the members of the committee and get their salaries raised. Everybody downtown knows them. When they enter the door the word is passed through the building: "Here comes that fellow from the committee." When there is no investigation they sit around cooling their heels and their time and their salary is wasted. When we do not have any further investigating to do we send all of our men back to the Bureau and we do not waste a cent on them. Then when you have 10 or 20 investigations, if you have a permanent staff the staff is not big enough to handle all investigations at one time. We can get any number from FBI and we get them at the salaries FBI pays them. We do not pay them any longer than we have to use them, and when the investigation is finished they go back and are through. Professional investigators have an interest in prolonging and extending an investigation so as to hold their jobs and retain their salaries. The men that are sent up here from the department come here and make the investigation and when their job is completed go back and there is no further expense. We have new men on every investigation. No one in the departments know they represent the Committee until we so advise them. We have a fresh group on every inquiry. And new brooms sweep clean. So clean, in fact, that we seldom have to assign a second group to the same investigation.

Mr. Chairman, we have obtained every pertinent fact we have asked for in the last 2 years. No one can say that we

have requested information which was not secured, and that the information supplied was not accurate and comprehensive.

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

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

Mr. COUDERT. The distinguished chairman has made the point that many committee reports have come out unanimously. Is it not a fact that the minority members of these subcommittees are wholly dependent upon the representatives of the Government agencies and the experts retained and controlled by the majority members of the committee?

Mr. CANNON. Certainly not. The minority have as much control over the investigations as the majority. In fact, most of the investigations are requisitioned by the minority and over the signature of the ranking minority members of the committee and the subcommittee.

Mr. COUDERT. And is it not a further fact that in taking members of one agency to investigate another agency the chairman is running the risk that those gentlemen will be disposed to scratch each other's backs?

Mr. CANNON. That could not possibly be true. And no one has ever charged that any report received was subject to such an objection. We have had hundreds of reports and one is yet to be received which any member of the subcommittee or the committee suggested was influenced by any such consideration.

The FBI does not lend itself to that sort of thing.

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

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for two additional minutes.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, these investigations are held at the request of members of both sides. They are always authorized by the signature of the chairman of the subcommittee and the ranking minority member of the subcommittee, as well as the chairman and ranking minority member of the whole committee. The men who come up here are nonpartisan and wholly disinterested. They are given written instructions as to the information to be secured. They make a factual report on the question submitted to them without interference from anybody. No influence can be brought to bear by any member of the committee, majority or minority. The men go down, get the facts, and bring them back. None of the departments which have been characterized here this afternoon as organizing against the committee has as large or as well-trained a force as we use for these investigations.

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

Mr. Chairman, I just want to make a point so that there can be no question about it. The way the chairman and the minority members of this committee,

since they took over in the Eighty-first Congress, have managed investigations of the departments is very simple. They have sent bureaucrats to investigate bureaucrats. For my part I do not think the country is going to be fooled by any comic opera performance of that sort.

Mr. CANNON. Name a single bureaucrat that has been appointed to investigate a bureaucrat. Let the gentleman name a single such instance. We have had hundreds of investigations and no such charge has ever been made on the receipt of the report on any of them.

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

Mr. COUDERT. I yield.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Furthermore, the gentleman from New York well knows that we on the minority do not have a specified group under our particular control to go into the various bureaus and tell them to find out what we need to find out.

Mr. COUDERT. What the gentleman means is that we in the minority are solely, completely, and exclusively dependent upon the investigators selected by the majority.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. The gentleman is absolutely correct.

Mr. COUDERT. Dependent on them for the information upon which we are required to act. That is an absurd and an impossible situation and, for my part, a betrayal of our committees.

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

Mr. COUDERT. I yield.

Mr. CANNON. As a matter of fact, most of these investigations are started on the request of the minority. The gentleman from Minnesota has never asked for any investigation which was not made nor for any facts which were not given to him.

Mr. COUDERT. Is it not still a fact that the Members of the minority who may ask for information are merely dependent upon the information that is furnished them by the bureaucrat selected by the majority chairman to investigate the other bureaucrat?

Mr. CANNON. The chairman has nothing to do with the selection of the men who make these investigations.

Mr. COUDERT. Who does?

Mr. CANNON. The chairman is never consulted. I do not see a single man who makes these investigations. We have an FBI man in charge, and when an investigation is to be made the requisition, signed by the ranking majority and minority members of the subcommittee and the committee, is transmitted by the clerk to the FBI man and the FBI man selects the operators who he considers are qualified. The chairman never comes in contact with him or any of the agents; and the minority have as much access to the information they supply as the majority.

Mr. COUDERT. It is most interesting to me that the chairman's concession is that not only do bureaucrats investigate bureaucrats but that a bureaucrat selects the bureaucrat who is going to make the investigation.

Mr. CANNON. Does the gentleman charge that an FBI man is a bureaucrat?

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

Mr. COUDERT. I yield.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I would like the gentleman from Missouri to state publicly that he is willing to make us the concession that the minority on each of the subcommittees may have a clerk to use for any purpose we might wish along the line of investigating any department of the Government.

Mr. CANNON. Of course not. These investigators are absolutely nonpartisan. We have had recent experience with men selected as the gentleman suggests, by the party and for the party.

The gentleman on that side appointed a minority clerk and last week the Senate investigations disclosed that they had so little need for him that he has been devoting a large part of his time to helping elect a United States Senator, and in that capacity had disbursed some thousands of dollars in a highly questionable campaign—so questionable, in fact, that it is being investigated by a committee of the other body. If gentlemen on that side needed such a man as the gentleman describes, why did you not use Mr. Lee? He seems to have had time hanging heavily on his hands. And what credence could be given to the reports of such political hacks? How do they compare with the factual reports made by disinterested, nonpartisan men from the FBI?

Mr. COUDERT. Mr. Chairman, let me point out that the FBI is part of this administration, wholly dependent upon the administration for appointment, for maintenance in office, and for promotion; and it still remains a bureaucrat appointing a bureaucrat to investigate a bureaucrat.

Mr. CANNON. Fortunately, that is not the case at all.

Mr. COUDERT. Mr. Chairman, I do not yield. If that is the best the majority on this Appropriations Committee can do, it is high time to go back to a Republican Congress and have a Republican majority on that committee to reestablish the independent staff of experts who were so helpful in the work of the Eightieth Congress.

Mr. CANNON. Such experts as Mr. Lee?

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

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Missouri is recognized.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I make the point of order that the gentleman from Missouri spoke on this matter for 10 minutes just a few minutes ago.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is overruled.

The gentleman from Missouri, chairman of the committee, is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, gentlemen on that side in a very partisan spirit have charged that the FBI is a bureaucracy, and its investigations are perfunctory, in effect a whitewash of what they call other bureaucracies. Anyone knows that regardless of which party is in

power, regardless of which party controls the Congress or the Presidency, the FBI remains undisturbed, intact, and unaffected from administration to administration. It is in every respect impartial and nonpartisan, the fairest and the most experienced and the best-trained system of investigation to be found anywhere in the world today. Nobody has ever charged that the Director or any of his staff or any of his investigators are bureaucrats.

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

Mr. CANNON. Or that they are subject to any sort of partisan or political influence, and it is an unfair and an unjust reflection on an honored and tested agency which stands today between our country and exploitation, both at home and abroad.

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

Mr. CANNON. No man could be said to be safe from danger of kidnaping and blackmail today or from many other menaces which might imperil private citizens but for the FBI. And no confidential activity of our war program could be protected against enemy espionage but for the timeless vigilance of FBI. Like the keepers of Israel they neither slumber nor sleep. Throughout their long and useful service they have a record of unbroken integrity and efficiency.

Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. COUDERT. Mr. Chairman, it seems to me that the FBI has enough to do with its highly important criminal and espionage operations. The FBI should not be saddled with this extra burden.

Mr. Chairman, I never intended and do not intend to reflect upon the FBI in any of its important functions, but I have yet to learn that the FBI is an auditing agency, an accounting agency, or an efficiency engineering agency. That is something quite new.

Mr. CANNON. In response to the gentleman, I say it has the best trained accountants and efficiency experts in the world.

Mr. COUDERT. For espionage and criminal detection.

Mr. CANNON. We have invariably found it to be equal to any task or any duty and skilled in any field in which we have required assistance.

It is an unworthy reflection to say it would be guilty of partisanship.

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

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I disagree with the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations in one vital particular. We on the minority side cannot do a good job if the investigators that are sent down to the departments do not report direct to the minority leader of the Appropriations Committee rather than being under the control of the administration end of the committee, regardless of which party is in power.

I am convinced that if we on the minority side of the Subcommittee on Agriculture, for example, had an investigator at our beck and call and could send him to look into certain things concerning which we have considerable doubt, we could save one hundredfold the salary of that particular man.

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

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. CANNON. The gentleman says the ranking minority member of the committee does not receive reports. On the contrary, he receives every report made. When our investigators make a report they submit four copies. One copy goes to the chairman of the subcommittee, one copy goes to the ranking minority member of the subcommittee, one copy goes to the chairman of the full committee, and one goes to the ranking minority member of the full committee. So the minority is as fully apprised and as promptly apprised of every report made as any majority member of the committee. The gentleman further says if he could send an investigator to look into things he could save money. Has the gentleman ever asked for an investigation of that kind that he did not get? He has not.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. That is not the point which I am here trying to bring out.

Mr. CANNON. The gentleman has never asked for any investigation he did not get. If he had asked for it he would have gotten it. And he has never complained that the report on any investigation was inadequate or unsatisfactory.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I further want to call the attention of the committee to the fact that each subcommittee chairman under the system of operation at this time has almost complete control of the particular clerk operating for that committee, at least he commands most of his time, and he also has had an additional clerk given to him because of the duties pertaining to that office. We minority members on the subcommittee, as the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON] well knows, receive no consideration whatsoever in the way of additional help so that we might go out and look into these things which come up daily throughout the hearings and which might mean millions of dollars in savings to the taxpayers.

Mr. CANNON. That is the system in use by every committee of the House and Senate and has been followed ever since the founding of the Government. In the Eightieth Congress the Republicans had the clerks and we had none. Everybody knows the clerks of the committee are directed by the party in charge of the bills, the party selected for that purpose at the last election.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, I refuse to yield further. The gentleman from Missouri has taken up most of my time.

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

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. COLMER. I ask the gentleman to yield now just to observe that I was trying to be of help to the Appropriations Committee, to the Members on both sides, and I am sorry I stirred up this hornet's nest, but I hope we will not forget the real issue before us—the saving of \$300,000.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I agree with the gentleman. The amendment certainly should be adopted.

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

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

Mr. Chairman, when I had the privilege of serving as the ranking minority member of this subcommittee during the Eightieth Congress no clerk or investigator was assigned to me by my Republican friends.

But I do want to say to my friends on the other side, if they know of any fat in this particular bill I hope they will come to me as chairman of this subcommittee and let me know where it is, because our committee sat for weeks hearing these various departments and looking for fat. We cut out all the fat we could find.

With reference to the amendment under consideration, the distribution of coins reached a high peak during World War II. After the war the demand declined and the Mint began to build up a stockpile of coins, to meet future needs. As a result of that, in their original request for 1952, they requested only \$3,-990,000. When, however, the Korean war broke out, immediately there came a tremendously increased demand for coins. The Mint has issued for the first 6 months of 1951 more than twice the number of coins that it issued during the entire year 1950. Now the stockpile has declined. They have few coins on hand. As a result of that situation they came in and filed a supplemental request bringing their total request up to \$5,-190,000. The committee felt that we should take some cognizance of that situation but we did not know that the demand was going to continue to increase. Therefore, we cut \$690,000 from their request.

This amendment proposes to cut \$200,-000 additional. It simply means that it will reduce the number of coins that the Mint can make during 1952. If the additional coins are needed, as the increasing demand indicates, then we are going to be short of coins. The banks are going to be demanding coins and the Mint is not going to be able to supply the need.

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

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

Mr. COLMER. Is it not true, nevertheless, I ask my distinguished friend, that the mint did produce over a billion coins with the \$3,000,000 appropriation last year, and that they stepped it up with that appropriation to twice what it had been doing?

Mr. GARY. Because the demand has increased and they have been supplying the demand out of the stockpile,

and they estimate that they need more coins than they produced last year.

Mr. COLMER. Is it not also true that a simple appeal from the administrative agency to the public to put these coins back into circulation would save the taxpayers considerable money?

Mr. GARY. If the gentleman will read the hearings he will find that the subcommittee suggested and recommended that very thing.

Mr. COLMER. Permit me to say, as I should have said first, that that is exactly what I did do. I read what the subcommittee recommended, and I think they will get results.

Mr. GARY. In anticipation of what we hoped might be obtained from that, we cut off \$690,000. If you reduce it further you are liable to face a shortage of coins.

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

Mr. GARY. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. CRAWFORD. In view of the fact that so many people deal with the question of supply of money as relates to inflation, I would like to have the Chairman get into the RECORD a statement as to whether or not cutting down the supply of the coins will increase the buying power of the coins or whether increasing the supply of the coins will lead to inflation. Will the gentleman clear the RECORD on that point?

Mr. GARY. The number of coins will have nothing to do with the value of the coins. Of course, the number of coins required depends upon public demand, and I think frankly that a great deal of the need for the coins today is due to the pennies used to pay sales taxes that are being imposed throughout the country. The greatest demand is for pennies and most of this money will be used to produce pennies.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. COLMER].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. GARY) there were—ayes 86, noes 39.

So the amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

GENERAL ADMINISTRATION

For expenses necessary for general administration of the postal service, operation of the inspection service, and the conduct of a research and development program, including services as authorized by section 15 of the act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a); \$250,000 to be available exclusively for procurement by contract of things and services related to design, development, and construction of equipment used in postal operations, and for contracts for management studies; rewards for information and services concerning violations of postal laws and regulations, current and prior fiscal years, in accordance with regulations of the Postmaster General in effect at the time the services are rendered or information furnished; purchase of one passenger motor vehicle (for replacement only) at not to exceed \$4,500; and expenses of delegates designated by the Postmaster General to attend meetings and conventions for the purpose of making postal arrangements with foreign governments pursuant to law; \$20,000,000: *Provided*, That expenses of delegates provided for herein, and not to exceed \$20,000 for rewards as

provided for herein, shall be paid in the discretion of the Postmaster General and accounted for solely on his certificate.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. GARY: Page 14, line 8, strike out "\$20,000,000" and the remainder of line 8 and lines 9 through 12 inclusive, and insert "and the expenses of delegates provided for herein, and not to exceed \$20,000 for rewards as provided for herein, shall be paid in the discretion of the Postmaster General and accounted for solely on his certificate; \$20,000,000."

Mr. GARY. Mr. Chairman, this amendment merely clarifies the language. Some of the Members got the impression that the \$20,000,000 applied to the attending of meetings and conventions by the Postmaster General and his staff. I assure them that it does not. This amendment clarifies the language so that there can be no question about it.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

POSTAL OPERATIONS

For expenses necessary for postal operations, not otherwise provided for, and for other activities conducted by the Post Office Department pursuant to law, including \$500,000 to be available exclusively for manufacture and procurement of improved devices for postal operations and other activities; \$11,579,000 to be available exclusively for the purchase of trucks, tractors, and trailers; and storage and repair of vehicles owned by, or under control of, units of the National Guard and departments and agencies of the Federal Government where repairs are made necessary because of utilization of such vehicles in the postal service; \$1,845,000,000: *Provided*, That during the current fiscal year the inventory of trucks, tractors, and trailers of the Post Office Department shall not exceed 17,500 such vehicles at any time.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. WIGGLESWORTH: Page 14, line 24, after "service" strike out "\$1,845,000,000" and insert "\$1,823,000,000."

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Chairman, of the \$38,000,000 increases carried in this bill as compared with funds available the present fiscal year approximately \$33,000,000 is to be found in the items affecting the Post Office Department.

The report of the committee on page 17 shows a request of \$1,866,000,000, which has been reduced \$21,000,000, leaving a balance recommended by the committee of \$1,845,000,000.

The report points out that this sum is \$52,000,000 in excess of the amount appropriated in the current fiscal year, not including \$14,478,000 transferred to the General Services Administration.

When the two are taken into account, it means that there will be a total of \$66,478,000 more available for postal operations in fiscal 1952 than was available in fiscal 1951.

If I understand the meaning of the report and the language on the page that I have referred to, this \$66,478,000 represents 3.7 percent of the amount made

available for post office operations in the current fiscal year. You will note the report indicates that the Department justifies the increase requested mainly on the increased volume of mail to be handled by the Post Office Department in the fiscal year 1952 and that the Department estimates that during 1952 the volume of mail will increase 3.7 percent. In fact, \$66,400,000 is 3.7 percent of the total available in the present fiscal year.

The amendment I have offered is a very simple proposal. I understand the subcommittee does not feel the complete 3.7 percent can be absorbed. My amendment, therefore, suggests that one-third of that, or 1.2 percent of the increase based on the volume of mail estimated for the fiscal year 1952, shall be absorbed by the Department. That will leave the Department with no less than \$44,400,000 in excess of what it had for the present fiscal year.

Mr. Chairman, it seems to me that with the mechanization and other improvements which are now under consideration and the possibility of increased postal rates which are now under consideration, it surely is not asking the Post Office Department too much to suggest that it absorb the anticipated increase in cost of operations to the extent of 1.2 percent. I hope the committee will adopt this amendment.

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

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I yield.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I think the committee and the gentleman are on very solid ground here and the same line of argument should obtain with reference to the amendment I intend to offer on page 15 relating to the transportation of mail. The gentleman knows full well that in all of the small villages throughout the country we do not add another postmaster or another clerk simply because the volume of mail for the next fiscal year goes up by one-thirtieth of what they handled this year. The bulk of offices will handle that particular mail with exactly the same expense that they incurred in 1951. I certainly agree with the gentleman that they can absorb part of that proposed increase.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I thank the gentleman for his observation.

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

Mr. Chairman, last year I felt just like the gentleman feels now, that certain reductions should be made in the appropriation for the Post Office Department. Our committee worked long and hard on this bill last year. We recommended a reduction of \$28,107,000. The committee also recommended that the Postmaster General reduce residential mail deliveries from two to one a day. We instructed the Postmaster General to operate within the appropriation which was recommended by us and passed by the Congress. The request last year amounted to \$2,235,607,000. The committee and the Congress reduced this amount by \$28,107,000. Now the Post Office Department is asking this year for a supplemental appropriation in the amount of

\$45,100,000. So the Department is coming back for an additional \$17,000,000. Just as sure as we are here this afternoon, if this reduction is made it will have to be reinstated next year just as has been done this year. I should like to repeat those figures:

We cut \$28,107,000, and they are back asking for a supplemental appropriation of \$45,100,000. I think there is a reason for it. No doubt Members of the Congress, and that applies to all of us, are somewhat responsible for the condition that exists. If you will turn to page 5 of the hearings, you will note that there is pending at this time requests for 125 new rural delivery routes. There are requests for 4,253 extensions on city deliveries. If you will look at page 187 you will discover that since July 1 of last year to date there have been approximately 1,000,000 extensions made in the postal service. They have pending at this time applications for several hundred thousand more extensions. They have extended delivery service to a million new homes since July 1 of last year.

Mr. Chairman, if we are going to force the Post Office Department to operate under laws passed by this Congress granting these extensions when certain qualifications have been met, then we are going to have to appropriate money to carry out this service. Just as sure as we are discussing this bill this afternoon if you reduce this appropriation the Department is going to come back next year and ask for supplemental appropriations to recover all the cut plus an additional \$15,000,000 or \$20,000,000. I wish you would consider the bill on this basis because of the experience we have had in the last 4 or 5 years.

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

Mr. PASSMAN. I yield.

Mr. GROSS. You are providing what, \$600,000 for extending how many rural routes?

Mr. PASSMAN. It all depends on the amount of money as to how many additional routes can be added.

There is an increase for the present fiscal year of \$1,295,000,000.

Mr. GROSS. But I am interested in the extension of rural routes; what are you allowing for new rural routes?

Mr. PASSMAN. It is broken down in the bill as city delivery and postal operations; it is all under one heading this time.

Mr. GROSS. Is that considered enough to take care of route extensions that have been approved?

Mr. PASSMAN. The Post Office Department says "No"; the committee says "Yes." The committee told them they would have to operate within the amount we recommended and the amount passed by the Congress. We cut them \$21,000,000.

Mr. GROSS. But the committee thinks that that leaves a proper amount for the extension of rural routes to cover the obligations incurred by the Post Office Department?

Mr. PASSMAN. I cannot speak for other members of the committee but when we marked up the bill it was

unanimous, majority and minority. The Post Office Department says "No"; we say "Yes"; so I do not know whether they are going to be able to operate on that amount of money or whether they are coming back for a supplemental appropriation. They always have in the past and in all probability will this time.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. GARY) there were—ayes 60, noes 46.

Mr. GARY. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered; and the Chairman appointed as tellers Mr. GARY and Mr. WIGGLESWORTH.

The Committee again divided; and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 79, noes 57.

So the amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

TRANSPORTATION OF MAILS

For payments, current and prior fiscal years, for transportation of domestic and foreign mails by air, land, and water transportation facilities, settlements with foreign countries for handling of mail; and for expenses, exclusive of personal services, necessary for operation of Government-owned highway post office transportation service; \$465,000,000.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN: Page 13, line 11, strike out "\$485,000,000" and insert "\$454,200,000."

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, the urgent need for every possible economy has been so repeatedly and so forcibly brought out upon the floor of this House and to such a degree that it will not be necessary for me to do other than bring out the facts relative to this very important item of transportation of mail which embodies almost one-half billion dollars.

On at least two occasions during the hearings the Post Office Department representatives based their request for an increase of nearly \$29,500,000 solely on the anticipated increase in the volume of mail in 1952 over fiscal year 1951. They estimated this increase to be 3.77 percent over 1951. On page 17 of the report the subcommittee stated:

The Department estimated that during 1952 the mail volume will increase 3.77 percent over 1951.

Mr. Chairman, suppose that we do subscribe and agree to the need of the Department for an additional 3.77 percent in this item for which they have asked \$467,000,000, suppose we do agree with the premise they have placed before the subcommittee that the mail will increase by 3.77 percent. All right, let us give them that amount of money. Let us give them the \$16,200,000 that involves, but let us not give them an additional \$11,000,000 for which there seems to be no justification.

Why should we give them an increase of 6.6 percent when they tell the subcommittee on appropriations that they are basing their request entirely upon

their estimated increase of 3.77 percent in the mail volume? Certainly we have a right to look into this very huge item.

I anticipate that the opposition will bring out the matter of pending rate cases, but the fact remains that the situation relative to this particular item, as far as I know, will be the very same in 1952 as far as calculations are concerned as obtained in 1951. This 3.77 figure is purely a guess on the part of the Department. The volume of mail may increase to the extent of 3.77 percent. Let us give them that increase. I repeat, of \$16,200,000 above 1951, but let us show our faith with the taxpayers of America and withhold this additional \$11,000,000. Let us give the Post Office Department, Mr. Chairman, a little incentive toward economy. Surely in that vast expenditure of \$465,000,000 there must be some place where that great Department can save a little bit here and a little bit there and effectuate the over-all saving of 2½ percent. I am asking that you adopt.

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

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana. He has always been fair in yielding to others.

Mr. PASSMAN. Does the gentleman realize that these rates are fixed by law by the ICC and CAB?

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Surely.

Mr. PASSMAN. And this money can only be spent for transportation?

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I realize that. That is provided for in the amount we are here considering.

Mr. PASSMAN. The committee made a reduction of \$2,539,000 in this appropriation below what the Post Office Department said they would have to pay for transportation during fiscal 1952.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. The gentleman from Louisiana will admit that they based that testimony on the 3.77 percent increase, will he not?

Mr. PASSMAN. Heretofore they estimated their cost and they had to come back for a supplemental appropriation.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Yes, they made a bad guess. They underestimated it. So here they are trying to make it up, not only through this 3.77 percent, but they want an additional 2.8 percent increase to take care of an error on their part.

Mr. PASSMAN. They pay out these sums according to rates fixed by the ICC and the CAB, and they will not pay out the money unless they are forced to do so to transport the mails.

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

Mr. Chairman, our committee reduced the operating expenses of the Post Office Department last year \$21,000,000. As a result of that reduction it was necessary for the Post Office Department to curtail services. You will recall that they reduced the service to one delivery a day in residential sections, and a hue and cry went up from Members of this House. A bill was introduced to require the Post Office to restore that service. I stood up here and took my medicine. I had sponsored the cut and I opposed

the bill to restore the services on the floor of the House, but the House passed it by a very large majority. I hope that the Members of this House who are gutting the Post Office service at the present time, when the cry goes up throughout the land, will have the courage to stand here and say, "I did it; I will take the responsibility." That is all I am asking.

So far as this figure of \$465,000,000 for the transportation of mails is concerned, it is a figure that neither the Post Office Department nor our committee can change one iota. The rates for transporting the mail by train are fixed by the Interstate Commerce Commission, and the rates for transporting the mail by air are fixed by the CAB. The Post Office has absolutely nothing to do with it.

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

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

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Has there been any change in rates established in 1951 that would affect 1952?

Mr. GARY. There will be a change in rates, and this figure of \$465,000,000 is not going to be near enough for 1952.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. There will be.

Mr. GARY. There has been an increase in rates.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I believe the gentleman is mistaken.

Mr. GARY. Not for 1952, but there has been an increase agreed to and approved by the Interstate Commerce Commission for the years prior to December 31, 1950. In a few days you will have on the floor of this House a supplemental appropriation bill appropriating \$152,000,000 to pay the addition for those prior years. The ICC is still hearing that rate case for the years 1951 and 1952. There will unquestionably be an increase over the rate that has been paid and consequently this Congress is going to be called upon to appropriate additional sums for the transportation of mails for 1951 and 1952. There is absolutely no question about it.

