

(Uash) Lazar; without amendment (Rept. No. 1989). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BERRY:

H. R. 7947. A bill to facilitate the management of land and recreational resources of reclamation projects in or adjacent to the national forests of South Dakota, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. BRYSON:

H. R. 7948. A bill to authorize the Supreme Court of the United States to make and publish rules for procedure on review of decisions of The Tax Court of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FORAND:

H. R. 7949. A bill to provide for the preservation of the frigate *Constellation*; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. MCCARTHY:

H. R. 7950. A bill to amend section 206 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, so as to enable the Comptroller General more effectively to assist the Appropriations Committees in considering the budget; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

By Mr. RAMSAY:

H. R. 7951. A bill to amend the Annual and Sick Leave Act of 1951 to provide equitable treatment for married women; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. PHILLIPS:

H. R. 7952. A bill to authorize the combination of the Truck Crop Insect Laboratory and the Citrus Insect Laboratory of the Bureau of Entomology and Plant Quarantine, located at Alhambra and Whittier, Calif., respectively, and to provide for new quarters; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. GARMATZ:

H. R. 7953. A bill to provide for the conversion of 10 oceangoing bulk carriers so as to promote ocean transportation in United States flag vessels of ore and other bulk commodities essential to the national defense; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. REED of New York:

H. R. 7954. A bill to provide that no interest shall be assessed on deficiencies attributable to the retroactive application of section 510 of the Revenue Act of 1951; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SABATH:

H. R. 7955. A bill to amend section 12 of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. WOOD of Idaho:

H. R. 7956. A bill to change the date for the beginning of annual assessment work on mining claims held by location in the United States, including the Territory of Alaska, from the 1st day of July to the 1st day of October, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. WILSON of Texas:

H. J. Res. 459. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PICKETT:

H. J. Res. 460. Joint resolution to continue in effect certain statutory provisions for the duration of the national emergency proclaimed December 16, 1950, and 6 months thereafter, notwithstanding the termination of the existing state of war, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FEIGHAN:

H. J. Res. 461. Joint resolution to continue the effectiveness of certain statutory provisions for the duration of the national emergency proclaimed December 16, 1950, and 6 months thereafter, but not beyond June 30, 1953; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SABATH:

H. Res. 648. Resolution amending the rules of the House of Representatives relative to testimony before committees; to the Committee on Rules.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ADDONIZIO:

H. R. 7957. A bill for the relief of Angelina Lanza Buldo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BERRY:

H. R. 7958. A bill to provide for the conveyance of a tract of land in Custer County, S. Dak., to the Crazy Horse Memorial Foundation, and for the reversion thereof to the United States; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. GRANAHAN:

H. R. 7959. A bill for the relief of Paraskevas George Stamatiou; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GREEN:

H. R. 7960. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Hannah Mae Powell; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JOHNSON:

H. R. 7961. A bill for the relief of Chiyoko Miki Tomono; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LOVRE:

H. R. 7962. A bill to provide for the conveyance of a tract of land in Custer County, S. Dak., to the Crazy Horse Memorial Foundation, and for the reversion thereof to the United States; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. SADLAK:

H. R. 7963. A bill for the relief of Edward Henry Erbes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SHELLEY:

H. R. 7964. A bill for the relief of Kosta Milisav Bulatovich; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania:

H. R. 7965. A bill for the relief of Asako Ikeda Corbin; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. THOMAS:

H. R. 7966. A bill for the relief of Edilberto Gonzales-Menchaca; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WILSON of Texas:

H. R. 7967. A bill for the relief of Dr. Morad Malek-Aslani; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SENATE

FRIDAY, MAY 23, 1952

(Legislative day of Monday, May 12, 1952)

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:

Almighty God, source of all love and wisdom, to whom the distinctions and differences which so often divide us and loom so large in our eyes are but as dust in the balance, brushing aside all illusions and trivialities, grant us now a

sense of unity of motive and of purpose amidst all diversities of thought. Our mercy is so soon exhausted, but Thy mercy to all mankind is like the wide-ness of the sea. Our forgiveness so quickly turns to retaliation, but Thy forgiveness endures even to 70 times 7.

Help us this day to regard one another with the sympathy and understanding of those who face a common destiny, as we dwell together under a divine fatherhood. May we be conscious of the fallible elements in ourselves, even as we deal with our fellows in all the tangled questions which together we share. Amid all the losses which need must come with the corroding years, may we never lose our self-respect nor forfeit the confidence of those who trust us now because we trust in Thee. In the Redeemer's name we ask it. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. McFARLAND, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, May 22, 1952, was dispensed with.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Chaffee, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed, without amendment, the bill (S. 2786) to amend section 106 (c) of the Housing Act of 1949.

The message also announced that the House had disagreed to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 5678) to revise the laws relating to immigration, naturalization, and nationality; and for other purposes; agreed to the conference asked by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. WALTER, Mr. CHELF, Mr. WILSON of Texas, Mr. DONOHUE, Mr. GRAHAM, Miss THOMPSON of Michigan, and Mr. CASE were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Senators be permitted to transact routine business, without debate.