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

Mr. GARY. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. SHAFER. I wonder if we have any assurance, if we give the Post Office Department the money they are asking for this year, of any better service in the future, and if they are going to do anything toward restoring some of the cuts in service that they have made.

Mr. GARY. No, sir; they cannot, because there is no money provided in the bill for restoring that service.

Mr. SHAFER. I wonder if the gentleman can tell me if it will give them ample money so that they can put more men on the post office in Boston, for instance, than actually work there, such as has been our experience during the last few weeks.

Mr. GARY. We feel there is enough money in the bill to enable the Post Office Department to do an adequate job.

Mr. SHAFER. Of course, that was a \$4,000,000 fraud up there.

Mr. GARY. But with the amount that has already been taken from the bill by the amendment just adopted, there will have to be, I fear, a further curtailment of service.

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

Mr. GARY. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. NICHOLSON. Will the gentleman tell me how many postal employees were left off the payroll for this year in comparison with last year?

Mr. GARY. No regular employees were left off, but there was a substantial saving in connection with substitute employees. Some of the substitute employees were dropped. However, the main economy came in the reduced number of hours that the substitute employees worked.

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

Mr. GARY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five additional minutes.

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

There was no objection.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. I should like to speak to two things the gentleman has brought up. One is the curtailment in the service. I feel that the reason for that curtailment has been very grossly exaggerated. After all, we all know and I think we are all agreed that we must make economies in nonessentials, that is, in nondefense spending on the part of the Government.

The Appropriations Committee told the Post Office Department that they had to save, that they had to economize. The Post Office Department then rushed out and curtailed the service as the first economy. I submit to the distinguished chairman of the committee that it might have effected economies in other ways. I think that had the Post Office Department investigated some of the practices in some of the offices they might have curtailed expenses. I know from the Hoover Report it was clearly pointed out that the Post Office Department could save many millions of dollars in various departments.

I merely wanted to ask the chairman of the subcommittee if he does not think that in all fairness the Post Office Department should try to cooperate, should try to come halfway instead of always coming before the various committees and saying, "We are very efficient, we do our work magnificently, and we cannot cut off one penny."

I have heard much testimony from the Department, and to my way of thinking a great many cuts could be made. I think the Department could be made a great deal more efficient. I personally am embarrassed that the only way in which they have been able to cut expenses is by curtailing service to the American people.

Mr. GARY. If the gentlewoman will read the report of our committee she will

find that we did not give the Post Office Department a clean bill of health on this score. I think it is an exceptionally efficient department, but there are many ways in which it can be improved.

Our committee has traveled practically all over the United States investigating first-hand conditions in the various post offices of the United States. We have suggested various changes to the Post Office Department. I think progress is being made in improvement of the service. However, I do not believe the Post Office Department can absorb further cuts without reducing the service, although I think they could have absorbed the amount our committee cut them. I am constrained to believe the action which this body has already taken is going to mean a curtailment in the service.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. I thank the gentleman for telling me of these exhaustive investigations. I am very sure they have been made. I, too, have visited some of the post offices of the country, notably the post office in Chicago. At the time I saw that post office and went all through it, I was rather impressed by the many things that could be done to increase efficiency. May I ask the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee if he investigated and visited the post office in Boston?

Mr. GARY. The committee has not investigated the Boston post office. I so stated yesterday.

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

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

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. The gentleman mentioned a \$165,000,000 figure. Why does that not show in the report? I am basing my amendment strictly upon the figures which are available in the report, which show that the transportation of mail in 1951 cost \$438,000,000.

My amendment proposes to give an additional \$16,200,000 above that amount. I do not know anything about this \$165,000,000 figure that the gentleman has brought into the controversy, but I think he is certainly trying to get the House off the issue in relation to my amendment.

Mr. GARY. I am trying to tell the Members of the House that this committee has investigated these matters rather fully. We know what is going to happen. There is certainly no point in cutting this appropriation any further when we are going to have to increase it later.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. You are basing your argument on an assumption of a condition in the future. I am trying to stick to the facts in the report.

Mr. GARY. These figures are based on the needs of the Post Office Department at the present time. They are going to have to be increased, but we are not asking for that increase now, because we do not know how much it will be. We think the amount of \$465,000 is necessary for the present needs without taking into consideration any increase in the future.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I do this for the purpose of calling attention to this situation. Last year our committee made the cut which the chairman of the subcommittee has referred to. The post office organizations and all of them were running up and down the length and breadth of the land making statements to the effect that one of the reasons why the Department cost so much was that they were ordering more railroad cars than they needed to haul the mail in different spots. The Interstate Commerce Commission fixes the rates which have to be paid to the railroads. However it does not fix the number of cars. The Department does that, and if its management is bad, the result is they order more cars and have to pay for more cars than they need. I am wondering when all these employee organizations and agents of the Department were out with those stories if they did not have something of the light of truth in it, and if there is not a saving at least of the \$10,000,000 that the gentleman from Minnesota has suggested.

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

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Mr. GARY. May I say to the gentleman that this return-car situation to which he has referred has been completely cleared up by the recent order entered by the Interstate Commerce Commission. That was one of the items which was taken care of in the rate-settlement case and it has been approved by the Commission.

Mr. TABER. But the thing went further than that. It went to the point where they were ordering more cars than they needed, and it would seem that that practice ought to be eliminated.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

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

Mr. Chairman, we are rushing through some cuts here in the appropriation for the Post Office Department. I wonder if the Members take into account that since 1945 the Congress has authorized pay increases for postal employees in the amount of \$800,000,000. If you consider other increases authorized by the Congress, the cost of operating the Post Office Department since 1940 has increased by \$1,444,000,000. You must take into account that the Post Office Department is going to have to operate according to the laws passed by the Congress. If you do not give them sufficient money, certainly they are going to have to ask for a supplemental appropriation next year. It was brought out that the Congress last year passed a resolution authorizing the Postmaster General to reinstate the curtailed services and by the same token there will be another amendment offered this afternoon to impose other expenses on the Post Office Department. There will be others coming from the CAB and the ICC and so forth. If we are going to continue to pass legislation forcing the Post Office Department to operate with these tremendous expenses, certainly more money will have to be appropriated to carry out

the laws passed by the Congress. I am tremendously disappointed that in all of the debate we have heard yesterday and today concerning extravagance and how much it costs to operate the Post Office Department, I have not heard one Member of the House say anything about increasing the postal rates to offset the one-half billion dollar annual loss incurred in operating the Post Office Department. Let us be consistent about this thing. If you want economy, then let us discuss postal rate increases along with the other arguments. Why do you not extend your remarks in the RECORD and make your positions known as to how you feel about postal rates and whether you are in favor of increasing them or forcing the department to continue to operate at a half-billion dollar annual loss?

Mr. PASSMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. HALLECK. I remind the gentleman that in the Republican Eightieth Congress we passed a postal rate increase bill.

Mr. PASSMAN. Was it a real bill or a piecemeal bill? We passed a piecemeal bill here last year but you gentlemen have found that it will do but a small part of what is necessary to do in meeting the costs of operating the Post Office Department.

Mr. HALLECK. My recollection is—I do not know whether any member of the Committee on the Post Office and Civil Service is on the floor, but my recollection is that the bill raised something over a hundred million dollars.

Mr. PASSMAN. I think it was \$160,000,000.

Mr. HALLECK. One hundred and sixty million dollars. That is quite a considerable amount of money.

Mr. PASSMAN. Not when you take into account the fact that it is costing \$2,500,000,000 to operate the Post Office Department and you have a deficit of \$580,000,000 for the present fiscal year.

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

Mr. PASSMAN. I yield.

Mr. GROSS. Does the gentleman believe that you can ever put the Post Office Department on a completely paying basis?

Mr. PASSMAN. If you put your business back home on a completely paying basis you can likewise put the Post Office Department on a completely paying basis. Yes; but it will take a lot of courage to do it. We will have to make a lot of people pay rate increases they justly should pay.

Mr. GROSS. This gentleman does not believe that at all.

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

Mr. PASSMAN. I yield.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Getting down to my amendment which is pending, the gentleman will admit that my amendment gives to the Department \$16,200,000 more than it had for the same item in 1951. What is unfair about that?

Mr. PASSMAN. I am in complete accord with the gentleman's views on economy; I have worked for it, but if you insist on passing legislation in this Con-

gress placing additional duties and burdens upon the Post Office Department, creating additional expense, you have got to be willing to furnish the Department the money with which to meet them.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. But I think they can meet them with proper management within the amounts we have suggested.

Mr. PASSMAN. Not unless you amend the present laws, because you give the ICC and other agencies rate-making power, the power to fix rates for carrying the mails, which the Post Office Department must pay.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. I think I may reassure the gentleman from Louisiana that the Committee on the Post Office and Civil Service now is studying a rate bill. I can assure the gentleman that it will be a bill that will considerably increase rates. It is a bill that will take courage to pass, but I believe courage still exists in this House.

Mr. PASSMAN. I thank the gentleman from New York. I hope the gentleman's committee will report out a bill to wipe out these subsidies which are enjoyed by the great publishing companies that should be made to shoulder their fair share of the cost of running this free enterprise system.

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

Mr. PASSMAN. I yield.

Mr. SADLAK. Does the gentleman contend that any increase we might make in the salary of postal employees must be conditioned on a rate increase?

Mr. PASSMAN. Is the gentleman speaking of an increase in salaries of postal employees?

Mr. SADLAK. I am. Must that depend on an increase in postal revenues? Does the gentleman from Louisiana contend that we must have an increase in postal rates before there can be an increase in salaries?

Mr. PASSMAN. I am speaking of the present, not the future. At the present time you have a tremendous deficit. If you increase postal rates to offset the deficit then if you want to increase the salary of postal employees, come back and increase the rates again.

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

Mr. Chairman, I always feel good when I am supporting what a majority of my brother Republicans are for, but on this measure I cannot go along with them. I am a member of the Post Office Committee myself and while I can agree about postal rate increases I cannot forget that transportation rates are not fixed by the Post Office Committee or by the Congress, or by the Postmaster General; they are fixed by the Interstate Commerce Commission. Those rates must be paid if you are going to send the mails. Now, that mail is going to be sent, and if you do not provide money enough for it and you demand that the Postmaster General send the mails, then he is going to have to curtail some other expense of administration in order to meet that need. We did that last year

and I am not altogether free from criticism because I voted for a 10 percent reduction, but I did not for a moment think that we are going to take that 10 percent by reducing the mail service. That is what happened. Then we came into this Congress and passed an act in this House directing the Postmaster General to restore it.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield there?

Mr. BURDICK. I will yield almost any place if the gentleman wants to pick it out.

Mr. GROSS. Let me say to the gentleman that the Postmaster General put his curtailment order into effect before the gentleman ever voted for the 10 percent reduction.

Mr. BURDICK. No; he put it into effect before we voted in this House to make him put it back, but the gentleman is wrong about the rest of it.

Mr. GROSS. No; I am not.

Mr. BURDICK. Do you want to curtail the mail service of the country? Is that what you want to do? If so vote for this amendment. I like to cut down expenses; I do that myself in my own business; I do not squander any money, and I do not want to squander any Government money. But I am not willing to have those who buy postage stamps have to pay more to send their letters in order to cover up this difference between transportation rates on the railroads and other lines in this country; I am not willing to do that.

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

Mr. BURDICK. I just want to make a very mild statement in my weak way and then I will yield to the gentleman. You are talking about a \$500,000,000 deficit; I can tell you where it is if you want to know. We contribute \$160,000,000 of that deficit; our frank and penalty mail costs \$160,000,000 every year.

Mr. PASSMAN. I think the gentleman will find franked mail cost \$1,000,000 annually, and penalty mail \$37,000,000 a year, not \$160,000,000.

Mr. BURDICK. I said \$160,000,000; the gentleman heard what I said.

Mr. PASSMAN. You said \$160,000,000?

Mr. BURDICK. Yes.

Mr. PASSMAN. Where does the gentleman get that information?

Mr. BURDICK. From the Postmaster General of the United States.

Mr. PASSMAN. If the gentleman will check the records I think he will find it is around \$38,000,000.

Mr. BURDICK. Oh, I checked them.

Mr. PASSMAN. I do not see where the gentleman got his information for the committee is under quite a different impression. Does the gentleman speak about franked mail or penalty mail?

Mr. BURDICK. I said both of them. Now is the gentleman satisfied?

Mr. PASSMAN. No; I am not satisfied. I will yield a little later when I get the figures.

Mr. BURDICK. See me outside then.

There is another \$51,000,000 involved when you are selling postal cards for 1 cent whereas they cost the Government 1.25 cents apiece. You can take that \$51,000,000 out of there. Then take out

this \$160,000,000 involved in franked and penalty mail and we are losing \$200,000,000 on—

Mr. PASSMAN. Evidently the gentleman is mixed up in his figures. The cost of penalty mail is only \$37,000,000, and the cost of franked mail was \$1,000,000 in 1950. The gentleman is absolutely correct about the penny post card. It should be 2 cents.

Mr. BURDICK. I am not only correct in reference to the penny postal card, I am correct on the \$160,000,000. I see the gentleman has raised it \$45,000,000 above what he started in with.

Mr. PASSMAN. I thought the gentleman had reference to franking privileges.

Mr. BURDICK. Now, it is a question of who is off. I do not pretend I cannot be off, but I am very seldom in that position.

That question of the \$200,000,000 we are losing on parcel post is now before the Interstate Commerce Commission. The farmers do not object to paying a higher rate on that kind of mail. All they are interested in is getting it. I do not know of a farmer in my section of the country who is not willing to pay more. They do not want the Government to lose \$200,000,000 on that transaction.

I should have made my statement of \$160,000,000 loss more specific in answering the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. PASSMAN]. The \$160,000,000 loss I was talking about included frank mail, penalty mail, and subsidies, all of which are not proper post office expenses and which the users of stamps should not have to pay in increased postal rates. The expenses should be covered by direct appropriations. With this explanation I am sure the gentleman from Louisiana will find himself in full accord and that if I had fully stated the proposition in the first place, no difference of opinion would have arisen.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from North Dakota has expired.

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

Mr. Chairman, I hold in my hand this repository of all human wisdom, the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, 4 inches thick, covering the period from September 11, to September 23, 1950.

My attention has been called to an incident reported in it that casts some light upon the discussion that some of us had a few moments ago with the distinguished chairman of the Appropriations Committee, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON]. I and others have made the point that in relying upon personnel furnished by Government agencies and bureaus to investigate other agencies and bureaus the Congress is running a very grave risk for the obvious reason there might be and probably must be a conflict of interest between those Government departments or agents and the Congress who represent the people who pay the taxes.

Back here a few years ago there was a very, very enlightening incident that really dramatizes this issue and illustrates the risk involved. You will remember the Un-American Activities

Committee organized in 1938. The chairman of the Un-American Activities Committee, Martin Dies, recently made a speech which was put in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD by the distinguished gentleman from Illinois [Mr. VELDE] on September 22, 1950. Listen to what Mr. Martin Dies says of his experience when he came to rely upon the Department of Justice to furnish investigators:

Well, I had started it—

Meaning the Un-American Activities Committee—

and I could not back up. I telephoned the Attorney General of the United States and said, "Mr. Attorney General, I want to secure the services of some competent and reliable investigators to assist me in my work."

That is precisely what the Appropriations Committee majority have been doing for the last 3 years with various Government agencies.

Mr. Dies continues:

He sent me two men. I received an anonymous telephone call, however, shortly before their arrival telling me both men were members of the Communist Party. I never knew who gave me the tip, but I acted on it. When they arrived I began to question them. I put them through the third degree. And finally they broke down and admitted they were members of the Communist Party who then worked for the Department of Justice and the Attorney General wanted to plant them on the committee which I headed.

I call the attention of the Members to that incident not because I am afraid we will get Communists particularly out of the agencies that provide us men to investigate other agencies, but merely to illustrate the obvious risk that we take in obtaining personnel from Government agencies to do work that the Congress itself should do through its own appointed agents exclusively responsible to itself.

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

Mr. Chairman, it is rather disheartening to observe these partisan efforts to discredit a great man and a great service, one upon which we are depending at this time for intelligence and information essential to national defense and one upon which we are depending for counterespionage against the horde of foreign and domestic spies swarming through every section of the country endeavoring to secure information to undermine our institutions and destroy our Government.

The FBI has never been accused, has never before been charged with lack of integrity or disloyalty; has never before been accused of pulling its punches and protecting incompetence or waste or bureaucracy. We are depending upon it and we have depended upon it these critical years, not only for domestic security but for national defense; the life and liberty of men in many parts of the country would not be secure without the FBI. The Nation itself would not be safe. It is no secret that upon the opening of hostilities the FBI would, within 1 hour, apprehend 4,500 persons, spies, Communists, and saboteurs, who are at large in this country, with whose identity

we are familiar, and whom we are watching but leaving undisturbed in order to trace associates and uncover ramifications of the organizations of which they are a part, and whom it would be necessary to pick up immediately in case of a declaration of war.

You can go through the files and records of the courts and of the military and civilian activities and functions of the country and you will not find a single instance in which an FBI operator was found derelict in his duty or recreant to any trust reposed in him. It is a record of which we may all be proud, regardless of party, instead of seeking to cast aspersions on them.

These are the men upon whom these partisan attacks are being made here today.

Now, let us take the man he quotes here in the excerpt read from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. It is a matter of common knowledge that this man repeatedly wrecked Government plants to apprehend criminals and break subversive rings by his overwhelming desire for publicity; that in order to get in the limelight and make the front pages of the newspapers he repeatedly betrayed confidential information which the FBI had given him in connection with the work of the Committee on Un-American Activities. That is the character of man quoted here against the most competent espionage organization ever assembled, one upon which we must depend for domestic security and national safety.

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

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

Mr. COUDERT. Mr. Chairman, I can understand that the gentleman should naturally be glad to divert attention from the issue that we are raising here by bringing in the FBI and the character of the FBI and Mr. Hoover and the others. It is quite clear on the RECORD that neither I nor any of my colleagues at any time have brought into issue the character or ability of the FBI or of its chief, Mr. Hoover?

Let me call attention to the fact that the quotation from the Dies speech, which I just recited, referred solely to the Attorney General; and, furthermore, I only use it as an illustration of what could happen when we rely on employees of some Government agencies to investigate other Government agencies.

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

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five additional minutes.

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

Mr. SHAFER. I object, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. TABER. Is the majority of the committee ever going to move to close debate?

Mr. PASSMAN. I do not think we want to enter into a debate on that at the moment.

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

Mr. Chairman, I wish to speak directly to the bill, and I should like to have the attention of the gentleman from Louisiana, a member of the committee.

On pages 14, 15, and 16 of the committee report there is a discussion which deals with the question of the Post Office deficit. I wish to ask the gentleman from Louisiana if in the proposal he submitted to the House a while ago he intends to put the Post Office Department on, we will say, a profit basis as if it were a business operation, or does the gentleman cling to the philosophy that the post-office work rendered in favor of the people is a postal service? I draw a distinction between something which renders a service and something which runs as a business proposition. If I understood the gentleman correctly, he argued that it should be put on a nonloss basis, as if it were not a service of the Government. I have no criticism; I just want to know the gentleman's position. For instance, we refer to it constantly as the postal service. Do I make myself clear?

Mr. PASSMAN. Yes; the gentleman makes himself quite clear. Does the gentleman think the newspapers, the book manufacturers, and the magazines are in business to make money or just to operate from a public-service standpoint?

Mr. CRAWFORD. If the gentleman wants to answer my question I will yield. If not, I will go ahead with my discussion.

Mr. PASSMAN. I am answering the gentleman's question. Yes, I am in favor of doing away with all subsidies and putting them on a paying basis.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Put the Post Office Department on a paying basis?

Mr. PASSMAN. Yes; increase the postal rates.

Mr. CRAWFORD. I have no objection to that whatsoever. I just wanted the gentleman's opinion as a member of this committee. If we are to put it on a nonloss basis we will have to raise at least \$271,000,000 of new revenue, based on this report, and that would still leave a deficit of \$250,000,000. The report states that \$160,000,000 of this should be chargeable to the general revenues because it represents the cost of handling official mail for all branches of the Government. Does the gentleman believe that those who pay postal charges, whether they be newspapers, individuals, or what not, should raise this \$160,000,000?

Mr. PASSMAN. I know it is the gentleman's desire to keep the record straight. The gentleman has used the wrong figures. The penalty mail for 1950 amounted to \$37,710,833.

Mr. CRAWFORD. If the gentleman will let me go ahead, I have said nothing about penalty mail. I am not interested in that. I am talking about what the gentleman's committee put in the report. I am trying to understand it. It reads:

Legislation is again being recommended at this session of Congress to increase the postal rates to the point where the postal revenues would cover all but about \$250,000,000 of the Post Office's expenditures, of which approximately \$160,000,000 is properly chargeable to the general revenues because it represents

the cost of handling official mail for all branches of the Government, the amounts paid to airlines in the form of subsidies, and certain other nonpostal costs.

Does the gentleman agree with that language?

Mr. PASSMAN. I do not agree with it, not the way the gentleman has put it.

Mr. CRAWFORD. I can read English, and I understand it.

Mr. PASSMAN. May I answer the gentleman as to whether or not I am correct?

Mr. CRAWFORD. If the gentleman does not agree with his own report, I have another proposal, so I will go ahead with my discussion.

Mr. PASSMAN. Let me go ahead. The gentleman has reference to the subsidy of airlines?

Mr. CRAWFORD. I decline to yield further.

Mr. PASSMAN. The gentleman is not fair.

Mr. CRAWFORD. I am fair.

Mr. PASSMAN. That is a matter of opinion.

Mr. CRAWFORD. The language speaks for itself.

On page 15 it is stated, "The proposed major increases are as follows," and it goes ahead and deals with post cards, newspapers and magazines, third-class mail, increase in the fees charged for special services, such as registry, insurance, c. o. d. mail and special delivery, and increased rates for fourth-class mail.

I simply want to go on record before this House and this committee as saying that I am in favor of raising the postal rates to where we who receive the service will pay for the postal service which is rendered to us. I do not believe that the people who pay postage rates should be charged with the revenue necessary to cover the handling of mail for all branches of the Government, the airline subsidies, and certain other non-postal policies referred to there, because I think that should come out of the general revenues of the Government.

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment.

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield? I think I can clear up the situation.

Mr. PASSMAN. I am sure the gentleman can, and perhaps save me the trouble of speaking.

Mr. BURDICK. What I said would make a saving of \$160,000,000 and I still stick to it. Here is what it is based on: It is penalty mail and franked mail and airmail subsidies. I left that part of it out, but altogether that makes \$160,000,000, and that is what I am going to stand on.

Mr. PASSMAN. And if the gentleman wishes to add all the other subsidies, it comes up to \$546,000,000.

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CRAWFORD] directed two or three questions to me and then he attempted to answer the questions which he asked. I want to ask the gentleman a couple of questions, and I know that I am challenging a man who is very capable in debate on the floor, but I will give

him the opportunity to answer the questions which I ask him. I ask the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CRAWFORD] if he is in favor of the large business houses paying their own way as far as postage is concerned, including the postage on the penny postal cards?

Mr. CRAWFORD. Would the gentleman let me answer that?

Mr. PASSMAN. I told the gentleman before that he would have all the time he needs to answer it.

Mr. CRAWFORD. If the gentleman from Louisiana will look at my remarks as taken down by the Official Reporter, he will find that I emphatically said I was in favor of business people who receive those services paying for them.

Mr. PASSMAN. That is wonderful. Maybe the gentleman from Michigan can make that a little plainer as to newspapers, magazines, and books, and state whether he is willing to increase their rates so that they will not be subsidized.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Do they not also receive the service? What you are trying to do is to put me behind the eight ball with respect to newspapers.

Mr. PASSMAN. Well, we will both be behind the eight ball. You put me behind the eight ball, so let us both get there.

Mr. CRAWFORD. I have answered the question, and I emphatically repeat that I am in favor of them paying their share and their part of the expense the same as the little fellow who buys a post card.

Mr. PASSMAN. Is the gentleman from Michigan speaking about newspapers now?

Mr. CRAWFORD. I certainly am. The gentleman from Louisiana understands that language, does he not?

Mr. PASSMAN. I understand it.

Mr. CRAWFORD. And the press heard it.

Mr. PASSMAN. I am going to give the gentleman an opportunity to understand me, which the gentleman did not give me before when he would not let me answer his question.

Mr. CRAWFORD. The press heard what I said and my remarks will not be changed. The gentleman can bet on that.

Mr. PASSMAN. I may add to my remarks, if it is within the rules of the House, but I do want to clear up that matter.

Mr. CRAWFORD. The gentleman gets an answer from me whenever he asks me a question.

Mr. PASSMAN. And the gentleman from Michigan will get an answer from me next time if he will give me an opportunity to answer his questions and not attempt to answer them for me.

Mr. Chairman, I think it should be brought out what the amount of subsidies are. The cost of penalty mail for the fiscal year 1950 was \$37,710,000, and the cost of franked mail was \$1,071,000. I agree with the gentleman that should he add the subsidies to the air lines it comes up to nearly \$160,000,000. I did not wish to get into any heated discussion with my friend, the gentleman from Michigan. I am in favor of economy and I practice it in my business and in my office. But I recognize the need for in-

creases in postal rates, and there have been too few Members of the House who expressed themselves as being willing to vote for postal rate increases. I think that should be discussed.

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

Mr. PASSMAN. I yield.

Mr. NICHOLSON. The gentleman from Iowa [Mr. Gross] yesterday called attention to the fact that they were carrying mail 300 miles beyond where it was supposed to be left, and brought back the 300 miles. Would it not be a saving if they could drop the mail off where it was supposed to go in the first place?

Mr. PASSMAN. Occasionally you may find a road washed out and you would have to go by another route. What the gentleman brought out here very definitely was the exception and not the rule under which the Post Office Department operates, and I am sure the gentleman who brought that point out knows that as well as I do.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. CANNON. I yield.

Mr. GARY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 5 minutes.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, did I correctly understand that the Chair has recognized the gentleman from Missouri?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Missouri yielded to the gentleman from Virginia.

Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Missouri yield for a parliamentary inquiry?

Mr. CANNON. I yield.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, is it in order for the gentleman from Missouri to be recognized again on this same amendment?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Missouri offered a pro forma amendment before, I think, to strike out two words. This time his amendment was to strike out four or five. Under these circumstances the amendment is in order and the gentleman is recognized.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I can understand the anxiety of the gentleman to prevent us from answering over here. The gentleman from New York made the wholly unsupported charge that the Committee on Appropriations' system of investigation is a system of bureaucracies investigating bureaucracies. When we made it clear that the statement was without foundation because we used FBI men against whom no such charge could be lodged, he attempted to beg the question by saying

he meant the Department of Justice. Mr. Chairman, our investigations are spearheaded exclusively by FBI men, so the strictures of the gentleman were against the FBI.

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

Mr. CANNON. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. HALLECK. Let me ask just for information: Does the Appropriations Committee in asking for the services of other people in the Government or agencies of the Government limit itself wholly to people in the FBI? Or does the committee on occasion ask for the help and assistance of persons in the agencies of the Government other than the FBI?

Mr. CANNON. As far as I know we have never used anyone but FBI agents. Every requisition for an investigation is referred to the FBI man at the head of our staff. All investigations are in charge of FBI agents. They are specialists trained in the field of investigation, men against whom no charge has even been brought of inefficiency or lack of integrity. Our years of experience with them has more than justified that reputation. We have never failed to get any information we asked; it has never failed to be comprehensive and accurate.

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

Mr. CANNON. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, the FBI is held in such high esteem that none other than the Ford Motor Co., under the able management of Henry Ford III, took Mr. Bugas, an FBI man in charge of the Detroit branch, and made him an officer of the Ford Motor Co. We praise big business at times; we are imitating them here in the House of Representatives in the Appropriations Committee.

Mr. CANNON. In conclusion let me say, Mr. Chairman, that we are using the most efficient method and the most economical method yet devised. No one has ever asked for information he did not secure. And it has always been authoritative.

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

Mr. CANNON. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Was the FBI available for purposes of investigations by other committees of Congress?

Mr. CANNON. I do not know about that. The Committee on Appropriations has a working arrangement with the Bureau which we have had with them for many years under which investigators are available to us without restriction. We transfer them to our rolls at their current salary for a week or two weeks or the time required to complete the specific inquiry for which they are called and as soon as the investigation is completed we transfer them back. We pay only their regular salary and only for the time actually employed.

Mr. GROSS. Is the FBI available for investigating overstaffing and inefficiency in various other agencies?

Mr. CANNON. Oh, yes. They make any inquiry assigned to them and we have found the information with which they supplied us invariably accurate.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. CANNON. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. HALLECK. Is it a fact that the gentleman or his committee, or he for the committee, twice a year files a report of reimbursement to the other agencies of the Government for personnel used? Is that correct?

Mr. CANNON. We file under the rules of the House semiannually a report on the employment of all members of our staff.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Missouri has expired. All time on this amendment has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN) there were—ayes 63, noes 67.

So the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

Notwithstanding any other provision of law, no part of any funds appropriated to the Post Office Department shall hereafter be used for the transportation (within the continental limits of the United States) of mail over any route or by any means which the Postmaster General determines to be more costly than other available and equally satisfactory routes or means.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. CROSSER: Page 15, strike out lines 12 to 18, inclusive.

Mr. CROSSER. Mr. Chairman, the purpose of my amendment is to prevent the adoption of a policy which would be calamitous to the country and be a really serious matter. The purpose in having helicopters developed in the service of the Post Office Department is not only to supply speedy mail service but is to provide pilots for the helicopters and also to provide as many helicopters as possible for use in the military service. I believe it was the Postmaster General himself who said that nowhere have we had a better illustration of the value of the helicopter and pilots trained in the postal service than at the present time in Korea, where helicopters developed in the postal service, together with the pilots trained in the postal service, rendered invaluable service in our military operation.

I shall not make a lengthy speech. Other members of our committee will discuss the matter further. Let me urge again, however, that we must provide helicopters and the personnel to operate them in civilian service because they are indispensable in the event of war.

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

Mr. CROSSER. I yield to the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. BATTLE. If this provision is not stricken out, lines 12 to 18, will not the small airlines be adversely affected?

Mr. CROSSER. Undoubtedly so.

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

Mr. Chairman, I cannot sit here and let an important matter like this come before the committee to be voted on without a further clarification and explanation. It will be remembered a year ago the distinguished chairman of this subcommittee, for whom I have the highest regard and who with his subcommittee has done an exceedingly good job in trying to bring to this House and the committee this important appropriation bill, brought to the attention of the House the same issue which is presented here today. I opposed this attempt to thwart legislative policy by an appropriation and such encroachment by the Appropriations Committee. I support this amendment now by our chairman.

The Appropriations Committee is endeavoring to change a policy of the Government, a legislative policy, by an appropriation bill. In the first place, I think most of us agree that an approach like this to a general policy proposition is bad. We had the fight on this issue a year ago. The committee refused to permit the change of an important policy as included in this provision. It affects the national security of our country, it affects the future security of this country.

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

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

Mr. RANKIN. What is the object of this provision, beginning in line 12 and going through line 18?

Mr. HARRIS. The object of the provision, according to the report of the committee as I understand it, is to give the Postmaster General authority to make determination in all instances of the methods and means of transportation of mail including rates which are under jurisdiction of Interstate Commerce Commission and Civil Aeronautics Board.

Mr. RANKIN. Is that done for the purpose of trying to prevent the transportation of mail by airplane?

Mr. HARRIS. This is done, so the committee says in its explanation for the purpose of preventing the CAB carrying out law which requires the Post Office Department to enter into an agreement for the transportation of mail from airports to the post office by helicopter. But I say to the gentleman this language is more far-reaching than that. The Postmaster General says if this provision as included in this language stands, and if he found it was uneconomical, and it is in a lot of cases, to discontinue star-route service, he could cancel every star-route contract in the United States.

The gentleman from Alabama [Mr. BATTLE] a moment ago spoke of transportation of mail by air. The Postmaster General under this provision could cancel every contract of any of the smaller and feeder air-mail services throughout the United States. There are only four big airline companies that could qualify under this provision. That is how far-reaching it is.

Mr. RANKIN. Well, if he made as thorough a mess out of it as DiSalle, alias DiSalvo, has in fixing the price of cotton, he might stop the mails altogether.

Mr. HARRIS. I am sure the gentleman would not advocate the stopping of

mail altogether, but I agree with him thoroughly on a terrible mistake by Mr. DiSalle in imposing a ceiling price on cotton. However, that is not in issue here.

Mr. RANKIN. I will say this: I am in favor of striking out this provision. I am for carrying all the mail by air we can.

Mr. HARRIS. The Department of the Army, the assistant to the chief on behalf of the Army, has transmitted a communication to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BECKWORTH], a member of our committee, in which he says that the Department of the Army favors the retention of this section of the act. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. BECKWORTH] could not be here today and asked that I read these letters to the House. He is unavoidably away.

The Secretary of the Navy for Air says:

It is believed that the provisions of the Civil Aeronautics Act authorizing mail pay for commercial scheduled operations must be retained in order to achieve the fullest development of the helicopter for commercial passenger operation.

I will include the full text of these letters as a part of my remarks in the RECORD.

I am not particularly concerned with helicopter service altogether. If the gentleman is fair—and I know he wants to be—and wants to get at helicopter service, why not limit this to helicopter service?

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

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for three additional minutes.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. HARRIS. Why does not your committee say "helicopter service," and not include the entire provision of uneconomic contracts, as your report and your provision says?

Now, the Members of this House know that our committee told you a year ago that we were going into this matter in an endeavor to try to do something about it. We did that. You remember the fight on the air-mail subsidy-separation bill we brought to the House last year. You remember the fight we had when we were over in the Committee on Ways and Means room. You remember we went back and the members of our committee with others got together on a bill, brought it out and passed it in this House, which would get to this particular problem. We have done what we said we would do. But yet I do not want to stand by, Mr. Chairman, and see a change in policy by a limitation in an appropriation bill that will change an important national defense policy of this country. The Post Office Department is opposed to it.

Let me say to the gentleman, too, in talking about the helicopter service, which you say you are trying to get, Is it not true that the Post Office Department initiated and supports the helicopter service of transporting mail from the Los Angeles Airport to the post office?

Mr. GARY. They opposed it at the Chicago post office.

Mr. HARRIS. I am asking the gentleman about Los Angeles.

Mr. GARY. I do not know about Los Angeles. This amendment would not prevent them from installing helicopter service at any point in the United States.

Mr. HARRIS. Well, what is the purpose of the amendment, then, may I ask?

Mr. GARY. It leaves it within the discretion of the Postmaster General, and we want to leave it that way. If the Postmaster General says it is an essential service, then he can use it. If he does not think so, then he cannot use it. And, I ask the gentleman, who is better prepared to determine how mail should be transported than the Postmaster General of the United States? If he is not, he ought to be discharged.

Mr. HARRIS. The Postmaster General told me, and he told you, as shown in the report, that if you delegated this authority and imposed this responsibility upon the military, that the Post Office Department is carrying out in the interest of national defense, it will cost not 1 time but 10 times more than it costs for the Post Office Department to do it.

Mr. GARY. May I read from the Postmaster's statement on page 19 of the transcript of the hearings?

Mr. HARRIS. The gentleman may do it in his own time. I cannot yield for that purpose.

Mr. GARY. The gentleman asked about the Postmaster General.

Mr. HARRIS. I do not have the time for that. I should like to say this: I have voted for a number of these amendments to reduce the amounts and I have voted against some of them. I am for economy and as I say have so voted here today and yesterday on most of these reductions. We must reduce the Federal budget on nonessential expenditures and wherever we can to obviate the necessity of higher taxes. I know it is going to be contended that this is another move toward economy. But, gentlemen, for the interest of our country and the national defense, false economy is bad. The Postmaster General told me this was bad. The Postmaster General told me it should be deleted, and I ask that the committee sustain this action.

Mr. D. W. Rentzel advises the Civil Aeronautics Board is unalterably opposed to this and said such a change may have a disastrous effect not only on helicopter service, but also with respect to continued operations of local service carriers as well. I will include the full text of his letter to Mr. BECKWORTH, with my statement, too.

Mr. Chairman, this could be a very dangerous departure and I ask that this amendment of our chairman be adopted.

DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY,
OFFICE OF THE CHIEF OF
LEGISLATIVE LIAISON,
Washington, D. C., March 20, 1951.

HON. LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. BECKWORTH: The Secretary of the Army has asked me to reply to your communication of March 15, wherein you asked whether the Department felt it necessary that the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938 remain

as it is in regard to the development of aviation, and in particular, the development of the helicopter.

The Department of the Army favors retention of those sections of the act which pertain to the encouragement and development of air transportation, as it is believed these sections adequately provide for the future development of helicopters. Without further study, it is not possible to offer comments with respect to other provisions of this act.

Your interest in this matter is appreciated and I trust the foregoing information will be helpful to you.

Sincerely yours,

T. A. YOUNG,
Assistant to the Chief.

THE ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF
THE NAVY FOR AIR,
Washington, March 20, 1951.
HON. LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. BECKWORTH: Thank you for your letter of March 15, 1951, to Secretary Matthews, requesting the Navy's opinion concerning the necessity of retaining the Civil Aeronautics Act in its present form in order to insure further development of the helicopter.

The Civil Aeronautics Board has granted a certificate of necessity and convenience to Los Angeles Airways for helicopter operation in Los Angeles and a certificate to the Chicago Helicopter Service for operation in Chicago. Both companies are presently engaged in scheduled operations carrying the mail but no passengers. The Board has pending before it applications for certificates in other cities.

I am informed that these operations have been authorized with the hope that they will demonstrate the practicality of carrying passengers in scheduled operations as well as mail.

The military services are of course developing the helicopter for specialized military purposes. Some of the helicopters developed by the military services may be susceptible to modification for commercial passenger use. It is believed, however, that the provisions of the Civil Aeronautics Act authorizing mail pay for commercial scheduled operations must be retained in order to achieve the fullest development of the helicopter for commercial passenger operations.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN F. FLOBERG.

CIVIL AERONAUTICS BOARD,
Washington, March 19, 1951.
HON. LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
Committee on Interstate and Foreign
Commerce, House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. BECKWORTH: I am writing to tell you of my deep concern over an amendment to the Treasury and Post Office appropriation bill for 1952 which was contained in the bill as reported by the House Appropriations Subcommittee on Thursday, March 15. This amendment provides that no part of any funds appropriated to the Post Office Department shall be used for the transportation within the continental limits of the United States of mail over any routes or by any means which the Postmaster General determines to be more costly than other available and equally satisfactory routes or means.

I believe that enactment of this proposed amendment may have a disastrous effect, not only with respect to the continuation of helicopter service, which I understand was discussed primarily by the subcommittee, but also with respect to continued operation of our local service carriers as well.

It is my view that adoption of this amendment would radically change the basic philosophy of the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, as amended, which charged the Civil Aeronautics Board with the duty of fostering air transportation not only to meet the needs of the postal service, but also in the interest of commerce and the national defense. In this connection I should like to point out that there are now under consideration by the Congress several proposals for separation of the subsidy element from mail pay, the purposes of which are to divorce Government subsidy from the Post Office appropriation and relate such subsidy directly to the national interests involved.

In view of these facts I am strongly of the opinion that this substantive proposal which would have such a far-reaching effect, should be enacted, if at all, only after full hearings have been held and thorough committee consideration given to its effect upon our air-transportation policy.

For your information I am enclosing copies of letters which I have addressed to Hon. GORDON CANFIELD, United States Representative from New Jersey, and to Hon. JOHN M. REDDING, Assistant Postmaster General, on this subject.

Sincerely yours,

D. W. RENTZEL,
Chairman.

Mr. GARY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment be limited to 15 minutes, with the last 5 minutes to be reserved to the committee.

Mr. HINSHAW. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Chairman, we went along for about 2 hours talking about nothing a little while ago and the gentleman did not do anything about it. Now we have an important amendment on the floor and the gentleman wants to shut off debate.

Mr. GARY. I was doing it at the request of the ranking minority member of the Appropriations Committee. He asked a little while ago if we could not limit debate somewhere. He asked it publicly on the floor.

Mr. CANFIELD. It was not regarding this item, it was on the other item.

Mr. GARY. I was referring to the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER].

Mr. CANFIELD. I filed a minority report on this item. I want to see it debated thoroughly.

Mr. GARY. I am perfectly willing to stay here all night. I have no other engagement. I am perfectly willing to let the debate go on just as long as the Members want it to go. I am just trying to find out how much time the House wants to spend on this. There is no disposition on my part to shut off any debate.

Mr. HINSHAW. Why do we not wait a while, then?

Mr. O'HARA. Let us go on a few minutes, then.

Mr. GARY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 30 minutes, the last 5 minutes to be reserved to the committee.

Mr. HINSHAW. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Chairman, I see 10 Members on their feet. That is 3 minutes apiece. We could not get started.

Mr. O'HARA. I object, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. TABER. Why does not the gentleman move it?

Mr. GARY. Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 30 minutes, reserving the last 5 minutes for the committee.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that a reservation of time to the committee is not in order in such a motion.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair sustains the point of order.

Mr. GARY. Then, Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 30 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the motion.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. HARRIS) there were—ayes 89, noes 20.

So the motion was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California [Mr. HINSHAW].

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Chairman, in order that we may understand this question, we must recognize that beginning back in the 1880's we established the Interstate Commerce Commission to bring order out of chaos in the matter of rates. The Interstate Commerce Commission has been in business all these years.

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

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

Mr. HARRIS. Is it not a fact that this language here would have been subject to a point of order had not the committee gone to the Committee on Rules and obtained a rule waiving points of order? That shows how important this is.

Mr. HINSHAW. They went to the Rules Committee and got a rule waiving points of order. Otherwise, it would have been out of order.

The Interstate Commerce Commission sets the rates for the transportation of everything, including persons, mail of course, and property of all kinds for the railroads. The same thing is true almost exactly in respect to aviation. The Civil Aeronautics Board establishes the rates and fixes the routes and all that sort of thing. Those two Commissions have brought order out of chaos. With this amendment you may make it possible for a trucking company to cut rates and bid against an agency which cannot change its rates or vary its route, and that is probably as unfair a thing as ever occurred in the history of this Congress, legislatively, and this is legislation on an appropriation bill. The legislation makes possible this situation: If the Postmaster General chooses to do so, he may cancel every star route in the country and in effect knock out all of the railroad certificates and the certificates issued by the Civil Aeronautics Board. If that is what the Congress wants to do, in a little sleeper like this one, without any hearings at all and without it even having been mentioned to the legislative committee—we only heard of it by accident—why then go ahead and do it. As has been said by the gentleman from Arkansas, we are handling this in the normal, regular, legislative way in our committee. Shortly I believe we will be prepared to bring out a bill which will do that which the gentleman from Vir-

ginia [Mr. GARY] hopes to do by his rider. We brought a bill out last winter as you remember. Let us, for goodness sake, not ball up the entire transportation system of the country by a legislative sleeper like this one on an appropriation bill. It is the worst thing I have seen happen in this Congress.

Mr. Chairman, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following letters:

CAB DOCKET NO. 946 ET AL., NEW YORK CITY AREA HELICOPTER SERVICE CASE

THE PORT OF NEW YORK AUTHORITY,
DEPARTMENT OF AIRPORT DEVELOPMENT,
New York, N. Y., February 14, 1951.

Maj. Gen. ROBERT M. WEBSTER,
Commanding General,
Eastern Air Defense Force,
Mitchel Field, Long Island, N. Y.

MY DEAR GENERAL WEBSTER: The Civil Aeronautics Board, through Ferdinand D. Moran, examiner, is at present conducting a hearing to determine whether a commercial helicopter service for the transportation of mail, passengers, and property in the New York area should be certificated. Among the most important considerations being heard is that of whether such service will be in accord with the requirements of national defense.

The Department of Defense has endorsed helicopter service for the New York area as being helpful to over-all military needs. However, little formal attention has been devoted to civilian defense aspects of this proceeding. Local civilian defense groups have indicated that they must rely upon the military for orientation and guidance on the facilities which can be helpfully employed for civilian defense purposes. They have further stated that your individual judgment could be most helpful to them and to the Civil Aeronautics Board in evaluating the potential contribution which a certificated helicopter service could make to civilian defense in this area. Your expressions with respect to this matter would, in my opinion, be very welcome and helpful to the Board in reaching a decision in this proceeding.

It is my understanding that such a communication should be directed to Mr. V. Rock Grundman, public counsel, Civil Aeronautics Board, care of Commerce and Industry Association, 233 Broadway, New York, N. Y.

Sincerely yours,
FRED M. GLASS,
Director of Airport Development.

THE COMMANDING GENERAL,
EASTERN AIR DEFENSE FORCE,
MITCHEL AIR FORCE BASE,
New York, February 16, 1950.

Mr. FRED M. GLASS,
Director of Airport Development,
The Port of New York Authority,
New York, N. Y.

DEAR Mr. GLASS: You have informed me that certain local groups and individuals who are seriously interested in the civil-defense problem of the New York City metropolitan area, have asked that I express my opinion as to the potential utility of the helicopter service now being proposed for the metropolitan area, in the event of attack by modern air weapons.

The New York City area is particularly vulnerable to attack from aircraft and submarines because its location on the Atlantic seaboard makes difficult the establishment of defenses against aircraft in depth, and exposes the area to attack by short-range guided missiles from the adjacent coastal waters. Since geographical position in this case enhances the probability of successful attack, the local civil-defense organization must be prepared to cope with that eventuality.

The helicopter has already proven to be of extraordinary value in emergencies where

other means of transportation could not be used. New York City is confronted with a much greater civil-defense problem than any other densely populated area in the world. In my opinion, the use of helicopters in the control and direction of fire fighting, evacuation, and the other organized action undertaken, would be invaluable.

Yours sincerely,
ROBERT M. WEBSTER,
Major General, United States Air Force.

THE DEPUTY SECRETARY OF DEFENSE,
Washington, D. C., December 16, 1949.
Mr. V. ROCK GRUNDMAN,
Public Counsel, Civil Aeronautics Board,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR Mr. GRUNDMAN: In accordance with your request of October 24, I am pleased to attach the comments of the Departments of the Army, Navy, and Air Force, and of the Research and Development Board on the New York Area Helicopter Service case, Docket No. 946, et al. As you will note, the expansion of commercial helicopter operation is of interest to these components of the Department of Defense. Civil helicopter operations can be an important supplement to military operations and to current military research on this type of aircraft.

Sincerely yours,
STEPHEN EARLY.

DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY,
Washington, D. C., December 1, 1949.

Memorandum for the Deputy Secretary of Defense.

Subject: New York Area Helicopter Service Case, Docket No. 946, et al., of the Civil Aeronautics Board.

1. The Department of the Army is vitally interested in fully exploiting the military capabilities and application of rotary wing aircraft. This relatively new field of aeronautics is believed to have a definite future in connection with ground operations by assisting and expediting the advance of the ground gaining arms.

2. The Department of the Army requirements for rotary wing aircraft fall generally in two categories, i. e., those types organic with the tactical and service units of the Army as authorized by the National Security Act of 1947, Public Law 253, Eightieth Congress and Joint Army and Air Force Regulations No. 5-10-1, and those types, organic to the Department of the Air Force, which are required to support combat operations of the Department of the Army.

3. Department of the Army organic utilization of small, highly maneuverable and easily maintained helicopters includes such missions as the maintaining of aerial surveillance of enemy forward areas for the purpose of locating appropriate targets, adjusting artillery, rockets and guided missiles, short range aerial reconnaissance, courier, and emergency front-line aerial evacuation. Requirements for tactical air support type helicopters employed by the Air Force in support of the Army included large, medium range, troop transport type helicopters and short range, heavy lift, flying crane type helicopters to facilitate the air movement of combat troops and matériel over impassable terrain void of large prepared airstrips. In addition, their capability of operation in defilade and during periods of relatively poor visibility and low ceilings makes them highly suitable for arctic, jungle, and mountainous warfare.

4. The expanding application and utilization of rotary wing aircraft by agencies outside the Department of Defense will considerably aid the services in the development of this new field for military purposes since, in many cases, this civilian utilization is quite similar to military application as opposed to military requirements for fighter and bomber type aircraft having no civilian counterparts. Accordingly, the demand of civilian operators that they have increasingly

better performance, lower initial cost, lower maintenance and operating costs will greatly stimulate the helicopter industry to strive for better design, better performance, improved manufacturing, production and distribution capabilities and, in general, to improve the utility of its product thereby assisting the services by furthering developments in this field at less research and development cost to the Government.

5. This stimulus will be of particular assistance to the Department of the Army in view of the fact that in general, the size, weight-carrying capabilities and types of helicopters that would normally be employed in such an endeavor as this are comparable to those employed organically by the Department of the Army. In addition, the experience gained and statistics compiled by such an endeavor in the transportation of cargo and personnel, the rapid movement of ambulatory patients and utilization as a communications medium will be of great value in supplementing Army experience with this type aircraft for similar missions under combat conditions.

JOHN W. MARTYN,
Administrative Assistant.

DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,
Washington, November 30, 1949.

From: The Secretary of the Navy.
To: The Secretary of Defense.
Subject: New York Area Helicopter Service Case, Docket No. 946, et al., of the Civil Aeronautics Board.

1. With reference to your memorandum of November 9, 1949, in regard to New York Helicopter Service case, Docket No. 946, et al., of the Civil Aeronautics Board, I wish to state that the Navy is greatly interested in further development of rotary wing type aircraft. The superiority of the helicopter for many naval uses has been amply demonstrated by actual fleet operations.

2. Despite the rapid progress attained to date there still remains a great deal of research and development work to be accomplished before the helicopter can be considered entirely satisfactory as a service type. Although the Navy will have to continue its own prototype developments due to design limitations peculiar to shipboard operations, any expansion of the helicopter industry through commercial operations will greatly accelerate the development of the helicopter. In addition, quantity production of helicopters because of increased commercial operations will reflect itself in lower costs to the Government of this type of aircraft and would provide an industry which could be more easily expanded in times of emergency.

3. I feel that helicopter service in the New York City metropolitan area demonstrates progressive, forward planning. The establishment of helicopter services will give impetus to the helicopter industry in general and therefore, will be of great value to the Navy.

4. Commander C. E. Houston, United States Navy, will be available to serve as a witness, if his presence is so desired, to sponsor the above statement.

DAN A. KIMBALL,
Under Secretary of the Navy.

RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT BOARD,
Washington, D. C., November 21, 1949.

Memorandum for the Executive Secretary, Office of the Secretary of Defense.
Subject: New York Area Helicopter Service Case, Docket No. 946, et al., of the Civil Aeronautics Board.

Reference: (a) Memorandum for the Departments and the Research and Development Board from the Executive Secretary, Office of the Secretary of Defense, dated November 9, 1949.

1. Your memorandum of November 9, 1949, was referred to the Committee on Aeronau-

tics of the Board. Comments contained herein are based upon the opinion of the secretariat of the committee, but have not been referred to the committee for formal action.

2. The Research and Development Board is interested in the subject case, particularly with respect to its possible effect upon the progress of research and development on helicopters. Exploitation of helicopters for commercial use would have desirable effects on the over-all helicopter research and development program. An expanded helicopter transport industry will materially benefit the Department of Defense, and will promote a healthier industry. There will be a tendency toward greater research and development support by private capital. A general improvement in engineering designs and techniques will result. Production processes will become more economical. Solution of such critical problems as stability and control, all-weather operations, etc., will be given greater impetus. A stronger, larger nucleus of trained pilots, maintenance crews, research, development and production facilities will result. It appears that the helicopter suitable for commercial use will also be suitable, with minor modifications, for application to certain operational requirements of the Department of Defense.

3. The Department of Defense is currently supporting the helicopter research and development program with both research and development and production funds. The present helicopter program has been reduced, due to lack of funds, to a level below what is considered the minimum desirable program. This situation is true, despite the fact that a certain amount of research and development in rotary wing aircraft design and components is being supported by the aircraft industry. Information regarding the helicopter production program indicates that the quantity of this type of aircraft will be below the quantity necessary to meet projected operational requirements in the event of an emergency. An expansion of the helicopter transport industry will tend to make available more private capital for the support of research and development and will make available helicopters and crews to alleviate anticipated shortages in the event of an emergency.

4. The Board does not believe it desirable to supply any witnesses for testifying in this case. It is believed more appropriate that personnel with operating experience from the departments be made available in case the Department of Defense wishes to supply witnesses for testifying in this case.

R. F. RINEHART,
Acting Chairman.

DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE,
Washington, November 28, 1949.

Memorandum for the Deputy Secretary of Defense.

Subject: New York Area Helicopter Service Case, Docket No. 946, et al., of the Civil Aeronautics Board.

Reference is made to memorandum from Executive Secretary, Office of the Secretary of Defense, dated November 9, 1949, subject as above, with attached letter from Mr. V. Rock Grundman, public counsel, Civil Aeronautics Board.

The Air Force wishes to reaffirm its position with reference to commercial operation of helicopters as stated in a letter to Mr. Frank J. Delaney of the Post Office Department on July 11, 1947, and also Under Secretary Barrow's letter of October 11, 1943.

It is not believed that the helicopter is being fully exploited from a commercial standpoint. The main reason for this is the high initial cost of the aircraft coupled with relatively high maintenance cost. The use of more helicopters in commercial operations would tend to reduce these factors, accelerate the development of this type aircraft,

and give to industry a greater incentive to develop more advanced designs. Extensive commercial use of helicopters would improve flying techniques and lead to the development of suitable instruments for blind flying. The high cost of helicopters would undoubtedly be reduced with more of this type of aircraft in operation.

It is considered that the increased facilities made available by the employment of helicopter air transport in large cities would most certainly increase the defense potential. Information reaching this office indicates that the helicopter mail service in the Los Angeles area has been very successful. With more advanced type helicopters currently under development, the efficiency of commercial operation will increase.

The Department of the Air Force strongly recommends that favorable consideration be given to approving the New York Area Helicopter Service case, Docket No. 946.

HAROLD C. STUART.

HEADQUARTERS, ARMY AIR FORCES,
Washington, July 11, 1947.

Mr. FRANK J. DELANEY,
Solicitor, Post Office Department,
Washington 25, D. C.

DEAR MR. DELANEY: This is in reply to your letter of July 2, 1947, concerning benefit to the national defense from the use of helicopters by the Post Office Department in its air-mail operations.

The helicopter is a comparative newcomer in the aircraft field and its full military significance has not yet been fully exploited. However, although the first American helicopter flew in 1940, its usefulness to the Armed Forces has progressed tremendously in the short span since that time.

The helicopter is unsurpassed as a rescue vehicle. It is presently being tested by the Army ground forces for air observation purposes, as a general utility aircraft, and is being investigated as a possible airborne assault vehicle. These are the prime military applications to date, however there are many other miscellaneous uses, such as the laying of communication lines, laying of pipelines, radar calibration, mapping, etc.

It is our feeling that the helicopter has unlimited possibilities. We believe it is the vital link necessary to complete the chain between surface and air transportation. It has the ability to operate from terrain such as mountains, swamps, jungles, or certain places in the Arctic, where other modes of transportation would be difficult or impossible. These characteristics make it indispensable in certain aspects of military operations.

However, despite its proven present value, many years of research and development will be required before the helicopter is perfected and its possibilities effectively realized. Practical budget limitations of the Armed Forces necessarily limit funds which can be expended for research and engineering on helicopter aircraft. It is vital to us that profitable commercial and civil applications be exploited in order that unit costs may be reduced to the lowest possible level.

The Air Forces has followed the experiments of the Post Office Department with keen interest. It seems to us that you have been wise in making early application of the potentialities of the helicopter to solve your problem of attaining the world's most efficient air-mail service. You had administered your experiments in a most impressive manner and we feel that you have effectively demonstrated the value of the helicopter to your activity. We believe that it is undoubtedly a most substantial contribution and that in the end it will contribute to the national defense in lending support to our vital aircraft industry.

Sincerely yours,
BRYANT L. BOATNER,
Brigadier General, United States
Army, Deputy Chief of Air Staff.

OCTOBER 11, 1948.

HON. JOSEPH J. O'CONNELL,
Chairman, Civil Aeronautics Board,
Washington, D. C.

Re Chicago Helicopter Service, Case, Docket
No. 2384, et al.

DEAR MR. O'CONNELL: It has come to the attention of the Department of the Air Force that the Chicago Helicopter Service case has been delayed in order to permit the Post Office Department to develop some additional data concerning truck costs. At the time of the hearing in this proceeding held in Chicago in September 1947, the Air Force took an active interest in supporting the development of the helicopter through the issuance of a certificate by the Civil Aeronautics Board. A letter to this effect, dated August 13, 1947, to Frank Delaney, Solicitor, Post Office Department, from Brig. Gen. B. L. Boatner, Deputy Chief of Air Staff, and a letter dated August 25, 1947, to the Postmaster General from Kenneth C. Royall, then Secretary of War, endorsing and adopting General Boatner's letter, were submitted to the Post Office Department. I understand that a copy of each of these letters is in the record as a part of the exhibits submitted by the Post Office Department, but for your convenience, I am enclosing a copy of each of them.

In order that you may have the current position of the Department of the Air Force in this matter, the Department desires to express its active interest in helicopter development from the national defense point of view. In this connection the Department reaffirms the views expressed on behalf of the Department's predecessor, the Army Air Forces, that it is vital to us that commercial and civil development of the helicopter be expeditious.

Sincerely yours,

A. S. BARROWS,
Under Secretary of the Air Force.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. REES].

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remark; at this point in the Record, and yield my time to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. O'HARA].

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

There was no objection.

REDUCTIONS IN FEDERAL EXPENDITURES ARE IN ORDER NOW

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, the bill before us today, amounting to several hundred million dollars, is a part of the huge request of the administration for running the affairs of our Government. It is of course conceded that a tremendous amount of funds is required for the administration of the affairs of our country and the requirements are even greater by reason of the need for increasing and expanding of our national-defense program. The Congress assumes a greater responsibility than ever with respect to the approval or disapproval of the items that come before it for consideration and vote. The President has submitted, and the Bureau of the Budget has approved, requests for appropriations, outside of what is known as contract authorizations, of more than \$75,000,000,000 for the fiscal year 1952. In addition to the \$75,000,000,000, there are requests for several billion dollars more by reason of what is known as authorization bills heretofore approved by Congress.

Approximately one-fourth of the total request is for nondefense expenditure. This does include, however, about 8 percent interest payments on the national debt. When the budget for next year was submitted to Congress the President indicated an increase in taxes of \$16,500,000,000, which, combined with estimates of tax receipts for the fiscal year 1952 of \$55,500,000,000, would balance the budget.

If any success is to be made toward balancing the budget, and paying as we go for defense activities, every dollar saved with respect to nondefense activities means a dollar less required from the taxpayers.

I should also add that Secretary of the Treasury Snyder forecasts an expenditure of not less than \$75,000,000,000 for the next fiscal year. It is appalling and dangerous to contemplate \$25,000,000,000 a year deficits. They have got to be wiped out or at least greatly reduced if we are going to save this country from financial chaos.

It is my view that we can reduce non-defense expenditures without injury to anyone by approximately seven or eight billion dollars.

Very few rivers and harbors and reclamation projects are essential to the defense effort. We ought not to begin any of these projects at the present time. We will do well to complete those already started. One project alone, the St. Lawrence seaway, is estimated to cost \$1,500,000,000, if and when completed. If we will cut our domestic long-term commitments as we should there could be a saving of more than \$3,000,000,000.

We have more people on the Federal payroll right now than we have ever had before, excepting during a very brief period in World War II. The total employment on the Federal payroll, I am informed, has reached a figure of 2,200,000 of which approximately 1,200,000 are in civilian agencies. No agencies should be permitted to employ any more people than they absolutely require, except and until a definite showing of a need is made, and it must be for national defense only. Furthermore, if every agency would cut out activities unnecessary in consideration of the tremendous cost of Government and the need to carry on the defense program, a saving could be made in that field alone of between \$1,500,000,000 and \$2,000,000,000.

We are spending approximately \$4,000,000,000 a year for foreign economic aid. We are also spending billions of dollars in military aid in foreign countries. You will be interested in knowing that the President's budget has requested an expenditure of \$10,900,000,000 for foreign military and economic aid and other services. This includes approximately \$4,000,000,000 for ECA. I say we ought to at least cut out the ECA and save the \$4,000,000,000. Not only that, but we can scrutinize the remainder of the expenditure for military aid in foreign countries and make sure it is expended judiciously.

There must be a genuine attempt to cut nonwar activities, including all pork-barrel projects, and there must be no appropriations to initiate new spending projects. As suggested above, when new projects are started, our Government is

charged with millions and billions of dollars of proposals that we cannot afford.

You may be interested in knowing that in the present budget approximately \$50,000,000 is requested to start six public-works projects that when completed would cost approximately \$2,000,000,000.

Mr. Speaker, there is no good reason why we should assume the expenditures of the military. After all, Congress is more or less of a guardian of the taxpayers' funds of this country, so we should examine these items from time to time and make sure, as far as we can, that the money is not expended extravagantly.

There is going to be a tremendous amount of pressure for the expenditure of funds in the name of national defense. I will not have time to discuss that matter except for one example, the St. Lawrence seaway, which I have mentioned before, and which has been before Congress for many years. Now, the St. Lawrence seaway is asking for the modest sum of \$4,000,000 and the Inland Waterways Corporation for \$3,000,000, just to start the projects along. There are many others, but I will not have time to discuss them at the present time. What we ought to do is to rescind a number of the public-works projects that have not yet been started and let them stand by until the national and international picture clears up.

Mr. Speaker, the time has passed when Congress should write blank checks to any agency or to the President himself. It is the Congress that ought to scrutinize every piece of legislation and every expenditure. It should be done in the light of the absolute needs for such expenditures and certainly in consideration of the condition of the Federal Treasury that is already showing a deficit of more than \$250,000,000,000. Congress must assert itself in respect to Federal expenditures. It must cut out "logrolling and pork barrel" procedures. It is the only way by which we are going to save our country from a spiral of inflation that will weaken us beyond control. We have got to put on the brakes and save our country from bankruptcy. We can if we will.

The CHAIRMAN. The chair recognizes the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. O'HARA] for 6 minutes.

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Chairman, I have always firmly believed in the rule of the House that we should not attempt to legislate on an appropriation bill. This is about as perfect an example as I have ever seen since I have been a Member of the House of Representatives. This is like operating on a small boil on your hand with a meat ax. Let me call your attention to a few things which would happen. The language in the bill would completely affect the Transportation Act of 1939. It would completely affect the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938. It would affect in every way that I can conceive of the right of the Postmaster General to control the delivery of mail.

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

Mr. O'HARA. I yield.

Mr. PRIEST. I understood the gentleman to say that this amendment would do it. He means the language in the bill, does he not?

Mr. O'HARA. Yes; I mean the language in the bill. I thank my good friend, the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. Chairman, let us follow the language here which says that the Postmaster General must use the route which he determines to be less costly than other available and equally satisfactory methods. It might be more economical to use an oxcart of the old pony express or some other means of transportation. This language is so broad that the Postmaster General says he is haunted by it and he does not want it. We are being asked to pass in this appropriation bill on a subject which, for example, would come within the jurisdiction of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries of the House affecting the carriage of mail by steamship. It would affect the carriage of mail by air and the carriage of mail by star routes, or any other means of carrying the mail.

If we leave this language in the bill it is going to completely affect the whole transportation system. Our national defense comes into the picture in the matter of fixing of rates by the ICC. They certainly must take into consideration the tremendously important part that the railroads play, not only in our economic system, but in our national defense. We all recognize that. In the licensing for the transportation of mail by air by the CAB, what do they have to do? What does that quasi-judicial body, the CAB, have to do? They must take into consideration the public interest, the national defense, and all of the things that enter into the picture. In effect it is not intended that we, let me say to my friend from Virginia, establish a complete monopoly in the larger airlines as opposed to the smaller airlines or the feeder airlines. I do not think there can be any question about that.

The thing to do is to let the proper committees after full hearings determine this matter. Let me say I cannot agree, and I have not had the benefit of any hearings, and my judgment would certainly be snap judgment, that there was a great part of wisdom in one of these developments, the helicopter, or the use of it, in one of these cities. I am convinced that it was a wise thing to do; but on the other hand it has been a tremendously important thing in this aid which has been given by the Post Office Department in the transportation of this mail and the development and the training as I understand of pilots and in the improvement of equipment.

Mr. Chairman, I hope that before we move in anything that is as important as this that we will let the Committee on the Post Office and Civil Service, the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce at least, hold hearings so that we may have the facts before us when we proceed. Let us not proceed blindly.

That is all I have to say, Mr. Chairman. I hope the amendment to strike this from the bill will carry.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. CHATHAM].

(Mr. MANSFIELD, by unanimous consent, yielded the time allotted to him to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. CHATHAM].)

Mr. CHATHAM. Mr. Chairman, the reason I oppose this language is that it gives enormous powers to what has normally in my lifetime been the greatest political office in our Government. I will admit that I think the present Postmaster General is a wonderful man who has come up from the ranks, but normally we have not had that type of man as Postmaster General, and under this language giving the Postmaster General complete authority over all types of transportation, I think it would be foolish indeed for us to extend that power. As all of you know, I am rather interested in the development of air transportation.

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

Mr. CHATHAM. I yield.

Mr. HARRIS. Is it not a fact that there was good reason for the Congress of the United States many years ago to adopt a policy that the Interstate Commerce Commission should set rates insofar as utility services to the people of the United States were concerned? And is it not equally true that there was some good reason that the Congress of the United States adopted a policy that the Civil Aeronautics Board would have authority to set rates insofar as air transportation is concerned?

Mr. CHATHAM. That has been my understanding.

Mr. HARRIS. And is it not a fact that those policies were adopted after exhaustive hearings before the committees involved? To permit this change as this language here provides in this limitation of authority would by one stroke, without hearings or anything else, change the entire policy that the Congress decided was for the best interests of the people of the country.

Mr. CHATHAM. I agree with the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. Chairman, it seems to me that under this language if the Postmaster General wanted to use a donkey and cart in my part of North Carolina he could, for certainly it would be cheaper than any other way I know. If this grant of power is given under the desire to stop the use of helicopters, why not stop the use of helicopters by substantive legislation?

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

Mr. CHATHAM. I yield.

Mr. GARY. If a donkey and cart furnishes equally satisfactory service to the other means of transportation is there any reason why we should not use a donkey and cart?

Mr. CHATHAM. I think every reason, sir, because some of the people do not care when they get their mail even in my district. But I feel that even the development of helicopters is most important. About us everywhere we see a world in crisis and helicopters play a very important role. The chairman of the Interstate Subcommittee a few moments ago said this amounted to about \$500,000 for the helicopters that are being asked for this year, but next year it will be more than \$500,000. We speak

of \$500,000 as though it were nothing, and granting the Postmaster General powers that I have not seen granted anywhere else and that I do not think have ever been granted, and I do not think they should be granted here. I am for curtailing some of the powers rather than granting more. Instead of spending \$500,000 why not tackle the proposition of trying to save \$500,000,000 by cutting out a lot of these subsidies?

The development of helicopters is important, very important, and if they were to be developed by the military, as the Postmaster General said, it would cost many times as much. The early air-mail policy in World War I developed airplane pilots and great transport pilots; bomber pilots and other pilots were developed in World War II.

These helicopter pilots are rescuing men in Korea today, they are taking out the wounded. I saw a man fall into the Caribbean. A helicopter picked him up 7 miles away and saved his life. I do not care if it cost \$500,000 if it saves lives of American boys. We are developing something for national defense. If they want to limit the amount of money for helicopters, I would be against that. We are giving the Postmaster General power which I think will change our whole mail system. I certainly am opposed to the pending amendment.

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

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

Mr. MANSFIELD. Speaking of helicopters, it seems to me I read in the paper recently something to the effect that the Marine Corps has saved something like 1,500 men who were shot down either on land or in the sea around Korea since the start of the fight there last June. Furthermore, getting back to this particular bill, it is my impression, and I wish the gentleman will correct me if I am wrong, that the Army and Navy Air Forces are against this particular provision of the bill?

Mr. CHATHAM. I have been told they are against it. Referring back to the Chairman of the Civil Aeronautics Board he says these helicopter-trained pilots are rescuing wounded soldiers in Korea today.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. PRIEST].

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Chairman, it is always with a great deal of reluctance that I rise here to oppose any provision suggested by my good friend from Virginia, the chairman of the subcommittee handling this bill. He and his subcommittee have done a very excellent job on this bill.

However, I rise at this time to support the pending amendment which will strike this language from the bill. I am a member of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce and in my opinion the language is extremely dangerous for the future of our country. As the gentleman from Arkansas and the gentleman from California have said, the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce has studied this matter, is now in the process of studying it further, and will report legislation to this House some time during the current session to

do the job that I believe the distinguished gentleman from Virginia hopes to do by this language in the appropriation bill.

I agree with what the gentleman from North Carolina said that this is a very broad grant of authority to one individual at a time when the unwise use of that power might seriously handicap the defense effort of the United States, and might seriously handicap the transportation system of our country. This language does, in my opinion, based on hearings before our own committee, seriously affect the Transportation Act; it seriously affects the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938 and the Interstate Commerce Act, all without any supporting evidence insofar as detailed hearings and testimony are concerned.

Mr. Chairman, as reluctant as I am to oppose the committee on any of its recommendations, I hope very much that the amendment offered by the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce will be adopted and that this language may be stricken from the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. CANFIELD].

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Chairman, it is rare that I part company with my distinguished chairman, the gentleman from Virginia, who is so able, so honest, and so sincere; however, I did file a minority report on this bill and I desire to read therefrom:

It is improper procedure and it poses a possible threat to our total national interest in time of conflict to employ the use of a legislative rider to an appropriation bill in order to alter the purpose and intent of the Civil Aeronautics Act under the name of economies which are disputable. The rider is directed particularly against helicopter mail service at a time when the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce again has under consideration a bill to provide for separation of air-mail pay and subsidy.

I invite particular attention to the fact that we had only one witness before us on this very important item and not more than 10 questions were asked of this witness, the Postmaster General of the United States, who incidentally said in part:

If you transfer from the Post Office Department to the Military Department the problem of promoting and advancing commercial aviation as the Post Office Department has since 1918, you would spend far more money of the taxpayers to the military service in supporting that program than you would in the postal service.

He added:

The use of the helicopter has never been better demonstrated than it has in the Korean situation.

Then we had another witness before our subcommittee. That witness was D. W. Rentzel, Chairman of the Civil Aeronautics Board, who is dead set against this rider. I have in my hand a memorandum from him, dated yesterday, asking me to do all I can to head off this ill-considered rider.

May I also point out to you that an application from the New York metropolitan area for helicopter mail and

passenger service, supported by the Port Authority of New York, is now pending before the Board and the committee. Our committee has been advised informally that it will probably receive favorable consideration if this rider is stricken out. It involves the use of 10 or 13 helicopters. Highly trained helicopter pilots and facilities would certainly prove a godsend to this prime target area in the event of atomic bomb attacks.

No witnesses from the National Defense Establishment were called before our subcommittee, only the formal testimony of one witness, the Postmaster General of the United States. It is sought in this rider to distort a settled policy of the Congress in the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938 to keep our planes flying so that they will be prepared for M-day; that is, preparedness with pilots, facilities, and planes.

(Mr. PASSMAN asked and was given permission to yield the time allotted him to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. GARY].)

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. GARY].

Mr. GARY. Mr. Chairman, we have been talking a lot the past 2 days about economy. Here is an opportunity to practice it. The statement has been made that the controversial provision in this bill was defeated last year. We did have a similar provision on the floor last year, but there was objection to the language, and consequently we have changed the language in the present bill to conform with the suggestions that were made last year. I do not see how anyone who is in favor of economy can possibly object to the language in this bill.

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

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

Mr. TABER. I want to say that I do not see how we can afford to adopt this amendment. I believe that the overreaching on the part of the Civil Aeronautics Board has been an abuse that this provision will correct.

Mr. GARY. I thank the gentleman from New York.

Let me read this language:

Notwithstanding any other provision of law, no part of any funds appropriated to the Post Office Department shall hereafter be used for the transportation (within the continental limits of the United States) of mail over any route or by any means which the Postmaster General determines to be more costly—

He must first determine that the route or means is more costly. If, therefore, he accepts any other route, we save money, because the rejected route is more costly.

Further, the provision reads—
than other available and equally satisfactory routes or means.

The Postmaster General must also determine, therefore, that the route or means which he uses is equally satisfactory. How anyone can oppose that language I do not know.

I want to say here that there have been a lot of red herrings drawn across this

trail. This language has absolutely no application to railroads. The Postmaster General has the authority under the present law to use railroads or not, as he sees fit.

Insofar as airplane mail is concerned, where people pay additional postage for air mail, it will be carried by air; and insofar as the national defense is concerned, the distinguished chairman of the Subcommittee on Armed Services, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON], told me just a few minutes ago that the provision would not affect the national defense because, he said, they are appropriating billions of dollars for the development of the Air Force, and this helicopter service at the various airports would have no effect whatever on the defense program.

Let us see what the Postmaster says about it:

I think a general law to the effect that the Postmaster General had authority to avail himself, or the Department avail itself, of any mode of transportation would be a greater expediter of the mails and probably more economical. I think some such law should be passed. It should be in general terms to authorize the Post Office Department or the Postmaster General, by negotiation with carriers, to transport mail by not only the cheapest method but by the method which gives the best postal service. It might not be cheaper, but it might provide better service.

That is all this provision does.

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

Mr. GARY. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. CANFIELD. I am sure my distinguished chairman will recall the testimony of Mr. Redding, who handles all transportation matters for the Post Office Department. He said this:

I happen to know that the Los Angeles service is now training military pilots in the use of helicopters for the military service. Those pilots are going directly into the service in Korea.

Mr. GARY. If the Armed Forces are going to use some of the helicopters that are now being used in Chicago for the mail service, God save the United States.

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

Mr. GARY. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. PASSMAN. Is it not true that there are only nine helicopters in service in both Chicago and Los Angeles? Certainly you could not train very many pilots with nine helicopters.

Mr. GARY. That is correct.

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

Mr. GARY. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. PRIEST. It has not been clear to me who would make the determination under this language as to the question of equally satisfactory delivery.

Mr. GARY. The Postmaster General would make the determination. He must determine that the service that is used is equally satisfactory before he can make the change.

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

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

Mr. HINSHAW. I have a statement here that was signed by the former Under Secretary of the Air Force, in answer to the gentleman from Texas, in which he says,

In this connection the Department—

Meaning the Air Force—

reaffirms the views expressed in behalf of the Department's predecessor, the Army Air Force, that it is vital to us that commercial and civil development of the helicopter be exploited.

Mr. GARY. Commercial and civil, but not necessarily mail service.

Mr. HINSHAW. That is commercial and civil; I beg the gentleman's pardon.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Virginia has expired. All time has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio.

The question was taken; and the Chair being in doubt, the Committee divided, and there were—ayes 71, noes 34.

So the amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 206. This title may be cited as the "Post Office Department Appropriation Act, 1952."

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

Mr. Chairman, I do not want to prolong the work of the Committee this afternoon and would not take this time except to make very sure that the record is clear and that the understanding of the Members is clear.

A question arose as to the use by the Committee on Appropriations of people in the Government agencies to carry on investigations.

The chairman of the committee, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON] undertook to predicate his whole defense of his position on the proposition that agents of the FBI were the only persons in the Government so employed.

Let me say first of all, as far as I could understand and discover, no Member who raised any question about the use of any such agents was questioning in any way the great position, the integrity, and the competence of Mr. Hoover, or anyone in the FBI.

Suggestion was made that bureaucrats were employed to check on other bureaucrats. I specifically asked the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON] if it was not true that he reported twice a year for the Appropriations Committee agents or personnel in other departments of the Government than the FBI so employed by the Committee on Appropriations. His answer and his previous statements were that only agents from the FBI were so employed by the Committee on Appropriations in its investigations.

May I say here and now that he either did not know what was going on in his own committee or what he himself had reported for his committee, or he did not choose to enlighten the members of this committee as to what was going on. One thing is obvious. He was trying to hide behind the skirts of the FBI.

If you will look in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of January 25, 1951, you will find

there a report from the Committee on Appropriations signed by none other than the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON] himself, as chairman of the committee which recites under the requirements of the Reorganization Act, the people so employed by the committee. Significantly it is headed "Investigation Staff." And lo and behold there are two places where men from the FBI are indicated as having been so employed. Then let me read you the list otherwise:

Atomic Energy Commission, Civil Service Commission, Interstate Commerce Commission, Federal Power Commission, Federal Security Agency, Department of Labor, Department of the Navy, Securities and Exchange Commission, the Panama Canal, Veterans' Administration, and the Treasury Department.

When the Committee rises and we are in the House, I am going to ask unanimous consent to include all of that report in the RECORD as part of my remarks. I hope also to have the total figure as to how much actually went to FBI people employed by the Committee on Appropriations and how much went to agents of the Government, employed in other agencies of the Government.

Under leave to extend I now state that the report signed by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON] himself on January 14 of this year shows a total of \$10,410.55 paid to personnel of FBI and \$52,537.33 paid to personnel of other agencies of the Government.

In other words, may I say again it is perfectly obvious now that if the chairman of the committee understood and knew what was in the report that he himself filed for the last 6-month period, he would have known when I asked him the question that other agents of other departments of the Government were employed by the Committee on Appropriations on its investigation staff. We knew what was in the report he should have given us the facts clearly and without equivocation.

It is now abundantly clear that the suggestions and representations which were made by the gentleman from New York [Mr. COUDERT], and others were in complete accord with what are the facts.

Mr. Chairman, I am thankful for this time in order to clarify the situation.

COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS (INVESTIGATE STAFF)

JANUARY 15, 1951.

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134 (b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, Seventy-ninth Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from July 1, 1950, to December 31, 1950, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
James J. Maloney.....	Chief investigator.....	\$4,274.76
Frederic D. Veohery....	Investigator.....	4,179.08
Hazel N. Ward.....	Clerk-stenographer....	1,809.24
Anna R. Murabito.....do.....	1,086.12

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
REIMBURSEMENTS TO GOVERNMENT AGENCIES		
Atomic Energy Commission:		
Albert P. Pollman.....	Investigator.....	\$2,725.80
Ned Williams.....do.....	2,250.00
Civil Service Commission:		
John E. Moore.....do.....	3,786.15
George R. Boss.....do.....	2,798.49
Federal Bureau of Investigation:		
James E. Nugent.....do.....	3,996.64
Robert E. Rightmyer.....do.....	3,496.66
Paul G. Travers.....do.....	2,238.47
Interstate Commerce Commission: Alexis P. Bukovsky.....		
.....do.....do.....	1,496.14
Federal Power Commission:		
Oscar A. Arnold.....do.....	3,492.30
Arne H. Ronka.....do.....	3,461.50
Federal Security Agency:		
Charles M. Erisman.....do.....	2,100.00
C. Erwin Rice.....do.....	3,702.11
Department of Labor: Charles E. Huttsler.....		
.....do.....do.....	1,349.99
Department of the Navy:		
Donald M. Patterson.....do.....	3,465.28
Paul G. Ross.....do.....	3,088.96
Securities and Exchange Commission:		
Michael J. LaPadula.....do.....	1,847.32
Joseph Bernstein.....do.....	1,829.21
The Panama Canal:		
Edwin M. McGinnis.....do.....	3,118.20
Augustus C. Medinger.....do.....	3,461.55
Nelson E. Wise.....do.....	2,561.20
Veterans' Administration:		
Stephen J. Grillo.....do.....	2,784.00
Joe M. Hansman.....do.....	2,855.38
Federal Bureau of Investigation:		
Maurice A. Hickey.....	Temporary clerical assistant.....	187.99
Frederick C. Fehl.....do.....	490.79
Federal Security Agency: Irene Bialek.....		
.....do.....do.....	97.24
Treasury Department:		
Frances E. Donovan.....do.....	141.12
Anna Mae Fleishell.....do.....	125.44

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures..... \$150,000.00
Amount expended from July 1 to Dec. 31, 1950..... 96,083.15

Balance unexpended as of Dec. 31, 1950..... 53,916.85
Payment of bills rendered for prior fiscal period..... 3,148.77

CLARENCE CANNON,
Chairman.

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

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed out of order.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Chairman, I would like to call the attention of my colleagues and the people of the United States to a most significant victory for the peoples of the free world in their determination to achieve peace. Yesterday at the sessions of the deputies of the Foreign Ministers in Paris the Russian delegate, Mr. Gromyko, finally accepted in rather vague terms the proposals of

the peoples of the free world that all nations accept international inspection of armaments.

Mr. Chairman, I remember in 1948 when the General Assembly met in Paris the French Delegation proposed international inspection. It was approved by an overwhelming vote by the General Assembly, but was vetoed by the Soviet Union in the Security Council.

I do not claim that this is something to be accepted without careful scrutiny of the sincerity and motives of the Soviet Union, but I do believe that we the people of the United States, the leaders of the free world, must be proud today that we have at least achieved a major victory forcing the Russians to accept this basic premise for peace.

"Why," may some of us ask, "have the Russians finally, after 2 years, accepted international inspection of armaments?" I think for one very simple reason—the force of world public opinion. The needle has burst the balloon of Russian peace propaganda. For any thinking human being or citizen, no matter in what part of the world he may live, could never reconcile Russia's claim that it was for peace and then its refusal to accept international inspection of its armaments.

Mr. Chairman, I would like also to point out that we here in the United States have never been able to hide and have never desired to hide the extent to which this country is under arms. We know just—and all you have to do is pick up the newspaper—we know just how many men we have in our Armed Forces. One need only read our congressional reports and bills to know how many ships are commissioned in the Navy and how many aircraft groups are commissioned in our Air Force. It is impossible to obtain this information from Soviet Russia or any of its satellite nations. But if they sincerely have accepted this great principle of international inspection of armaments for which the free world has been fighting, then a great victory for the cause of peace has been achieved by the free nations and by the western world.

May I add in closing that I hope our State Department will seize upon this achievement and will carry it into every home in every part of the world, to emphasize once again the determination of the people of the United States to achieve an honest, a decent, a just peace for all nations.

The Clerk read as follows:

EXPORT-IMPORT BANK OF WASHINGTON

Not to exceed \$950,000 (to be on an accrual basis) of the funds of the Export-Import Bank of Washington shall be available during the current fiscal year for all administrative expenses of the bank, including not to exceed \$25,000 for temporary services, as authorized by section 15 of the act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a): *Provided*, That necessary expenses (including special services performed on a contract or fee basis, but not including other personal services) in connection with the acquisition, operation, maintenance, improvement, or disposition of any real or personal property belonging to the bank or in which it has an interest including expenses of collections of pledged collateral, or the investigation or appraisal of any property in respect to which an ap-

plication for a loan has been made, shall be considered as nonadministrative expenses for the purposes hereof.

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

Mr. Chairman, I wish to take just 2 or 3 minutes to discuss this matter pertaining to the Export-Import Bank. Chairman Gaston told us that the Bank is doing business on all the continents and some 40 countries throughout the world. The testimony also indicates that the Export-Import Bank is very largely carrying on the work which is embraced in what I understand to be the general concept of the so-called plan 4 of the President. Chairman Gaston also refers to a lot of other work which is being carried on in different parts of the world under funds known as Grant funds, and all of which conforms with a general conception of point 4.

There are very interesting discussions on page 393 of the hearings, and I wish to ask the chairman of the committee, or the gentleman from Pennsylvania, [Mr. JAMES], a member of the committee, if he is present, if in the closing of the testimony the committee thoroughly understands that the Export-Import Bank is not soliciting plan 4 loans, or, you might say, soliciting any other type of loans other than those which have to do with the supply of strategic materials for the defense effort? Does the chairman desire to answer that? In other words, is it the committee's understanding that the Export-Import Bank does not directly or indirectly solicit loans in foreign countries other than those loans which have to do with the supplying of strategic materials for the defense effort?

Mr. GARY. That is our understanding.

Mr. CRAWFORD. I think that understanding could be obtained from the testimony, but at the same time I think the testimony which is printed here in the hearings will lead anyone who does not want to narrow their views, to the belief that the Export-Import Bank is soliciting other types of loans; and here is what I refer to:

Mr. GASTON. What I mean is this: That under Mr. Sauer's direction, he and one of our economists and other members of the staff have sought out people in the Government and talked to them about this strategic materials supply situation.

Then he goes on and says this:

That statement relates only to strategic materials, to defense items. It relates only to our operations within the Government to find out where we could be helpful and to what extent.

Then Mr. JAMES asked:

The sense of that is that you would be more than commonly interested in suggestions brought to you, for instance, out of the point 4 or like program but which your staff does not solicit?

And Mr. Gaston replied:

Yes. I have said we do not send people into the field. That is not entirely true. We have sent people up into Canada to look into the cobalt situation, because we have heard only vague statements as to what the cobalt situation was.

I gather from that language that the staff of the Export-Import Bank through that statement announces to the world that the Bank is in a responsive mood to make loans under the plan 4 program.

I want to get that in the RECORD, unless the committee wishes to deny that assumption because I think it is necessary for our people who will be later called upon to support plan 4 and to the extent of many billions of dollars, should know that the Export-Import Bank is already carrying on a very substantial part of that work.

Mr. GARY. Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee do now rise and report the bill back to the House with sundry amendments, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and that the bill as amended do pass.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. SMITH of Virginia, chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 3282) making appropriations for the Treasury and Post Office Departments and funds available for the Export-Import Bank of Washington for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and for other purposes, had directed him to report the bill back to the House with sundry amendments, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and that the bill as amended do pass.

The SPEAKER. Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment?

Mr. GARY. Mr. Speaker, I demand a separate vote on two amendments, the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WIGGLESWORTH], page 14, line 24, and the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. CROSSER], page 15, lines 12 to 18.

The SPEAKER. Is a separate vote demanded on any other amendment? If not, the Chair will put them in gross.

The amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the first amendment on which a separate vote has been demanded.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 14, line 24, after the word "service", strike out "\$1,845,000,000" and insert "\$1,823,000,000."

The SPEAKER. The question is on the amendment.

Mr. GARY. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays. The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 136, nays 138, not voting 159, as follows:

[Roll No. 20]

YEAS—136

Abbitt	Baker	Busbey
Abernethy	Beall	Butler
Adair	Belcher	Byrnes, Wis.
Allen, Calif.	Bender	Carlyle
Andersen,	Betts	Case
H. Carl	Bishop	Chatham
Andresen,	Boggs, Del.	Chenoweth
August H.	Bramblett	Chipperfield
Arends	Brehm	Church
Armstrong	Brown, Ohio	Clevenger
Auchincloss	Budge	Cole, N. Y.
Ayres	Buffett	Colmer

Cotton	Hoffman, Mich.	Reed, N. Y.	Golden	McCormack	Riehlman	Mr. Boykin with Mr. Harvey.
Coudert	Holmes	Rogers, Fla.	Gordon	McCulloch	Sabath	Mr. Brooks with Mr. Hill.
Cox	Hope	Rogers, Mass.	Gore	McDonough	Saylor	Mr. Stanley with Mr. Horan.
Crawford	Hull	St. George	Green	McGregor	Scott, Hardie	Mr. Lesinski with Mr. Johnson.
Cunningham	Hunter	Schwabe	Gwinn	McMullen	Scrivner	Mr. Fernandez with Mr. Wilson of Indiana.
Curtis, Mo.	Jackson, Calif.	Scott,	Hall,	McVey	Sheehan	Mr. Powell with Mr. Widnall.
Dague	Jensen	Hugh D. Jr.	Leonard W.	Machrowicz	Sheppard	Mr. Welch with Mr. Stefan.
Davis, Wis.	Jones,	Scudder	Harden	Martin, Mass.	Sieminski	Mr. Kluczynski with Mr. Smith of Kansas.
Denny	Woodrow W.	Shafer	Harrison, Wyo.	Mason	Smith, Kans.	Mr. Hays of Ohio with Mr. Scrivner.
Devereux	Judd	Short	Harvey	Miller, Calif.	Smith, Wis.	Mr. Richards with Mr. Saylor.
D'Ewart	Kean	Simpson, Ill.	Hays, Ohio	Miller, N. Y.	Springer	Mr. Redden with Mr. Nelson.
Dolliver	Kearney	Simpson, Pa.	Hedrick	Mills	Stanley	Mr. Sutton with Mr. Curtis of Nebraska.
Dondero	Kearns	Sittler	Heffernan	Mitchell	Stefan	Mr. Tackett with Mr. McDonough.
Doughton	Keating	Smith, Va.	Heller	Morris	Stockman	Mr. Wheeler with Mr. Beamer.
Eaton	Kersten, Wis.	Taber	Hill	Morrison	Sutton	Mr. Dingell with Mr. Angell.
Ellsworth	Kilburn	Talle	Hoeven	Moulder	Tackett	Mr. Green with Mrs. Bolton.
Fellows	LeCompte	Thompson,	Hoffman, Ill.	Mumma	Taylor	Mr. Philbin with Mr. Bennett of Michigan.
Fenton	Lovre	Mich.	Holifield	Murphy	Thomas	Mr. Deane with Mr. Bakewell.
Ford	McConnell	Tollefson	Horan	Murray, Tenn.	Vail	
Gamble	Mack, Wash.	Towe	Jarman	Murray, Wis.	Vinson	
Gathings	Martin, Iowa	Van Pelt	Jenison	Nelson	Welch	
George	Meador	Van Zandt	Jenkins	O'Konski	Wharton	
Goodwin	Merrow	Vaughn	Johnson	O'Neill	Wheeler	
Gossett	Miller, Md.	Velde	Jonas	Ostertag	Wickersham	
Graham	Miller, Nebr.	Vorys	Jones, Mo.	O'Toole	Widnall	
Gross	Morton	Vursell	Kee	Patman	Williams, Miss.	
Hale	Nicholson	Weichel	Kelly, N. Y.	Philbin	Williams, N. Y.	
Halleck	Norblad	Werdell	Kennedy	Poulson	Wilson, Ind.	
Hand	O'Hara	Wigglesworth	Kerr	Powell	Withrow	
Harrison, Va.	Phillips	Willis	Klein	Radwan	Wood, Idaho	
Herter	Pickett	Wiscn, Tex.	Kluczynski	Redden	Woodruff	
Heselton	Potter	Winstead	Larcade	Rees, Kans.	Yorty	
Hess	Prouty	Wolcott	Latham	Regan	Zablocki	
Hillings	Reece, Tenn.	Wolverton	Lesinski	Rhodes		
Hinshaw	Reed, Ill.	Wood, Ga.	Lyle	Richards		

NAYS—138

Addonizio	Gregory	O'Brien, Mich.
Andrews	Hagen	Passman
Aspinall	Hall,	Patten
Bailey	Edwin Arthur	Patterson
Bates, Ky.	Hardy	Perkins
Battle	Harris	Poage
Bennett, Fla.	Hart	Polk
Bentsen	Havener	Preston
Boggs, La.	Hays, Ark.	Price
Bolling	Hébert	Priest
Breen	Herlong	Quinn
Brown, Ga.	Howell	Rabaut
Bryson	Irving	Rains
Burdick	Jackson, Wash.	Ramsay
Burleson	James	Rankin
Burnside	Javits	Reams
Burton	Jones, Ala.	Ribicoff
Camp	Jones,	Riley
Canfield	Hamilton C.	Rivers
Cannon	Karsten, Mo.	Roberts
Carnahan	Kelley, Pa.	Robeson
Celler	Keogh	Rodino
Chelf	Kilday	Rogers, Colo.
Chudoff	King	Rogers, Tex.
Cooley	Kirwan	Rooney
Crosser	Lane	Roosevelt
Davis, Ga.	Lanham	Sadlak
Denton	Lantaff	Sasser
Dorn	Lind	Secrest
Doyle	Lucas	Seely-Brown
Eberharther	McCarthy	Shelley
Elliott	McGrath	Sikes
Evins	McGuire	Smith, Miss.
Fallon	McKinnon	Spence
Feighan	McMillan	Staggers
Fisher	Mack, Ill.	Steed
Flood	Madden	Stigler
Fogarty	Magee	Teague
Forand	Mahon	Thompson, Tex.
Forrester	Mansfield	Thornberry
Frazier	Marshall	Trimble
Garmatz	Morano	Walter
Gary	Morgan	Whitaker
Granahan	Multer	Whitten
Granger	Murdock	Wier
Grant	Norrell	Yates
Greenwood	O'Brien, Ill.	

NOT VOTING—159

Aandahl	Bonner	Dawson
Albert	Bosone	Deane
Allen, Ill.	Bow	DeGraffenried
Allen, La.	Boykin	Delaney
Anderson, Calif.	Bray	Dempsey
Anfuso	Brooks	Dingell
Angell	Brownson	Dollinger
Bakewell	Buchanan	Donohue
Barden	Buckley	Donovan
Baring	Bush	Durham
Barrett	Byrne, N. Y.	Elston
Bates, Mass.	Clemente	Engle
Beamer	Cole, Kans.	Fernandez
Beckworth	Combs	Fine
Bennett, Mich.	Cooper	Fugate
Berry	Corbett	Fulton
Blackney	Crumpacker	Furcolo
Elatnik	Curtis, Nebr.	Gavin
Boiton	Davis, Tenn.	Gillette

So the amendment was rejected.
The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Elston for, with Mr. Kerr against.
Mr. McGregor for, with Mr. Moulder against.

Mr. Leonard W. Hall for, with Mr. Miller of California against.

Mr. McCulloch for, with Mr. O'Neill against.
Mr. Anderson of California for, with Mr. Machrowicz against.

Mr. Riehlman for, with Mr. Yorty against.
Mr. Miller of New York for, with Mr. O'Toole against.

Mrs. Harden for, with Mr. Buchanan against.

Mr. Rees of Kansas for, with Mr. Furcolo against.

Mr. Fugate for, with Mr. Anfuso against.
Mr. Gwinn for, with Mr. Holifield against.

Mr. Taylor for, with Mr. Combs against.
Mr. Latham for, with Mr. Blatnik against.

Mr. Murray of Wisconsin for, with Mr. Hedrick against.

Mr. Mason for, with Mr. Rhodes against.
Mr. Hoeven for, with Mr. Sieminski against.

Mr. Gillette for, with Mr. Barrett of Pennsylvania against.

Mr. Jenkins for, with Mr. Engle against.
Mr. Ostertag for, with Mr. Fine against.

Mr. Poulson for, with Mr. Dollinger against.
Mr. Sheehan for, with Mr. Donohue against.

Mr. Gavin for, with Mr. Morrison against.

Mr. Smith of Wisconsin for, with Mr. Gordon against.

Mr. Jonas for, with Mr. Zablocki against.
Mr. Hoffman of Illinois for, with Mr. Clemente against.

Mr. Woodruff for, with Mr. Delaney against.
Mr. Allen of Illinois for, with Mr. Klein against.

Mr. Bow for, with Mrs. Kelly of New York against.

Mr. Blackney for, with Mr. Jarman against.
Mr. Jenison for, with Mr. McCormack against.

Mr. Wharton for, with Mr. Heller against.

Mr. Williams of New York for, with Mr. Heffernan against.

Mr. McVey for, with Mr. Buckley against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Jones of Missouri with Mr. Martin of Massachusetts.

Mr. Williams of Mississippi with Mr. Corbett.

Mrs. Bosone with Mr. Fulton.

Mr. Bonner with Mr. Cole of Kansas.

Mr. GATHINGS changed his vote from "nay" to "yea."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment on which a separate vote has been demanded.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 15, strike out beginning with line 12 down through line 18.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the amendment.

Mr. GARY. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were refused.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. HARRIS and Mr. HINSHAW) there were—yeas 147, nays 56.

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

The SPEAKER. The Chair will count. [After counting.] Two hundred and thirty-four Members are present, a quorum.

So the amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

Mr. GARY. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were refused.

So the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. GARY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have five legislative days to revise and extend their remarks on the bill just passed.

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

There was no objection.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Woodruff, its enrolling clerk, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment a joint resolution and concurrent resolution of the House of the following titles:

H. J. Res. 173. Joint resolution to amend and extend the provisions of the District of Columbia Emergency Rent Act, as amended; and

H. Con. Res. 83. Concurrent resolution providing for the adjournment of the House from March 22, 1951, until April 2, 1951.

AUTHORIZING VESSELS OF CANADIAN REGISTRY TO TRANSPORT IRON ORE BETWEEN UNITED STATES PORTS ON THE GREAT LAKES DURING 1951

Mr. HART. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H. R. 2338) authorizing vessels of Canadian registry to transport iron ore between United States ports on the Great Lakes during 1951.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, as I understand, this bill permits the use of Canadian vessels to haul ore.

Mr. HART. That is right.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. There are some of us insisting on having Canadian vessels also haul grain. It is my understanding that an amendment would be offered to this bill so that the Canadian vessels could haul the grain as well as ore.

Mr. HART. That matter was considered, I will say to the gentleman, in committee this morning, and it was decided, because of the essence of time with respect to the carrying of ore, that we would report out a bill dealing with grain later.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Then there will be other legislation which will permit the use of Canadian vessels to haul grain?

Mr. HART. I am sure there will be, and I am sure it will be done right after the Easter recess. The matter was discussed rather fully this morning, and the only reason grain was not included in the measure now before us was because time was of such essence for the transportation of the ore that it was thought better to introduce a separate bill respecting the transportation of grain.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I may say to the gentleman that it will be probably 30 days, at least, before the ice is out of the Great Lakes, so there may be ample time to amend this bill. I do not want to oppose this bill, the gentleman understands.

Mr. HART. I understand that, sir, and I appreciate it. But our information was to the effect that the ice would soon begin on the Great Lakes. In fact, it was stated to me informally that they expected transportation to open on March 24, and certainly not later than the middle of April.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I would like to have the gentleman know and the Record show that our storage capacity for grain out through the great Midwest is filled up to the limit. We are not able to get boxcars to ship that grain out of there, and we must use the Great Lakes as much as we can. We need boats to do so, and if the gentleman will bring up this other legislation, which I am sure he or some member of his committee will do, then we may be able to use those Canadian boats to haul the grain because of lack of other facilities.

Mr. HART. I will say that the gentleman from New York [Mr. BUTLER] expressed great interest in the transpor-

tation of grain this morning and I gave him the assurance and I give the gentleman the assurance that upon the introduction of a bill there will be no time lost in bringing it up.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, the bill is already prepared and I will drop it in the hopper tomorrow.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, by reason of emergency conditions in transportation on the Great Lakes, notwithstanding the provisions of section 27 of the act of June 5, 1920 (41 Stat. 999), as amended by act of April 11, 1935 (49 Stat. 154), and by act of July 2, 1935 (49 Stat. 442), or the provisions of any other act or regulation, vessels of Canadian registry shall be permitted to transport iron ore between United States ports on the Great Lakes until December 31, 1951, or until such earlier time as the Congress by concurrent resolution or the President by proclamation may designate.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

Mr. HART. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (S. 683) authorizing vessels of Canadian registry to transport iron ore between United States ports on the Great Lakes during 1951. This is identical with the House bill just passed.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, by reason of emergency conditions in transportation on the Great Lakes, notwithstanding the provisions of section 27 of the act of June 5, 1920 (41 Stat. 999), as amended by act of April 11, 1935 (49 Stat. 154), and by act of July 2, 1935 (49 Stat. 442), or the provisions of any other act, or regulation, vessels of Canadian registry shall be permitted to transport iron ore between United States ports on the Great Lakes until December 31, 1951, or until such earlier time as the Congress by concurrent resolution or the President by proclamation may designate.

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.

By unanimous consent, the proceedings by which the bill H. R. 2338 was passed were vacated, and the bill was laid on the table.

THE McMAHON-RIBICOFF RESOLUTION

Mr. RIBICOFF. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks and include a letter from the Secretary of State.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. RIBICOFF. Mr. Speaker, a short time ago I introduced House Concurrent Resolution 57 intended to express the peaceful intentions of the United States

and the friendship of the American people for all other peoples, and especially for the people of the Soviet Union. Two colleagues, the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. CHATHAM] and the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. HOWELL], introduced similar measures in the House. In the other body a similar resolution was introduced by the senior Senator from Connecticut [Mr. McMAHON], with the support of 22 distinguished Members of that body. This resolution has come to be known as the McMahon-Ribicoff resolution.

A few days ago an inquiry was sent from the Committee on Foreign Affairs to the Secretary of State asking his views on House Concurrent Resolution 57. He has sent an answer which I believe to be a state paper of high order. It appears at the end of my remarks.

The Committee on Foreign Affairs plans to take this resolution up for action in the near future. In due course it will come before the House. I trust that it will draw overwhelming support so that its important message may be helped to pierce the iron curtain with the utmost effectiveness.

This resolution and the Secretary of State's able explanation of its importance in our national policy concern matters far above the plane of party differences. They lie at the heart of the hopes and intentions which unite us as a people.

Our hope is for peace—a peace based not simply on moral default to the enemies of liberty and reason, but a peace representing a common quest of the things that are good and decent in the world's life. Peace is not just the absence of violence. Peace means influencing the world environment in ways that we honestly believe to be consistent with our duty to ourselves and conducive to the growth of dignity and decency in world affairs, not to their decline.

Our earnest hope is that the men who rule the Soviet Union can be caused to permit an honest statement of our intentions to go through to the peoples under their control. Even without their help, we must use every practical means of getting the truth through the iron curtain.

As rational men, believing in peace, we must miss no chance to get over to the Soviet rulers the idea of their historic opportunity to help in setting the world on a new and hopeful course.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, March 20, 1951.

The Hon. JOHN KEE,
Chairman, Committee on Foreign Affairs,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. KEE: Your letter of March 7, 1951, gives me opportunity to endorse explicitly and emphatically the McMahon-Ribicoff resolution reaffirming the abiding friendship of the American people for all other peoples, including the peoples of the Soviet Union.

I wish to commend the legislative initiative in this vital matter. I hope that it will prove possible to have favorable action completed by the Congress in the near future. I am sending a similar letter to the Chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations of the United States Senate.

Three aspects of the resolution impress me particularly.

The first is the voicing of the American people's fervent, profound desire for peace. The resolution well expresses this as our goal now and ever. After taking note of the "terrible danger to all free peoples" as the circumstance compelling us reluctantly to rearm, the resolution affirms that we "desire neither war with the Soviet Union nor the terrible consequences of such a war." It notes our preference "to devote our energies to peaceful pursuits." It finds cogent support of this in our willingness "to share all that is good in atomic energy, asking in return only safeguards against the evil in the atom."

I note that the resolution proclaims our aim not simply in the word "peace" but as just and lasting peace. It links this with the dignity of man and the moral principles which alone lend meaning to his existence. This concept is echoed in a reference to our determination to defend freedom.

It is well that the resolution makes clear that while we covet peace, we will not sell our souls for it. The peace we seek is not simply the absence of war but a sound and free collaboration among nations in a pattern of responsibility based on mutual respect. Peace in the first sense might be obtained by moral capitulation. Peace in the sense of our seeking can be achieved and held only by long, hard effort. We and our allies with us are determined to create that kind of peace. The goal would be brought incalculably nearer with help rather than hindrance from the Soviet Union.

That brings me to the second point of special significance. It is well that in affirming our friendship for all peoples the resolution specifies the peoples of the Soviet Union. That special concern to express our friendship extends, I am sure, to all other peoples in Europe and Asia, including China, now suffering the tragedy of life behind the iron curtain. The great structure of peace which the United States and its allies are building will never be complete until all the peoples now under domination by the Kremlin participate in full partnership. Here, however, we speak specifically of the peoples within the Soviet Union proper.

Were the truth available to them and were they free to speak their minds and register their will, I am sure they would answer us in the same spirit.

They are capable and hard-working peoples who love their homeland. We recall with fresh admiration their sacrifice and courage under the ordeals of the Nazi invasion. We are in constant awareness of their gifts to civilization and of their potential for still further gifts to enrich other cultures. The wall which the Soviet rulers, impelled by inward fears, maintain around their dominion represents tragedy for those within it. To those outside it represents real and deep deprivation.

It will be well if the peoples within can be caused to know that those beyond regard them, not with hostility as represented to them by their rulers, but with an inherent friendliness. It will be well for them to know that we understand the heavy burdens they bear, particularly in the circumstance that the course determined upon by the group in control bars them from the fruits of the secure and steady peace which they have so greatly earned.

As the third point of special significance, I refer to the closing lines of the resolution expressing the idea:

"That the Congress request the President of the United States to call upon the Government of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics to acquaint the people of the Soviet Union with the contents of this resolution."

These words point to the opportunity which the men of the Kremlin have for set-

ting affairs on a better course. No others are in such a position to say the words and perform the acts which can either strengthen or confound men's hopes.

In a curious way they mirror themselves in their interpretation of the outside world. As monopolists of power, they profess to see in other governments the evil of monopoly. Dominated by hostility toward all contrasting systems, they profess to see that characteristic reflected in the systems they fear and hate. Maintaining in readiness armaments of such excess as to be explained not on a basis of defense but only by the desire to intimidate others, they pretend to regard other nations as bent upon aggression.

If the men of the Kremlin could but conquer their inward fears and resolve their contradictions, if they could but bring themselves to the comity which is the foundation of peace, great burdens would be lifted from the shoulders of peoples everywhere.

A start could be made by letting the truth flow freely into and within the Soviet Union. This would mean an end to the practice of systematically distorting to the peoples of the Soviet Union the policies and intentions of governments free of its domination and the conditions of life beyond the Soviet orbit. It would reduce the dangerous disparity of public information now obtaining as within and beyond the span of Kremlin control.

In our own country, for example, the press, radio, and television are free to present all sides of every issue. The Soviet case is fully reported. Attitudes and pronouncements originating in the capitals of the Soviet system are made freely available to our people, who are left free to resolve their wills on the basis of full possession of essential facts. In contrast, the monopolistic system of information within the Soviet area makes available only the ruling group's side of every issue. There truth is made the servant of policy rather than policy the servant of truth.

It is significant, for illustration, that the plan for international control of atomic energy, approved in the United Nations General Assembly in the fall of 1948 by a vote of 40 to 6, was never imparted to the peoples who get their information through the Soviet monopoly. This plan for placing atomic energy under international control, limiting its uses to peaceful purposes and establishing an adequate system of inspection and control to neutralize its destructive potential, was opposed by the governments of the Soviet system. This fact has been withheld from the peoples within that system.

The same occurred with respect to the General Assembly resolution on the essentials of peace, reaffirming the principles of the Charter and endorsed in 1949 by a unanimous vote of all nations other than those within the Soviet orbit. Its principles and the implications of the clear division on them have never been explained to the peoples behind the iron curtain.

The same applies to the action of the General Assembly last fall in support of the resolution on uniting for peace. This plan for strengthening the General Assembly with respect to security matters, supported by 52 nations, drew implacable hostility from the Kremlin and the governments under its control. The facts and their enormous implications have not been imparted by the Kremlin to the peoples whom it professes to represent.

These three examples chosen from many instances illustrate that the walls impeding the flow of information are also obstacles of crucial importance in the course to a sound and lasting peace.

Sincerely yours,

DEAN ACHESON.

Mr. CHATHAM. 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 North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. CHATHAM. Mr. Speaker, as a cosponsor of this friendship resolution, I would like to add the following to the statement made by the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. RIBICOFF].

Eventually the Kremlin will have to yield on its attitude of hostility toward the world, and its hopes for conquest through the penetration and subversion of other political systems.

It has followed the path of stubbornness too long. It has flouted the standards of responsibility too long. It has created tension and dismay too long. The free world is now aroused. Reluctantly, though with determination, it is going through with a program for developing strength. That program will vastly exceed the capabilities of the Kremlin system to match it.

The Kremlin must soon face the choice of trying desperately to strike down the forces before the free forces have gained overwhelming ascendancy or to accommodate itself to a new ordering of the world's affairs—an ordering based upon principles of freedom and responsibility heretofore apparently unacceptable to the masters of the Soviet Union.

Our aim is not to destroy the basis of life for the peoples living within its domain. Rather it is to provide the basis in a world community in which the peoples of that area can enjoy dignity and freedom and the world's respect in a pattern of full cooperation with other nations. Our aim in brief is peace.

It is essential that we get this truth over to the Soviet peoples. We ask the assistance of the rulers of that area. We must not exaggerate the hopes that they will come to reason. We can still hope that they will, out of prudence, accommodate themselves to the new facts of the world situation.

If they should, the world can again enjoy a secure peace. If they do not, the result will be tragedy for the world and for the peoples of the Soviet Union in particular.

FINAL REUNION OF UNITED CONFEDERATE VETERANS

Mr. HARDY. 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 Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. HARDY. Mr. Speaker, there are only a few of the gallant Confederate veterans left. I call the attention of the House to the final reunion which will take place at Norfolk in my district from May 30 to June 3.

Let me read to the Members a letter of invitation to the Members of Congress to attend this final Confederate reunion as guests of the city of Norfolk. It reads as follows:

SIXTY-FIRST AND FINAL REUNION,
UNITED CONFEDERATE VETERANS,
Norfolk, Va., March 10, 1951.

HON. PORTER HARDY, JR.,
Second Virginia District,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. HARDY: The Sons of Confederate Veterans and this committee have heard

from a good many Congressmen to the effect that they would like to attend the sixty-first and final reunion of the United Confederate Veterans.

Doubtless many others among your distinguished colleagues would like to attend, so the committee wishes to extend through you a most cordial invitation to as many of them as can to accept Norfolk's hospitality on a boat ride from Washington and return, and during their stay in our city.

Personal invitations will be sent to all Senators and Representatives as soon as they can be prepared. Meanwhile we should know as soon as possible whether most of them would prefer to be here on Memorial Day for the formal military parade, or on Saturday, June 2, for the more colorful reunion parade and fireworks, including a reenactment of the celebrated battle between the U. S. S. *Monitor* and C. S. S. *Virginia* (*Merrimac*). In either event, we expect to arrange for their entertainment and enlightenment a tour of Norfolk Harbor, the idle fleet in James River, and to Jamestown, Williamsburg, and Yorktown.

Please assure the Members of Norfolk's warmest welcome. With thanks and best wishes, I remain, sir,

Sincerely yours,

W. LUDWELL BALDWIN,
Director General.

Mr. Speaker, it will be noted that Mr. Baldwin's invitation contemplates that the Members will go down by steamer on an overnight trip. I believe that plans are now under consideration for an alternative means of transportation, and it may be that the Members can fly down. In any event, these arrangements will all be worked out and there will be ample notice.

I hope that a large number of the House Members will attend this reunion. I can think of no finer way to exemplify the accomplishment of national unity than through such a gathering, participated in both by Yankees and by Rebels. Every American honors the surviving members of both of the armies which participated in the War Between the States.

I feel sure also that the House membership generally will find this trip particularly valuable from an historical standpoint. I feel certain that many of you have never set foot on the soils of Jamestown or seen the historical buildings in Williamsburg, or the battlefield at Yorktown where Cornwallis surrendered. The reenactment of the battle of the first two ironclad ships in history should be particularly interesting.

Again, let me urge every Member who possibly can do so to accept the hospitality of the city of Norfolk and join us at the forthcoming Confederate reunion.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. HARRISON of Virginia asked and was given permission to address the House for 30 minutes today, following any special orders heretofore entered, and to revise and extend his remarks.

THE STRUGGLE FOR PEACE

Mr. HOWELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. HOWELL. Mr. Speaker, I want to add a word of commendation for the res-

olution introduced by the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. RIBICOFF] and his colleague in the Senate, Senator McMAHON. I also am a cosponsor of that resolution. I believe, particularly now when all of us realize how necessary it is to build up our defenses and to be prepared to defend our country, or to support our allies in any part of the world where further aggression occurs, that we should at least devote an equal effort to keeping open positive means for peace. Certainly this resolution by the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. RIBICOFF] is in line with what I think we should be doing at this time. I think it has been demonstrated that Stalin like Hitler in the last war has attempted and succeeded almost entirely in keeping all information from the Russian people, and I believe a real effort on the part of our Voice of America program to penetrate the iron curtain will do a tremendous amount of good.

I believe we should always take care, in our dismay at the recalcitrance of the men who rule in the Soviet Union, that we distinguish between the rulers and their victims.

I do not know how better to characterize the people who live under the dominion of the Kremlin. They are victims of a cruel, immoral conspiracy against the free and decent impulses in man's nature.

In hating the governing system of the Soviet Union, let us remember that the individuals who bear the yoke were also made in the image of God.

Let us recall here the words of Woodrow Wilson 34 years ago:

Russia was known by those who knew it best to have been always in fact democratic at heart, in all the vital habits of her thought, in all the intimate relationships of her people that spoke their natural instinct, their habitual attitude towards life. The autocracy that crowned the summit of her political structure, long as it has stood and terrible as was the reality of its power, was not in fact Russian in origin, character, or purpose. . . . The great generous Russian people have been added in all their naive majesty and might to the forces that are fighting in the world, for justice and for peace. Here is a fit partner for a League of Honor.

Let us hope those words are prophetic.

That the impulses to decency are stronger than oppression is attested by the circumstance that after years of Soviet mastery, the rulers still do not feel secure enough to relax the controls by which the great peoples of the Soviet Union are held in toil.

I think we can find the same sign in the fact that after decades of an infamous campaign against religion in the Soviet Union, millions still bravely throng its churches for divine worship.

Let us devoutly hope that in our lifetime, indeed in some time near at hand, the impediments to unity may be removed and that they and we can enter into a full and fruitful partnership for mankind's good.

A VOICE OF FREEDOM

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, and include a copy of a bill and a copy of a letter.

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

There was no objection.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, on Thursday last I recommended in the speech that I made at that time that instead of having only the Voice of America and the different "voices" of the different countries on different radio broadcasts, that we have all of those countries that are living in freedom and trying to live in freedom and who love freedom, unite and have the Voice of Freedom. I think that would be very effective in reaching Russia; very effective in bringing about peace. I hope that will be done, and I am introducing a bill along that line.

EMERGENCY FOOD AID FOR INDIA— ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, it was emphasized during the hearings before the Committee on Foreign Affairs that a large-scale movement of grain to India had to be gotten under way in April to deal effectively with the famine situation in India and that this was also required by transportation problems in the United States and overseas transportation. This urgency continues and requires the most expeditious possible action on the part of the Congress. The question of governmental stability in India with which relief of the famine situation is directly tied up also continues to have the highest priority for American foreign policy.

Though the bill reported out by the Committee on Foreign Affairs has not come to the floor for consideration due to the fact that the question of granting a rule is still undecided in the Rules Committee the issue remains extremely pressing and in view of the interest in it throughout the country Members will undoubtedly be called on to answer questions respecting it when they are at home during the recess.

Accordingly, I am appending the answers to a number of questions which have been raised in the course of committee consideration and speeches in the House and the attention of Members is urgently invited to these answers. They are: First, a statement of the Government of India repudiating the statements of Dr. Bharatan Kumarappa on the position of India in the struggle between democracy and communism; second, the statement of Prime Minister Nehru to the Parliament of India with respect to the message sent to the Congress of the United States by 43 members of the Parliament showing that this was an expression of embarrassment by the Government of India and not a question of the right of the members of Parliament to speak; third, a factual memorandum from the Embassy of India with respect to provisions for feeding the indigent in India; and fourth, a similar factual memorandum with respect to disposi-

tions regarding the wealth of the Indian princes.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
March 16, 1951.

The Honorable JACOB K. JAVITS,
House of Representatives.

MY DEAR MR. JAVITS: The Embassy of India has requested that I forward to you the following papers which are enclosed:

Government of India Information Services press release of March 9, 1951, concerning Dr. Bharatan Kumarappa.

Prime Minister's statement of February 16, 1951, in the Indian Parliament with respect to the message sent to the Congress by members of the Parliament and other matters.

Memorandum prepared by the Embassy of India with respect to provisions for feeding the indigent in India.

Memorandum prepared by the Embassy of India with respect to the disposition of the wealth of the Indian princes.

The Embassy informs me that it has cabled to New Delhi for current information on monazite sands and hopes to have this information available within a few days.

Sincerely yours,

ELBERT G. MATHEWS,
Director, Office of South Asian Affairs.

[Special press release, Government of India Information Services, Washington, D. C.]

WASHINGTON, D. C., March 9, 1951.—The following statement has been issued by the Government of India:

"The attention of the Government of India has been drawn to certain reports of speeches made in the United States of America by Dr. Bharatan Kumarappa. Dr. Kumarappa has stated that these reports are incorrect and to some extent distorted.

"Dr. Kumarappa is an Indian Delegate to the United Nations Social Commission which concerns itself with social welfare activities. He has previously attended meetings of the Commission. The next meeting of the Commission will be held in Geneva later this month.

"The present visit of Dr. Kumarappa to the United States is entirely a private one for the purpose of a lecture tour and has nothing to do with the Government of India or with the United Nations Social Commission. He is authorized to speak for the Government of India only in the Social Commission and that, too, on subjects coming up before that Commission and according to the Government's instructions. Any views expressed by him on topics outside the Commission or on topics other than those before it are his own and the Government of India has no responsibility for them."

NEW DELHI, February 16, 1951.

The Prime Minister made the following statement in Parliament this morning:

"I have the pleasure to inform you, sir, and the house that one of our colleagues in this house, whose energy and activities in the house are known to all members and to you, sir—Shri Mahabir Tyagi—has been appointed by the President, on my advice, as Minister of State. He will be working in the Ministry of Finance under the honorable Minister for Finance. I am sure that the inclusion of Shri Mahabir Tyagi will strengthen our Government as well as the close contacts which the Government has with all members of the house.

"There is another, and a different, matter to which, with your permission, sir, I should like to make some reference. I should like to express my appreciation of most of our newspapers for the fair manner in which they discharge their duties to the public. As is well known, we have the fullest freedom of the press and it is open to any newspaper to criticize the Government in any way it likes, subject only to the laws of the land. We have no official press and no Government-

owned or controlled newspapers. While expressing my appreciation of newspapers in general, may I also say that some periodicals in various parts of India fall very greatly below any standard of decency and legitimate criticism. Indeed, it has amazed me to find to what depths these periodicals can fall and how they can go on giving publicity to an amalgam of falsehood and indecency. Constant references are made to alleged conflicts and intrigues in the Cabinet and in the Government and it is insinuated that some of my honored colleagues in the Cabinet do not cooperate with others. I have ignored these writings of irresponsible journalists but I feel that it is due to my colleagues and to this house that I should say something about this false and malicious campaign, which reaches not only to the Central Government but also to some Provincial governments. In particular, some weekly periodicals are guilty of this behavior.

"I should like to state categorically that these stories are completely false and the Cabinet and the Government function with probably a far greater measure of friendly cooperation than any other government in any other country. What I am specially concerned about is the degradation of some part of our public press. This is a serious matter for those connected with the honorable and responsible profession of journalism, which has such a vitally important part to play in the life of the country, more specially a country which is governed by democratic ideals and objectives. It is for the leaders of the newspaper world in India to consider this matter with all seriousness with a view to prevent this degradation which cannot but affect the whole public life of our country.

"There is yet a third, and a different, matter to which I should like, sir, to make reference. In this morning's newspapers, I saw, for the first time, a report that 43 members of Parliament have sent cables to the presiding officers of the United States Congress in regard to the legislation that is pending before the Congress for supplying foodgrains to India. This message was sent without any kind of reference to any member of Government and I was considerably surprised to read it. It is open to members of Parliament, of course, to address any message they like to any individual or any government. But this does appear to me a novel precedent for a number of members to take a step in a matter concerning foreign policy and in addressing the officers of a foreign government without consideration of the larger issues. If this practice continues, different members of Parliament may send contradictory messages and advocate different policies by telegram addressed to foreign countries. The house will realize how embarrassing that must be not only for the Government but for this house. In this house there is perfect freedom for members to express their views. But for members of the house to send direct messages to foreign governments is a practice which, I submit, is to be deprecated and which can only lead to confusion and embarrassment."

The question is what safeguards there are in the Indian situation as it exists at present to prevent people from starving to death not because there is no food in the ration shops but because they have no money to buy the food with. This question is particularly pertinent because there is in India no system of unemployment relief organized by the state.

The safeguards are as follows:

1. The price of food in the ration shops is deliberately kept (through governmental subsidy) low enough to enable even the lowest income groups to buy their rations. The question of inability to buy through lack of money arises only if through failure of supplies the ration card cannot be honored. The card holder then has to go to the black market where the quantities available are

exceedingly small with the result that any transference of legitimate demand to it causes prices to soar very high and prevents the poorer sections of the population from satisfying their needs.

2. The Indian joint family system is for the purposes now under consideration an excellent substitute for unemployment relief. It insures that no member of a joint family can starve if any other has enough to eat. As the joint family is a fairly large group, the risks of starvation (except in the case of a widespread calamity) are small.

3. The Indian village community system, which is still vigorous, is another substitute for unemployment relief. The bhairchara (fellow feeling) of the village acts in somewhat the same way as the joint family system. In the latter the group is smaller and more closely knit and the obligation is legal; in the former the group is larger and more diffuse and the obligation is moral, but its influence is strong enough to prevent individuals in a village from starving if the village as a whole has sufficient to eat.

4. The famine code: The joint family system and the village community prevent individual starvation. When, however, there is over a large area an over-all shortage of food supply through failure of crops, etc., the system is to declare the area a famine area which has two consequences. The first is that it becomes the administration's duty to transport food to that area from other areas and the second is that it becomes the administration's duty to provide the population (which through failure of the crops has no money to support itself) with money to purchase the food that is brought into the area. The money is provided not through cash doles but through the immediate commencement of public works (whether economically justified or not) such as the building of roads and the building of canals. The famine code is the name given to a body of regulations built up during the course of the nineteenth century designed to minimize the consequences of a local failure of crops.

PRINCELY WEALTH

At the time the princely states were asked to join the Indian Union, concessions in regard to the rulers' privy purses and private properties were made by the Government of India. The concessions were later embodied in the constitution.

Article 362 of the constitution, promulgated January 26, 1950, lays down:

"In the exercise of the power of Parliament or of the Legislature of a State to make laws or in the exercise of the executive power of the Union or of a State, due regard shall be had to the guarantee or assurance given under any such covenant or agreement as is referred to in clause (1) of article 291 with respect to the personal rights, privileges, and dignities of the Ruler of an Indian State."

Article 291 (1), referred to above, prescribes:

"Where under any covenant or agreement entered into by the Ruler of any Indian State before the commencement of this constitution, the payment of any sums, free of tax, has been guaranteed or assured by the Government of the Dominion of India to any Ruler of such State as privy purse—
"(a) Such sums shall be charged on, and paid out of, the Consolidated Fund of India."

As an illustration, the covenant signed between the Nizam of Hyderabad and the Government of India on January 25, 1950, may be cited. The provisions in the covenant regarding the Nizam's private properties were:

"His Exalted Highness, the Nizam of Hyderabad shall be entitled to the full ownership, use, and enjoyment of all the jewels, jewelry, ornaments, shares, securities, and other private properties, movable as well as

immovable (as distinct from State properties), belonging to him on the date of this agreement."

The reason why the Indian Government entered into such seemingly unequal agreements with the princes was given by Sardar Vallabhbhai Patel, the late Deputy Prime Minister and Minister for State, in a speech before Parliament on October 12, 1949. The occasion was discussion of concessions to the rulers provided in the constitution. Sardar Patel said:

"We accepted it because we had no option to act otherwise. While there was recognition in the various announcements of the British Government of the fundamental fact that each state should link up its future with that dominion with which it was geographically contiguous, the Indian Independence Act released the states from all their obligations to the British Crown. In their various authoritative pronouncements, the British spokesmen recognized that with the lapse of paramountcy, technically and legally the states became independent. They even conceded that theoretically the states were free to link their future with whichever dominion they liked although, in saying so, they referred to certain geographical compulsions which could not be evaded. The situation was indeed fraught with immeasurable potentialities of disruption, for some of the rulers did wish to exercise their technical right to declare independence and others to join the neighboring dominion. If the rulers had exercised their right in such an unpatriotic manner, they would have found considerable support from influential elements hostile to the interests of this country. * * *

"There was nothing to compel or induce the rulers to merge the identity of their states. Any use of force would have not only been against our professed principles but would have also caused serious repercussions. If the rulers had elected to stay put, they would have continued to draw the heavy civil lists which they were drawing before and in large number of cases they could have continued to enjoy unrestricted use of the state revenues. The minimum which we could offer to them as *quid pro quo* for parting with their ruling powers was to guarantee to them privy purses and certain privileges on a reasonable and defined basis. The privy purse settlements are therefore, in the nature of consideration for the surrender by the rulers of all their ruling powers and also for the dissolution of the states as separate units. We would do well to remember that the British Government spent enormous amounts in respect of the Mahratta settlements alone. We are ourselves honoring the commitments of the British Government in respect of the pensions of those rulers who helped them in consolidating their empire. Need we cavil then at the small—I purposely used the word "small"—price we have paid for the bloodless revolution which has affected the destinies of millions of our people."

Therefore, the Government of India cannot take over the princes' properties without violating the constitutional guarantees given to the rulers, who may of their own wish, make gifts of their wealth to help the country but certainly they cannot be compelled.

The large civil lists which the princes used to enjoy before integration have been cut down. In truth, previously there was no distinction between the expenditure on the administration and the ruler's privy purse. After integration the distinction between the privy purse and state expenditure has been made clear, and the former fixed on a standard scale. It is calculated on the basis of 15 percent on the first \$21,000, average annual revenue of the state concerned, 10 percent on the next \$84,000, and 7½ percent above \$105,000, subject to a maximum of \$210,000. The total annual privy purse commitments made amount to \$9,450,000.

Private properties of the princes are as inviolable as those of ordinary citizens. The Indian constitution recognizes the right of private property as a fundamental human right. It would be as illegal for the Government of India to seize the Nizam's jewelry as for the United States Government to confiscate the bank balance of one of its leading industrialists.

Some of the jewelry of the senior princes, although regarded as their personal property, cannot easily be disposed of by the princes, as they are required for use on ceremonial occasions. This type of jewelry, e. g., coronets and belts, have been in the possession of the princes for generations and are handed down from successor to successor.

There is a good deal of sentimental and traditional attachment to this type of jewelry, and there is no question of either appropriating or disposing of them.

INCOME-TAX EVASION

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks and include an editorial from the St. Louis Post-Dispatch of March 15.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, in the March 19, 1951, RECORD I inserted an editorial from the St. Louis Post-Dispatch calling attention to income-tax filing. This is not a local St. Louis problem. It is national in scope. I am today placing in the RECORD another editorial from the same paper on the same subject. I hope the Members of this Congress will pay heed to this development and investigate it thoroughly. It is obvious that neither the Justice Department nor the Treasury Department is going to do anything about it. They are going to ignore it until publicity forces them to take cognizance of it.

It is this attitude upon the part of the administration which has produced the low state of morality in the Federal Government which is shocking the entire country.

REPLY FOR MR. SNYDER

If Secretary of the Treasury Snyder and his top assistants knew everything that goes on in every income-tax evasion case, then Mr. Snyder's statement to the Post-Dispatch would carry more weight.

Mr. Snyder, speaking through Acting Secretary Edward H. Foley, says it is "absolutely false" that pressure was exerted in his Department to call off prosecution for tax evasion of a widely known St. Louis businessman who is a friend of President Truman and Mr. Snyder.

With all due respect to the Secretary of the Treasury, Mr. Snyder's declaring the statement false does not make it so.

As a matter of fact, the testimony of a Government Department head, unsupported by other evidence, is likely to be peculiarly unconvincing in such a case as this. As we said on Monday, income-tax evasion cases have been "killed by high office holders in St. Louis, Chicago, or Washington, or by underlings fearful of embarrassing the boss," meaning President Truman or Treasury Secretary Snyder." Mr. Snyder of all the persons in his Department might be the least likely to know about a fix. And when a fix is charged, he can deny it only on the word of those implicated in the accusation. He may honestly believe the charge to be

false. But the Secretary's belief does not establish what the facts actually are.

So we are not going to withdraw our statement about the highly connected St. Louis businessman, nor our statement that "a pattern has developed by which income-tax cases against wealthy persons, including donors to Democratic campaign funds, go so far but no further toward prosecution."

Acting Secretary Foley, speaking for Mr. Snyder, adopts the usual injured air of the officeholder when he says our disclosures on income-tax cases are calculated to suggest that the revenue system is "unworthy of trust." They are calculated to do nothing of the kind. They are calculated to inform the public. If anybody wishes to conclude that the revenue system is "unworthy of trust," that is due to the facts we bring out, not to the publication of them.

We shall, therefore, continue to bring out the facts—such facts as the offer of two lawyer-fixers who sent word to a St. Louis businessman that they could deliver favorable action on his claim for a \$3,000,000 tax refund in return for a fee of 20 percent. Everything is supposed to be very confidential in the Treasury, but somehow these two fixers knew that this claim was pending.

Let all the facts come out. Then the public can decide whose statements have been "absolutely false."

FINGERPRINT ALL FOR COMPLETE UNITED STATES WHO'S WHO

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, it is true that the lack of a whole set of prints to cover our one-hundred-and-fifty-odd-million population does permit some criminals to escape detection. That is only part of the story. There is also the fact that many innocent people are inconvenienced in various ways because we have no genuine record of them.

Our best hospitals now take impressions from each baby that comes into the world, in order to avoid confusion, and to make certain that parents take home the child that is really theirs. No one makes a fuss about this, or thinks that we are putting children and criminals in the same class. It is done to prevent mix-ups.

I think it is a good idea. And I am suggesting legislation that will require every person to have pictures taken of the individual pattern that nature writes into the skin formation of our fingertips so that no one person will be mistaken.

There are too many people floating around within our country with no anchor of identity. Any one of these cannot verify, for instance, that he is the one and only child that was born at exactly 12:27 a. m. on the morning of Monday, April 5, 1892, at the Benevolent Hospital in Hometown, Kans., to Patrick and Imogene Smithovich.

The social-security agency has a hard time with some old folks who cannot establish their qualifying age. This is not entirely the fault of people who believe that they have reached the age of retirement. Vital statistics were imperfectly recorded by town and church, or disappeared through fire or neglect. And

when the paper evidence goes it is a job to piece together other miscellaneous facts in its place.

Of course, we cannot have every grown-up go back and get born all over again so we can take his prints right from the time he let out his first squawk.

From 1951 on, however, we can begin to make up for this deficiency. And it will not mean that we will have to wait in long lines to register for some all-inclusive national service.

The procedure I recommend is a non-duplicating method whereby prints are taken of all who go to school, or who work, drive cars, travel by ship, rail or plane, receive Government benefits, get married, pay taxes, become hospitalized, or have contact with any agency of the local, State, or Federal Governments. A copy would be given to each person. In this manner we would finally get a thumb-and-finger record of everybody in the United States family.

Whenever I read of an amnesia case, where neither the sick person nor anyone else knows who he is, I get an empty feeling at the thought of any person being a "nobody."

You have heard about the Bureau of Missing Persons. You have seen the strange word "Unidentified" filling in for the unknown name of a person who has been killed in an accident and rests in anonymity on a slab at the morgue. Maybe you know of the "Presumed to be dead" interpretation of certain circumstances recognized in law.

And when we think of a fellow human, healthy, and in sound mind, who misses out on an inheritance because he cannot convince anybody that he really is himself, our sympathies really take fire.

The legislation I propose is not inspired by the needs of law enforcement, or for the defense of our national security alone. I am thinking of the right of every American to protect his own interests.

The tracery on his fingertips never changes. It can always be checked against the prints taken of them and kept in a safety vault maintained by the Federal Government when individual proof is required.

If there is no such record, and you ask other people to believe in you on your own thin say-so, you may find yourself the victim of doubt, delay, or even financial loss.

Fingerprints on file is the one indelible way to guarantee the identity of each and every person in our Nation.

PERMISSION TO RECEIVE MESSAGES AND SIGN ENROLLED BILLS

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that notwithstanding the adjournment of the House today the Clerk be authorized to receive messages from the Senate and that the Speaker be authorized to sign any enrolled bills and joint resolutions duly passed by the two Houses and truly enrolled.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from

Virginia [Mr. HARRISON] is recognized for 30 minutes.

JAMES MADISON, FOURTH PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

Mr. HARRISON of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, last Friday it was my privilege to attend an observance of the two hundredth anniversary of the birth of James Madison, fourth President of the United States.

The celebration was held at a State educational institution of which all Virginia is proud—Madison College at Harrisonburg, in the Shenandoah Valley—which has achieved stature as one of the outstanding teacher-training centers in the South.

It is not necessary for me to recount to this House the achievements of James Madison. He has come to be known as the father of the Constitution.

The freedoms which we enjoy, and which we cherish, are ours today because of the sturdy structure of democratic government which Madison and his colleagues erected.

In the ceremonies at Madison College, the words, the writings of Madison were recalled. As my thoughts were directed once more to the first years of this Republic, I wished that it had been possible for all of the Members of this House to be present. The demands of these crucial days often prevent our contemplation of the basic ideas of our Government and our free society at times in which such consideration would be most beneficial.

There, as the principles which Madison expounded and sought to enshrine for his posterity were recalled, I found a reinforcement of the national faith. At Madison College, a relatively small, but exceedingly sturdy, fortress of intellectual integrity, Dean Raymond Pinchbeck, of the University of Richmond, stated the philosophy of Madison in a fashion which I could not approach.

I believe Dean Pinchbeck's message will be of value to those of us who serve here. I take the liberty, therefore, of quoting his words as follows:

Two hundred years ago today James Madison, father of the Constitution of the United States was born. It is fitting that we assemble here, at Madison College, which bears his name, to pay homage to this great Virginian, great American and great world citizen. It was a highly significant and appropriate honor paid James Madison in 1938 when his beloved native Commonwealth of Virginia gave his name to this college which is dedicated primarily to the preparation of teachers of the youth of Virginia. Madison believed that popular government, political democracy, and human freedom would not long endure without an intelligent and educated citizenry of our local, State, and Federal governments. He believed that "Liberty and learning are best supported when leaning on each other"; that a "popular government without popular information or the means of acquiring it is but a prologue to a farce or a tragedy, or perhaps, both"; that "knowledge will forever govern ignorance; and a people who mean to be their own governors must arm themselves with the power which knowledge gives." It was he who urged the new national Congress to establish a national university with the plea that in the new nation it would serve as a "model . . . in the formation of other seminaries; as a nursery of enlightened preceptors, and as a central resort of youth and genius from every

part of their country, diffusing these national feelings . . . which contribute cement to the union and strength of our great political fabric of which that is the foundation." It was in this conviction that Madison joined Jefferson and Monroe in the work of establishing the University of Virginia, and to serve as its rector from the death of his friend, Jefferson, in 1826 to his own death in 1836.

Memorials to James Madison have not taken the form of equestrian statues or monuments. The life and services of this gentle and scholarly man must be sought in the libraries of the United States and the free nations of the world, in the massive and eternally brilliant proceedings of the Federal Constitutional Convention in Philadelphia in 1787, in the 29 Federalist papers he wrote in defense of the new Constitution, in his voluminous correspondence on the Constitution and a myriad of other subjects, in the Journals of the General Assembly of Virginia, in the Journals of the Continental Congress and the Congress of the United States, in archives of the Secretary of State under President Jefferson, in the official papers of President James Madison, in the minutes of the board of visitors of the University of Virginia, in the records of the African Colonization Society, in the legions of decisions of the Supreme Court of the United States, and in more than a century and a half of scholarly writings by a host of writers on constitutional law in all the free nations of the earth.

It is in the scholarly realm of constitutional law, political science, and political history that we discover the real genius of Madison. He was too frail in physical stature and health to be accepted for service in the Continental Army or the Virginia Militia to which he offered his services. He led no military battalions to victory. As an executive in the office of Secretary of State of the United States and the President of the United States he refused to be a power-grasping political dictator. In all the offices he held over a period of more than 40 years he insisted on the self-effacement of his powers as an executive. In the Federal Constitutional Convention in Philadelphia his views were accepted by the brilliant membership of that body not because of his oratorical powers, which were very modest, but on account of their sound logic based on his universal and scholarly knowledge of the history of constitutions and constitutional law, ancient and modern. In his defense of the proposed new Constitution of the United States in the Virginia Ratification Convention held in the spring of 1788 in Richmond he spoke so quietly and calmly that the recorder and audience could scarcely hear his quiet utterance. Yet his sound and scholarly persuasiveness more than equalled the powerful eloquence of Patrick Henry and the sincere views of George Mason and James Monroe. It was largely the leadership of Madison in the Virginia convention which led to the adoption of the new United States Constitution by a vote of 79 to 69.

A study of the life of Madison is a revelation of the Virginia political and social philosophy which began unfolding shortly after the first settlement at Jamestown in 1607. This philosophy was ultimately to launch a new free and independent democratic United States of America under the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution of 1788, both documents largely written by two great Virginians, Jefferson and Madison. It is to be regretted that no adequate history of the contribution of Virginia and Virginians to the making of the United States has yet been written.

Like his brilliant company of Revolutionary contemporaries, the life of James Madison was influenced by a composite of the philosophy of many Old World and Virginia antecedents. The scholarly Madison was

well acquainted with the classical culture of England and the European Continent. He was familiar with the philosophy which resulted in the first General Assembly of Virginia in 1619. He knew the history of the bloody struggle between King James and the British Parliament from 1641 to 1660 and the period of the Cromwellian Commonwealth. He knew of the mortal struggle of Nathaniel Bacon against the tyrannical rule of Virginia's Gov. William Berkeley in 1676. He knew the long history of Negro slavery in the New World since Negro slaves first came to Jamestown in 1619. He doubtless knew the writings and works of Robert Beverly, James Blair, and William Byrd II, of Westover, and their historical services to Virginia. He knew the facts, causes, and consequences of the French and Indian War which came in his infancy and childhood, and the services of George Washington in that war. He was acquainted at first hand with the tyrannical abuses of George III against Virginia and the other Colonies so brilliantly stated by his dear friend and neighbor, Thomas Jefferson, in the American Declaration of Independence.

Numerous and good biographies of Madison have been written. One of the most recent, and one of the best, has been written by Irving Brant. Mr. Brant divides the life of our fourth President into four periods and devotes a volume to each—James Madison, *The Virginia Revolutionist, 1751-1780*; James Madison, *the Nationalist, 1780-1787*; James Madison, *father of the Constitution, 1787-1800*; and James Madison, *The President, 1800-1836* (published by Bobbs-Merrill Co., Inc.). In 1902 Gallard Hunt, editor of the *Writings of James Madison*, published an excellent one-volume life of Madison in the 37 chapters of which he gives a highly satisfactory narrative and interpretation of the life of the father of the Constitution. In 1938 Edward McNall Burns published a brief but thorough analysis and interpretation of the views of Madison on constitutional theory, entitled "James Madison, philosopher of the Constitution" (Rutgers University Press). Madison's own writings, notes, and letters have been published. A host of articles on Madison, his life and work, have been published in journals in the United States and other nations.

The genius of James Madison was undoubtedly stimulated by the brilliant galaxy of minds and careers of such contemporary Virginians as Washington, Jefferson, Marshall, Monroe, Mason, Richard Henry Lee, Patrick Henry, Edmund Pendleton, John Randolph, Edmund Randolph, George Wyth, and William B. Giles. His great mind and spirit was further kindled by his labors and associations with such patriots from the other colonies as John Adams, Samuel Adams, Alexander Hamilton, Benjamin Franklin, the Pinckneys, John Jay, Peter Muhlenberg, Gouverneur Morris, Robert Morris, and their genius in turn was fired by his brilliant genius, tireless labors for human freedom, and his personal and political purity of character.

It is well that we review briefly the principal events of the life of Madison in further quest of a fuller view and appreciation of this scholarly patriot whose learning was accomplished not only by the study of books and literature, but by the fruitful practical experience of more than 40 years of public service for his beloved Orange County and Commonwealth of Virginia, and for the new Union.

PRINCIPAL EVENTS IN THE LIFE OF MADISON

James Madison was born on March 16, 1751, at Port Conway, King George County, Va., and was the oldest son of James and Nellie Madison of Montpelier, Orange County, Va. He was destined to reside at Montpelier nearly all of the 85 years of his long and fruitful life. His parents were descend-

ants of early pioneers in the Virginia colony and were a relatively prosperous and conservative family. His father owned slaves in considerable numbers, served as a vestryman in St. Thomas' Parish and lay delegate to the Episcopal Convention in 1776. One of his cousins, bearing the same name, James Madison, served as President of the College of William and Mary, and as the first Episcopal bishop of Virginia.

The locale of Madison's rearing had a considerable part in the formation of his philosophy of life. He was raised at Montpelier, in Orange County, near Albemarle County, the home of Thomas Jefferson. Most of his neighbors were small landowners, many of them from the North or from the conservative tidewater plantation country, seeking larger opportunities and freedom. Here were the principal centers of revolt against entails and primogeniture, slavery and the Established Church. Yet his father was probably the largest landowner in this Piedmont area.

Madison's early education was entrusted to a Scotsman named Donald Robertson, a man with a reputation for learning. Madison received instruction in Latin, Greek, arithmetic, geography, algebra, geometry, and a varied range of literature. After some 3 or 4 years under his tutor, Robertson, Madison studied a year or two under the Reverend Thomas Martin, vicar of the Established Church. He also did a great deal of reading on his own account. His private reading covered a wide range of subjects including *A Warning to a Careless World*, *The Life of Man in the Soul of God*, *The Nature of Sin*, *Moses Unveiled*, *The Religion of Nature*, *Discourses on Quicksilver*, *The Motion of Fluids*, and *Chambers' Dictionary of Arts and Sciences*. In 1769 he entered the College of New Jersey, now Princeton University, instead of the College of William and Mary, the college of most of his distinguished contemporaries. Some believe that the then current controversy between the faculty and Board of Visitors of the College of William and Mary, and the progressive course of study of the College of New Jersey under its president, Dr. Witherspoon, had something to do with Madison's choice of a college.

At Princeton the classes in political science and history were the favorite courses of Madison, although he was required to take studies in the classics, metaphysics, and constant practice in oratory. He studied very hard and is said to have slept only about 5 hours in 24. His college contemporaries included Aaron Burr, Philip Freneau, Hugh Henry Breckenridge, and Henry Lee. At Princeton he joined these men in the founding of the American Whig Society. In 1771 he was awarded the A. B. degree after completing the 3-year course in 2 years. Although his health was so poor that he was excused from the commencement, he remained for another year's studies in Hebrew and ethics and other advanced studies. He was deeply interested in religious subjects, as indicated by his notes on the Gospels, the Acts of the Apostles, and foreknowledge of God, although he insisted that law was even then his chosen profession.

Madison returned to his home at Montpelier in 1772 in a bad state of health, melancholy, and indecision. He was not much disposed to make a planter's life his career. He read widely during this period while he was tutoring his younger nine brothers and sisters. Three years after leaving his studies at Princeton Madison began his public career of more than 40 years. In 1775 he found himself, at the age of 24, involved in the crux of events leading to the American Revolution and ultimate American independence. That year he was elected a member of the Orange County Committee, of which his father was chairman. In this capacity he worked hard in recruiting men for the Army after falling

to gain admission to the Army himself on account of his delicate health. In 1776 he was elected to the convention which drafted the first Constitution of Virginia, including the famous declaration of rights, which has been included in all subsequent Virginia Constitutions. His principal contribution here related to the section on religious freedom. George Mason prepared the declaration.

Madison served in the Virginia House of Delegates in 1776-77, after which he was defeated, it is said, because of his refusal to favor the voters with treats of hard liquor at political rallies. He accepted defeat rather than participate in this customary practice, which he regarded as a form of corrupting the voters. In 1777 he was elected to the council of state and served 2 years in that body, which was an advisory cabinet to the Governor of Virginia. In 1779 he was elected to the Continental Congress and served to June 1783, when he retired under the provision of the Articles of Confederation, which limited this service by one person to three successive years in any 6-year period. In 1784 he was again elected to the Virginia House of Delegates and served to 1787. In the latter year he served briefly in the Continental Congress again, in the spring of 1787, only to retire to enter upon his duties as a delegate to the Federal Constitutional Convention in Philadelphia, where the most outstanding service of his long career was to take place.

Madison was undoubtedly the best prepared member of the Philadelphia Constitutional Convention of 1787. He had made extensive researches into ancient and modern constitutions on political theories. He actively participated in all of the debates of the convention, and as an unofficial reporter made copious notes daily, and laboriously transcribed them each night. He did not write the important and famous Virginia plan presented to the convention on May 29, 1787, but he had a very large part in its framing. Following the adjournment of the Convention in September 1787 he joined Alexander Hamilton and John Jay in October 1787 in the preparation of a series of newspaper letters in support of the Constitution. These were later published in a volume we now know as the *Federalist Papers*. He wrote at least 29 of the 35 *Federalist Papers* which are generally regarded as the most significant contributions to political theory ever made in the United States, and perhaps the world.

In April 1788 Madison was elected to the ratifying Virginia convention which met in Richmond and concluded its labors on June 25, 1788, by the approval of the Constitution of the United States by a vote of 79 to 69. Although not an orator he brilliantly opposed Patrick Henry, George Mason, James Monroe, and others who were hostile to the proposed new Constitution of the United States. He is generally credited with securing the approval of the Constitution by the Virginia Convention.

On September 15, 1794, Madison was married to the charming, gracious, and talented young widow, Mrs. Dolly Payne Todd, after an engagement of 6 months. She was 26 years of age and he was 43. Although this marriage resulted in no children it was a long and happy one. She survived Madison 13 years and died at the age of 81 on July 12, 1849.

Washington was anxious to have Madison serve in the new United States Senate but he chose to stand for election to the new House of Representatives and was elected in February 1789 and served to 1797. He felt that membership in the House was very important because it was the popularly elected branch of the new National Legislature which should play a dominant part in the new Government. There he pressed for amendments to the Constitution to provide for a Bill of

Rights by the first Congress, and opposed all excesses of the Federalists. He took this stand in spite of the fact that he had been the leader of the movement for a strong Federal Government in the Philadelphia Convention. He explained that to have added the amendments prior to the adoption of the Constitution by the States would have made it more difficult to agree on the Constitution at the Philadelphia Convention and at the State conventions which were to ratify it. He had seen the weakness of the impotent Government of the Confederation during the period 1775-89 and wanted a Federal Government of strength but limited and specified powers. He voluntarily retired to private life on March 4, 1797, at a time when Americans were alarmed by the excesses of the French Revolution, the breach of the neutral rights of the United States by Britain and France, and the abusive attacks on the Federal Government by the Jefferson-led anti-British Republicans. It was this situation which led to the Alien and Sedition Acts. It was Madison who joined with Jefferson in the preparation and proposal of the Resolutions which they led to adoption by the Legislatures of Virginia and Kentucky in 1799.

In 1799 Madison was again elected to the Virginia House of Delegates where he was the leader of the movement against the unconstitutional policies of the new Federal Government. His report on the Virginia Resolutions against the Alien and Sedition Acts represents one of the finest statements of Madison's constitutional theories.

Madison's close friend and neighbor, Thomas Jefferson, was elected President of the United States in the Republican triumph in the elections of 1800. He appointed Madison his Secretary of State, in which office the latter served the full 8 years of Jefferson's administration. Madison was Jefferson's choice as his successor. After Jefferson's retirement from the Presidency, he wrote of his relations to Madison: "Our principles were the same, and we never differed sensibly in the application of them." Under Madison's administration as Secretary of State, the United States acquired the Louisiana Purchase in 1803, fought the undeclared war with France, and faced the gravest violations of American neutral rights by Britain. These latter violations were to lead to the War of 1812 in his own Presidential administration. He and his own beloved Dolly lived close to the widowed Jefferson during the latter's two administrations, and she was the historic and brilliant hostess of the White House for which she is so well remembered. She was destined to serve for 8 more years as the mistress of the White House under her husband from 1808 to 1817.

Madison was elected President of the United States in 1808 and served to March 4, 1817. His administration was marked by the disastrous events leading to the War of 1812 and many humiliating defeats during the war, including the burning of Washington by the British, when he and his family fled the White House which was burned by the invaders. The war resulted in heavy financial burdens, which led to his consent to the chartering of the Second Bank of the United States, although he had opposed the First Bank in 1791. He favored protective tariffs, although he was at heart a free trader. He was accused of allowing the warmongers of his party to push the Nation into war with Britain and making a peace with Britain which did not even mention the primary cause of the war, the impressment of American seamen, and violation of other neutral rights. Before the close of his administration most of these problems had cleared, and the Nation was once more enjoying a measure of prosperity, with the result that his popularity had greatly increased. His administration was not marked by any brilliant executive leadership on his part because of the very nature of Madison

personally, because of his conviction that the Executive should not exert great power, and because of the great problems which faced him.

On March 4, 1817, he retired to his beloved Montpelier and private life. He returned to public service only to serve on the Board of Visitors of the University of Virginia with Jefferson and Monroe, and as a member of the Virginia State Constitutional Convention of 1829. His principal service in the convention related to compromises on the suffrage provisions. He insisted on what was very nearly universal freehold suffrage which Jefferson had favored. Through the remaining years of his life he devoted much of his time to correspondence on constitutional questions, always opposing State nullification and secession on the one hand, and national absolutism on the other. He served as rector of the University of Virginia during the last 10 years of his life after the death of Jefferson in 1826. Madison died quietly as he sat in his chair on June 28, 1836, in his eighty-sixth year. Jefferson had died 10 years before at the age of 83. Madison bequeathed his library to the University of Virginia. His beloved Dolly returned to Washington in 1837 where she was to live 13 years after her husband's death and face straitened financial conditions because, in large part, of a wastrel son by her first husband. She was helped by the purchase of Madison's papers by Congress, even as the Congress had purchased Jefferson's library to assist him and found the Library of Congress.

MADISON'S CONSTITUTIONAL THEORIES

Madison had from long study and political experience and observation arrived at a rather precise set of constitutional theories and convictions. He did not believe that the state is an organism, a product of evolution and history, but that it was a compact between the people consciously and voluntarily entered into by them. He held that the purpose of government is to correct the evil propensities of man's nature which include base and selfish motives, suspicion, desire for self-aggrandizement, discrimination, and disinclination to do more than is required by convenience or self-interest, or exacted of them by force. The majority of the people actually adopt the compact of Government, but this majority are required to protect the rights of the minorities of the people. Pursuant to his compact theory he believed in their right of revolution in extreme cases.

Like Jefferson it was believed by Madison that an agrarian society is the best and that cities are socially and politically bad for a democracy. He vigorously opposed monarchy and all absolute power and heritable privileges. He was an advocate of republican representative democracy and completely hostile to pure democracy in lawmaking and the administration of government. He opposed unitary National Government and favored Federal Government with specified limited powers with all other unspecified powers reserved to the States or the people. He believed in the separation of governmental powers into the legislative, executive, and judicial departments, as checks and balances on the power of government. He believed in a government with coercive power to carry out its laws under the Constitution, but opposed ex post facto laws and sudden or drastic changes in legislation. He feared factions which would rend a government and destroy the rights of the people and proposed large election districts to dilute the power of factions and pressure groups. Government, according to Madison, must be mostly negative and designed to protect the rights and property of men. Confidence, justice, and security are the exalted objects of government. He was a strong believer in the Malthusian theory of population and opposed

government relief which he felt should be served by private charity and philanthropy. At heart he opposed protective tariffs but ultimately favored rather extensive tariff protection to the Nation's new industries. He favored public works in turnpikes, canals, and the like, to be paid for from surpluses in the Treasury.

Madison did not believe that the voice of the people is the voice of God but was convinced that there is a higher law of reason and universal right existing as a limitation on all government. He believed in complete protection of minority rights. He insisted on the veto right of the President with the overriding power of the Congress, fairly long terms of office for Senators and Congressmen, election of the President by the House when there is no candidate with a majority vote, proportional representation in the House, the popular election of the President in principle, the original adoption of the Constitution by conventions elected by the people for this purpose, that one generation ought not to be able to bind future generations, and that there should be some property-ownership basis for the franchise.

Madison opposed slavery but also opposed the Missouri Compromise because he thought that if slaves were in all parts of the Nation their lot would be better and emancipation would come sooner. He opposed all limitations on expression and believed in the complete separation of church and state. He opposed war except as a last resort and believed in complete dominance of the civil authority over the military and all standing armies.

It has been said that the essence of Jefferson's vision of democracy was simply a faith in personal liberty as the highest guiding principle in the progress of civilization. Government, to secure the natural rights of individuals, provide for popular elections to achieve this, provide exact and equal justice, provide periodic revisions of constitutions and laws; subordinate the military to the civil authority, provide for the education of the people, and stimulate local self-government. Jefferson opposed the supremacy of the judiciary over the other branches of government. Madison and Jefferson both abhorred absolutism in any form, both adhered to the ideals of limited government and the supremacy of the civil over military authority, both believed in universal suffrage in principle, both believed in the importance of local self-government, both believed in the duty of government to protect the natural rights of men, both distrusted the proletarian masses, the hangers-on of parasitic capitalism, and the rootless and instable mobs. Madison tended to place larger emphasis on the rights of property than did Jefferson. Perhaps Jefferson and Madison agreed with the common dicta of their day, including such statements as, "The necessity of any government is a misfortune"; "Government is the greatest of all reflections on human nature"; "Government is a necessary evil," or in the words of Thomas Paine, "Society springs from our wants, government from our wickedness."

MADISON'S IDEAL GOVERNMENT

In his final message to Congress on December 3, 1816, Madison defined his ideal government as:

"Government pursuing the public good as its sole object, and regulating its means by the great principles consecrated in its charter, and by those moral principles to which they are so well allied; a government which watches over the purity of elections, the freedom of speech and press, the trial by jury, and the equal interdict against encroachments and compacts between religion and state; which maintains inviolably the maxims of public faith, the security of persons and property, and encourages in every authorized mode the diffusion of knowledge

which guarantees to public liberty its permanency and to those who possess the blessing the true enjoyment of it; a government which avoids intrusion on the internal repose of other nations and repels them from its own * * *; a government, in a word, whose conduct within and without may bespeak the most noble of all ambitions, that of promoting peace on earth and good will to men."

AN APPRAISAL OF MADISON—PARALLEL WITH THE WORK OF JEFFERSON

Without doubt Jefferson and Madison were the ablest political figures produced in the Revolutionary period of our Nation, and perhaps in all American history. Like Jefferson, his intimate friend and neighbor, Madison was the scholar and philosopher whose brilliant genius shaped the political doctrines which made Madison the political architect of our National, State, and local system of government. In this way Madison formulated the political basis of our precious modern American way of life. Like Jefferson, he devoted nearly all of his productive life to the service of his State and National Governments. Jefferson served in public office for more than 60 years, and Madison for more than 40 years. Largely because of long and devoted public service both men came to the end of their long lives in relative economic and financial embarrassment. Like Jefferson's, the long public service of Madison included no military office. Like Jefferson again, Madison was a lawyer who devoted most of his long and fruitful life to constitutional law in the service of his country. Both men served as Secretary of State, although Madison's diplomatic experience did not include any foreign service such as Jefferson's service as Minister to France. Again like Jefferson's, the genius of Madison did not lie in the field of political administration in executive positions where their success was not pronounced. Madison never served as Governor of Virginia as did Jefferson, but he did serve in the Governor's Council of State. Thus the lives of these two great Americans who were neighbors and friends had many parallels.

AN APPRAISAL OF MADISON—HIS WARNINGS TO OUR GENERATION

The brilliant luster of the genius of Madison shines like a lighthouse through the centuries across the stormy seas of man's eternal struggle toward the freedom and justice for the individual. Comparison of his life and works with those of his contemporaries anywhere in the world, or with great lawgivers in any nation at any time in history, only serves to enlarge the picture and scope of his eternal service to the cause of the freedom of the individual. It is not easy to summarize briefly an estimate of the more than 40 years of public service of James Madison. He made enduring contributions to the foundations of the American way of life as we know it today. Through the decades we can hear his clear voice warning our generation of the human errors which can lead to the destruction of our individual and national freedom and tyranny over the minds, souls, and bodies of every American.

1. He believed in a strong national government but we should hear him well as he warns us against the usurpation of power by our National Government. We should remember his insistence upon a strict interpretation of the limited powers of the Federal Government, and his warning that any loose interpretation of these Federal powers will surely lead to a unitary national government of unlimited authority over every detail of our individual lives and freedom, a tyranny detested by Madison and every freeman, and forbidden by our Bill of Rights.

2. We should remember his high moral purity in his personal and public life. He

refused to trade in public securities or to use his offices of public trust to enrich himself or in any way to draw suspicion or contempt to his personal integrity which remained spotless to his death. He was a God-fearing public servant of the noblest character.

3. We should remember his insistence that true human freedom means the right to "life, liberty, estate, and the pursuit of happiness." We should hear his long clear warning that men will not long remain free if government appropriates a large part of the national wealth and income by taxation or any other means, or gravely impairs the private ownership and use of wealth, or destroys the initiative to produce wealth for individual ownership and use. We can hear him insisting that under our constitutional way of life, "life, liberty, estate, and pursuit of happiness" can be assured for all, labor, capital, agriculture, commerce, finance, minority groups, and majority groups, and above all, for every individual.

4. We should remember his firm insistence on sound governmental finance, an honest system of money values, and balanced National and State budgets under a frugal public administration. He knew that irresponsible financial administration in government will ultimately destroy free government and individual human freedom.

5. We should remember his conviction that war can destroy our way of life and our individual freedom, even though we triumph on the battlefields. He knew from bitter personal experience the horrors of war on our American way of life, and urged peace by all honorable means. We can hear him say that we must be strong economically, politically, morally, and militarily, if we are to remain free. Yet we must as a free people be leaders of all efforts to bring world peace to earth, and raise the level of human physical and spiritual life around the world.

6. We should remember his long insistence on sound self-education as a foundation for sound self-government by the people, for the people.

We may well conclude with this final testament, a testament of his abiding faith in the Constitution and the American way of life, found among his papers after his death. In this Madison writes:

"ADVICE TO MY COUNTRY

"As this advice, if it ever sees the light, will not do so till I am no more, it may be considered as issuing from the tomb, where truth alone can be respected, and the happiness of man alone consulted. It will be entitled, therefore, to whatever weight can be derived from good intentions, and from the experience of one who served his country in various stations through a period of 40 years; who espoused in his youth, and adhered through his life, to the cause of its liberty; and who has borne a part in most of the great transactions which will constitute epochs of its destiny. The advice nearest to my heart and deepest in my convictions is: That the Union of the States be cherished and perpetuated. Let the open enemy to it be regarded as a Pandora with her box opened, and the disguised one as the serpent creeping with his deadly wiles into paradise."

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. HARRIS asked and was given permission to revise and extend the remarks he made in Committee of the Whole and include three letters from various services of the Government.

Mr. CARNAHAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. GRANAHAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an address by the Minister for External Affairs of Ireland.

Mr. WIER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an item from a newspaper in his district.

Mr. PRICE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in four instances and include in each extraneous matter.

Mr. EVINS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in two instances and include extraneous matter.

Mr. ADDONIZIO asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an article on Jewish Youth Week.

Mr. CELLER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in three instances.

Mr. ROOSEVELT (at the request of Mr. CELLER) was given permission to extend his remarks in two instances.

Mr. FISHER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in two instances and include additional matter.

Mr. SIKES asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include a resolution.

Mr. HART asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in three instances and include additional matter.

Mr. SAYLOR (at the request of Mr. HUGH D. SCOTT, Jr.) was given permission to extend his remarks on the subject of Pennsylvania's governors.

Mr. BEALL (at the request of Mr. HUGH D. SCOTT, Jr.) was given permission to extend his remarks.

Mr. PATTERSON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include a letter.

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in four instances and include certain articles.

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include a speech.

Mr. BUSBEY (at the request of Mr. HALLECK) was given permission to extend his remarks.

Mr. HINSHAW (at the request of Mr. HALLECK) was given permission to revise and extend his remarks made in Committee of the Whole and include some letters.

Mr. REES of Kansas (at the request of Mr. HALLECK) was given permission to extend his remarks and include an editorial.

Mr. VAN ZANDT (at the request of Mr. HALLECK) was given permission to extend his remarks in two instances and include editorials.

Mr. HALLECK asked and was given permission to revise and extend the remarks he made in Committee of the Whole this afternoon and include a report of the Committee on Appropriations in respect to its investigating staff under date of January 15, 1951, which report is signed by Mr. CANNON, chairman of the committee, the report being found in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, January 25, 1951, at page 699.

Mr. JENSEN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include a tribute to the soil of Iowa by Arthur Orr, one of its native sons.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts asked and was given permission to extend her remarks and include a copy of a bill and a copy of a letter.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee (at the request of Mr. PRIEST), for today, on account of official business.

To Mrs. KELLY of New York (at the request of Mr. ROONEY), for today, on account of illness.

To Mr. BUSH (at the request of Mr. ARENDS), for today, on account of illness.

ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

Mr. STANLEY, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills and a joint resolution of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H. R. 609. An act for the relief of Carroll L. Vickers;

H. R. 2339. An act to clarify the immigration status of certain aliens; and

H. J. Res. 173. Joint resolution to amend and extend the provisions of the District of Columbia Emergency Rent Act, as amended.

The SPEAKER announced his signature to enrolled bills of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 58. An act for the relief of Edulji Dinshaw and his sister, Mrs. Bachoo Dinsha Woronzow;

S. 63. An act for the relief of Marie Louise Ardans; and

S. 243. An act for the relief of Dewey Pickett.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 29 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, March 22, 1951, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

307. A letter from the Secretary of State, transmitting a draft of a proposed joint resolution entitled, "Joint resolution to give the Department of Commerce the authority to extend certain charters of vessels to citizens of the Republic of the Philippines, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

308. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated December 12, 1950, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and illustrations, on a preliminary examination and survey of Shoal Harbor and Compton Creek, N. J., authorized by the River and Harbor Act approved July 24, 1946 (H. Doc. No. 89); to the Committee on Public Works and ordered to be printed with illustrations.

309. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated January 10, 1951, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and an illustration, on a preliminary examination and survey of anchorage at Lowes wharf, Talbot County, Md., authorized by the River

and Harbor Act, approved on July 24, 1946 (H. Doc. No. 90); to the Committee on Public Works and ordered to be printed with illustrations.

310. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated September 11, 1950, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and an illustration, on a preliminary examination and survey of Nanticoke River, Bivalve, Wicomico County, Md., with a view to providing a harbor for small boats, authorized by the River and Harbor Act approved on March 2, 1945 (H. Doc. No. 91); to the Committee on Public Works and ordered to be printed with illustrations.

311. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated January 2, 1951, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and illustrations, on a preliminary examination and survey of Westchester Creek, N. Y., authorized by the River and Harbor Act approved on March 2, 1945; to the Committee on Public Works and ordered to be printed with illustrations.

312. A letter from the Secretary of Defense, transmitting a report that no amounts were paid from the appropriation "Claims, Office of the Secretary of Defense" for tort claims arising from the acts or omissions of employees of the Department of Defense, excluding the military departments, during the fiscal year ending December 31, 1950, pursuant to the provisions of title 28, United States Code, section 2673; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

313. A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting a copy of an order of the Acting Commissioner of Immigration and Naturalization, dated October 20, 1950, authorizing the temporary admission into the United States, for shore leave purposes only, of alien seamen found to be excludable as persons within one of the classes enumerated in section 1 (2) of the provisions of section 6 (b) of the act of October 16, 1918, as amended by section 22 of the Internal Security Act of 1950; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

314. A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting a copy of an order of the Acting Commissioner of Immigration and Naturalization, dated October 20, 1950, authorizing the temporary admission into the United States, for shore leave purposes only, of alien seamen found to be excludable as persons within one of the classes enumerated in section 1 (2) of the provisions of section 6 (b) of the act of October 16, 1918, as amended by section 22 of the Internal Security Act of 1950; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

315. A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting a copy of an order of the Acting Commissioner of Immigration and Naturalization, dated October 20, 1950, authorizing the temporary admission into the United States, for shore leave purposes only, of alien seamen found to be excludable as persons within one of the classes enumerated in section 1 (2) of the provisions of section 6 (b) of the act of October 16, 1918, as amended by section 22 of the Internal Security Act of 1950; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

316. A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting a letter relative to the case of Sofoclis Demosthenes Despotopoulos or Sofoclis Demos Despotopoulos or Sofos Despotopoulos, file No. ~~XXXXXX~~ CR 28881, requesting that it be withdrawn from those now before the Congress and returned to the jurisdiction of the Department of Justice; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

317. A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting a letter relative to the case of Arnalzo Pacheco or Chico Pacheco, file No. ~~XXXXXX~~ CR 27074, requesting that it be

withdrawn from those now before the Congress and returned to the jurisdiction of the Department of Justice; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

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. HART: Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries. H. R. 2338. A bill authorizing vessels of Canadian registry to transport iron ore between United States ports on the Great Lakes during 1951; without amendment (Rept. No. 283). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. FORAND:

H. R. 3391. A bill to amend the Federal Unemployment Tax Act to extend its coverage to employers having one or more individuals in employment; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 3392. A bill to extend the unemployment insurance program by redefining the term "employment" to include, among others, certain individuals engaged in activities which are not ordinarily regarded as constituting "agricultural labor," certain individuals employed outside the United States by American employers or on American aircraft, and insurance salesmen; to provide a less restrictive definition of the term "employee," and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 3393. A bill to amend the Social Security Act to provide unemployment insurance for Federal civilian employees, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 3394. A bill to enable the Secretary of Labor to assure payment of unemployment-compensation benefits to workers employed in more than one State and to insure payment of benefits only to individuals entitled thereto, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 3395. A bill to repeal the so-called Knowland amendment and to reenact the pertinent provisions of the Social Security Act and the Internal Revenue Code as they existed prior to the enactment of such amendment, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 3396. A bill to increase the upper limit on earnings subject to the Federal Unemployment Tax Act from \$3,000 to \$3,600, and to include tips in the definition of wages, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FARRINGTON:

H. R. 3397. A bill to make the calendar fixed and perpetual; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. JAVITS:

H. R. 3398. A bill to provide for promotion by merit of employees in the postal service and to establish uniform procedures for examination and appointment of candidates for promotion to supervisory positions; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 3399. A bill to provide facilities in post offices for displaying information on public officials and voting; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. KEE:

H. R. 3400. A bill to authorize the transmission and disposition by the Secretary of the Interior of electric energy generated at

international dams on the Rio Grande; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

H. R. 3401. A bill to make certain increases in the annuities of annuitants under the Foreign Service retirement and disability system; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. McGRATH:

H. R. 3402. A bill to amend the National Service Life Insurance Act of 1940 so as to permit payments to aunts and uncles of the insured where the insurance matured prior to August 1, 1946, and where the remaining proceeds of the insurance would otherwise remain unpaid; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. HERTER:

H. R. 3403. A bill to increase the efficiency of the postal service in that part of the Boston, Mass., suburban area in and around Newton by the discontinuance of certain branch post offices of the Boston post office and the establishment of a separate post office and branch post offices thereof; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. KLEIN:

H. R. 3404. A bill to amend the Nationality Act of 1940 to provide expeditious naturalization for persons serving in the Armed Forces of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 3405. A bill to extend the benefits of section 1 (c) of the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended, to employees who are involuntarily separated after having rendered 20 years of service but prior to attainment of age 55; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mrs. CHURCH:

H. R. 3406. A bill to create a commission to make a study of the administration of overseas activities of the Government and to make recommendations to Congress with respect thereto; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

By Mr. JACKSON of Washington:

H. R. 3407. A bill to extend the time within which veterans of World War II on active duty on or after June 27, 1950, may initiate and receive education and training under Veterans Regulation No. 1 (a); to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. KEATING:

H. R. 3408. A bill to amend the Clayton Act by granting a right of action to the United States to recover damages under the antitrust laws, establishing a uniform statute of limitations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MACK of Illinois:

H. R. 3409. A bill to provide pension for certain widows of recipients of the Medal of Honor; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. REED of New York:

H. R. 3410. A bill relating to the treatment of powers of appointment for estate- and gift-tax purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 3411. A bill relating to exclusion from gross income of income from discharge of indebtedness; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 3412. A bill to amend section 113 (b) (1) (B) of the Internal Revenue Code with respect to the adjustment of the basis of property for depreciation, obsolescence, amortization, and depletion; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN:

H. R. 3413. A bill to provide that the tax on transportation of persons shall not apply in the case of a member of the Armed Forces traveling for the purpose of visiting his home; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LESINSKI:

H. R. 3414. A bill to extend coverage under the Social Security Act to additional Federal officers and employees, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CARNAHAN:

H. R. 3415. A bill relating to the acquisition of certain land in Pulaski County, Mo., adjacent to the Fort Leonard Wood Military Reservation; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. CUNNINGHAM:

H. R. 3416. A bill relating to Federal financial assistance for certain school districts in which veterans' hospitals are situated; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. REECE of Tennessee:

H. R. 3417. A bill to authorize the TVA to purchase a tract of land; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. WALTER:

H. R. 3418. A bill to amend section 17 of the Contract Settlement Act of 1944 so as to authorize the payment of fair compensation to persons contracting to deliver certain strategic or critical minerals or metals in cases of failure to recover reasonable costs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CELLER:

H. R. 3419. A bill to amend the Nationality Act of 1940, to preserve the nationality of naturalized veterans, their wives, minor children, and dependent parents; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HART:

H. R. 3420. A bill to authorize the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to reimburse certain contractors and subcontractors sustaining losses in the construction of hospitals and other buildings or facilities for the Veterans' Administration and to confer jurisdiction on the Court of Claims to hear and determine such claims after action of the Administration thereon; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. FOGARTY:

H. J. Res. 216. Joint resolution to negotiate a new treaty of peace with Italy; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. MACK of Illinois:

H. J. Res. 217. Joint resolution to create a commission to consider and formulate plans for the erection and presentation in Caracas, Venezuela, of a statue of Abraham Lincoln, in response to Venezuela's generous gift to the United States of a statue of its great patriot, Simon Bolivar; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. ROOSEVELT:

H. Con. Res. 84. Concurrent resolution to strengthen the United Nations; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

MEMORIALS

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

By Mr. DEMPSEY: Memorial of the Twentieth Legislature of the State of New Mexico, memorializing the Congress of the United States, and the New Mexico Representatives therein, to oppose the drafting of 18-year-old youths; to the Committee on Armed Services.

Also, memorial of the Twentieth Legislature, State of New Mexico, memorializing the President of the United States to immediately go on record as favoring the establishment of a Veterans' Administration intermediary hospital and rehabilitation center at Truth or Consequences (Hot Springs), N. Mex., with a strong department of physical medicine; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

Also, memorial of the Twentieth Legislature of the State of New Mexico, memorializing the Congress of the United States to build a post office building at Bernalillo, N. Mex.; to the Committee on Public Works.

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Idaho, requesting the amending of the Trade Agreement Extension Act of 1951; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Iowa, requesting the passage of appropriate legislation specifically limiting the Secretary of Agriculture in the use of directives; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Massachusetts, relative to the appropriation of funds for the elimination of pollution from the rivers, streams, inland and tidal waters of the Commonwealth; to the Committee on Public Works.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Oregon, relative to the coastal fisheries of the Pacific coast; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. ADDONIZIO:

H. R. 3421. A bill for the relief of Sylvia Schwarz; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ANFUSO:

H. R. 3422. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Stanislaw Karczewski Kilarski; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BLATNIK:

H. R. 3423. A bill for the relief of Sister Constantina (Teresia Kakonyi); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TARRINGTON:

H. R. 3424. A bill for the relief of Yumi Horiuchi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 3425. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Chang Soon Liu; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 3426. A bill for the relief of Sul Kin Chun; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 3427. A bill for the relief of Mitsuko Takahashi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 3428. A bill for the relief of Mitsuo Arita; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FULL:

H. R. 3429. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Julia Gamroth; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McCORMACK:

H. R. 3430. A bill for the relief of the estate of Nora B. Kennedy; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 3431. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Ann R. Norton; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McKINNON:

H. R. 3432. A bill for the relief of William Hewson; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MORANO:

H. R. 3433. A bill to adjust the status of nine displaced persons in the United States who do not meet all the requirements of section 4 of the Displaced Persons Act; 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:

159. By Mr. GRAHAM: Petition of 24 residents of Beaver County, Pa., members of the College Hill Presbyterian Church, urging passage of no measure for universal military training that does not include the recommendations of the President's Advisory Commission on universal military training calling for limitation of the opportunities for the purchase by trainees of any alcoholic beverages, including beer, through (a) prohibiting the sale thereof to them of any military, naval, or other camp reservation, or in any post exchange, ship's store, or canteen (b) declaring off-limits to trainees all taverns, taprooms, and similar facilities whose principal business is selling alcoholic beverages; to the Committee on Armed Services.

160. Also, petition of 54 residents of Beaver County, Pa., urging passage of no measure for universal military training that does not include the recommendations of the President's Advisory Commission on universal military training calling for limitation of the opportunities for the purchase by trainees of any alcoholic beverages, including beer, through (a) prohibiting the sale thereof to them of any military, naval, or other camp reservation, or in any post exchange, ship's store, or canteen (b) declaring off-limits to trainees all taverns, taprooms, and similar facilities whose principal business is selling alcoholic beverages; to the Committee on Armed Services.

SENATE

THURSDAY, MARCH 22, 1951

(Legislative day of Friday, March 16, 1951)

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

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Eternal God and Father of all men, who bringeth forth righteousness as the light and judgment as the noonday, our souls wait upon Thee; our expectation is from Thee. In all the fiery tests of these critical days which are setting the shape of things to come, deepen the wells from which we draw our power to endure.

In this Holy Week, bowing at this altar of prayer, steady us with the realization that back of all the dark tragedy of these troubled days there is a permanent good in which we may believe and to which we must be loyal if life is to be saved from frustration at last.

"O Thou whose dreams enthrall the heart, ride on!

Ride on till tyranny and greed are evermore undone.

In mart and court and parliament the common good increase

Till men at last shall ring the bells of brotherhood and peace."

We ask it in the blessed name of that One who hath swallowed up death in victory. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. HILL, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Wednesday, March 21, 1951, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

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

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed a bill (H. R. 3282) making appropriations for the Treasury and Post Office Departments and funds available for the Export-Import Bank of Washington for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and for other purposes, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the enrolled bill (S. 683) authorizing vessels of Canadian registry to transport iron ore between the United States ports on the Great Lakes during 1951, and it was signed by the Vice President.

COMMITTEE MEETING DURING SENATE SESSION

On request of Mr. HILL, and by unanimous consent, the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare was authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY AND FOR RECESS ON THAT DAY

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the following order be agreed to:

Ordered, That at the conclusion of its business today the Senate adjourn until 12 o'clock noon on Monday, March 26, 1951, and that immediately after the convening of the Senate on said day the Presiding Officer shall, without debate and without the transaction of business of any nature, declare the Senate in recess until 12 o'clock noon on Tuesday, March 27, 1951.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the order is agreed to.

TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

By unanimous consent, the following routine business was transacted:

PROPOSED AMENDMENT TO CONSTITUTION RELATING TO TERM OF OFFICE OF PRESIDENT

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a letter from the secretary of state of the State of South Carolina, dated March 20, 1951, informing the Senate that the Legislature of South Carolina had ratified a proposed amendment to the Constitution of the United States prohibiting a person from being elected President of the United States of America more than twice, and further prohibiting a person who has held the office of President, or acted as President, for more than 2 years of a term to which some other person was elected President, from being elected to the office more than once, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

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

CHARTERS OF VESSELS TO CITIZENS OF REPUBLIC OF PHILIPPINES

A letter from the Secretary of State, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to give to the Department of Commerce the authority to extend certain charters of vessels to citizens of the Republic of the Philippines, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

LEASING OF WITHDRAWN OR RESERVED PUBLIC LANDS IN ALASKA

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to lease withdrawn or reserved public lands in Alaska for dock, wharf, and landing-site purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

AMENDMENT OF MATERIALS ACT RELATING TO DISPOSAL OF MATERIALS ON PUBLIC LANDS

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend section 2 of the Materials Act in order to facilitate the disposal of materials on the public lands (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

ADMISSION OF CERTAIN ALIENS

A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report concerning certain aliens who were admitted to the United States under the ninth proviso, section 3, of the act approved February 5, 1917, as amended (with an accompanying list); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SUSPENSION OF DEPORTATION OF ALIENS—WITHDRAWAL OF NAMES

Two letters from the Attorney General, withdrawing the names of Arnaldo Pacheco or Chico Pacheco, and Sofoclis Demosthenes Despotopoulos or Sofoclis Demos Despotopoulos or Sofos Despotopoulos from reports relating to aliens whose deportation he suspended more than 6 months ago, transmitted to the Senate on January 16, 1950, and December 1, 1950, respectively; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

ADMISSION INTO UNITED STATES OF CERTAIN ALIEN SEAMEN FOR SHORE LEAVE PURPOSES

Three letters from the Attorney General, transmitting, pursuant to law, copies of orders of Acting Commissioner of Immigration and Naturalization, dated October 20, 1950, authorizing the temporary admission into the United States, for shore leave purposes only, under authority of the ninth proviso to section 3 of the act of February 5, 1917, as amended, of alien seamen found to be excludable persons, together with lists furnishing detailed information concerning individual seamen admitted thereunder (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PRIORITIES IN TRANSPORTATION BY MERCHANT VESSELS

A letter from the Acting Secretary of Commerce, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to provide for priorities in transportation by merchant vessels in the interests of national defense, and other purposes (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

REPORT OF SOCIAL SECURITY ADMINISTRATION

A letter from the Administrator of the Federal Security Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of the Social Security Administration, Federal Security Agency, for the fiscal year 1950 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Finance.

REPORT OF EXPORT-IMPORT BANK OF WASHINGTON

A letter from the Vice Chairman of the Export-Import Bank of Washington, transmitting, pursuant to law, the eleventh semi-annual report of the Bank for the period July-December 1950 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

AUDIT REPORT ON FEDERAL MARITIME BOARD AND MARITIME ADMINISTRATION, DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE, AND THE PREDECESSOR AGENCY, UNITED STATES MARITIME COMMISSION

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the audit of Federal Maritime Board and Maritime Administration, Department of Commerce, and the predecessor agency, United States Maritime Commission, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1950 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.