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

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED

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

By Mr. O'CONNOR:

S. 3221. A bill to amend the Labor-Management Relations Act, 1947, in order to protect the national health and safety against the consequences of certain labor-management disputes; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

By Mr. CAPEHART (for Mr. JENNER):

S. 3222. A bill for the relief of Alice Power and Ruby Power; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LODGE.

S. 3223. A bill for the relief of Guntram Weissenberger; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MUNDT:

S. 3224. A bill to amend the Tariff Act of 1930, so as to impose a special equalization duty upon agricultural commodities for which price support has been made available and a parity price established; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. McKELLAR:

S. 3225. A bill to incorporate the National Safety Council; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'CONNOR:

S. J. Res. 157. Joint resolution to advise the President of the United States concerning the will of Congress respecting the labor dispute in the basic steel-manufacturing industry; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

MUTUAL SECURITY ACT OF 1952— AMENDMENTS

Mr. LONG submitted several amendments intended to be proposed by him to the bill (S. 3086) to amend the Mutual Security Act of 1951, and for other purposes, which were ordered to be printed and to lie on the table.

ADDRESSES, EDITORIALS, ARTICLES, ETC., PRINTED IN THE APPENDIX

On request, and by unanimous consent, addresses, editorials, articles, etc., were ordered to be printed in the Appendix, as follows:

By Mr. BRICKER:

Editorial entitled "Let's Keep Our Bill of Rights," written by Donald R. Wilson, national commander of the American Legion, and published in the May 1952 issue of the *Kiwanis* magazine.

By Mr. MUNDT:

Article entitled "United States-to-Europe TV Is Studied as Global Link," published in the *New York Herald Tribune* of May 18, 1952, and an editorial entitled "TV to Europe," published in the *New York Herald Tribune* of May 19, 1952.

NATIONAL MARITIME DAY

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the *RECORD* a statement prepared by me relative to the national observance of Maritime Day.

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

STATEMENT BY SENATOR O'CONNOR IN CONNECTION WITH MARITIME DAY OBSERVANCE, MAY 22, 1952

The Nation yesterday observed National Maritime Day. It would be gratifying in the extreme to be able to say that in recent years the United States has made great progress toward that shipping and ship-construction self-sufficiency which the needs of peace as well as war demand so emphatically.

Unfortunately, such progress cannot be reported. Despite all the efforts of maritime-minded Members of the Congress, our Nation has floundered badly in the matter of building up its dry-cargo fleet, and particularly in the matter of construction of fast passenger vessels, capable of conversion to troop transports in an emergency. But while our Government has fallen short with regard to this most important segment of our national economy, other nations of the

world have stepped forward in the matter of ship construction to the point where the United States now occupies a poor seventh place among the shipbuilding countries of the world.

National observance of Maritime Day as a day on which to focus attention on the accomplishments—and the needs—of the merchant marine could, and was intended to, be most effective as a means of promoting the American merchant marine which so badly needs promotion today. Despite all the pleasant statements which have been made in recent years, however, the unpleasant fact remains that very little has been done either in the way of adequate immediate additions to available shipping facilities, or in the development of a long-range shipping program which would insure a continuing supply of modern, competitive vessels, and would enable the shippers of the country to be maintained on a going basis.

Yes, we have withdrawn a number of old Liberty ships of World War II from the reserve fleet and turned them over to the National Shipping Authority, to a total of approximately 800 since the outbreak of Korean hostilities. What is not so gratifying is that practically all the better cargo ships have been taken out of the reserve and the old Liberties, the only ones now remaining, are poor substitutes at best, to meet the competition of modern shipping needs.

Forced by the emergency, just as we were impelled by even greater emergencies at the outbreak of World Wars I and II, the country has launched a construction program of a faster type of dry cargo vessel worthy to compete with the newer vessels of other nations. Some 35 of these new *Mariner* class vessels were authorized. But this number falls far short of present needs in this field, not to mention the additional requirements which any full-scale emergency would bring.

In the field where our deficiency is greatest, namely, that of passenger-type vessels, suitable for use as troop carriers, the new steamship *United States*, which has just completed its trial runs, is a splendid example of what we should have. But it is one isolated vessel of its type. Capable of handling 14,000 troops in times of emergency, the steamship *United States* nevertheless will be, in the final analysis, but an addition to a woefully undersized passenger-type fleet which now represents less than half of the number of such vessels available at the beginning of World War II, while the actual passenger-carrying capacity of these vessels is little more than a third of what the World War II vessels were able to transport.

In extolling today, therefore, the heroic achievements of the United States merchant marine during World War II and following the initial Korean aggression, let us temper our gratification at these exploits, glorious as they have been, with thought of what might well happen in another emergency, unless the Congress thoroughly realizes the situation as it is, and takes positive steps to put into effect promptly a realistic program of construction and maintenance.

It was my privilege to introduce, in connection with the distinguished Senator from Washington, Mr. MAGNUSON, S. 241, known as the long-range shipping bill, passed by the United States Senate after extended hearings, on August 16. It was presented to the House the following week and hearings have been held by the House Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

At both the Senate and House hearings, representatives of labor and management in the shipping and ship-construction field emphasized the need of a well-considered program, to replace the hit-and-miss emergency programs which were the rule in the three major emergencies that have developed in the last 40 years.

S. 241 lays down certain basic provisions designed to make construction and operation of dry cargo and, particularly, fast passenger-type vessels attractive to private industry. The purposes and provisions of the bill have been so thoroughly propounded that it is needless to detail them now. The thought worthy of real emphasis, however, is that they seek to correct unsatisfactory conditions in the shipping and shipbuilding field, in a manner which has received administration approval and the fullest support of both labor and industry.

I take this occasion, therefore, simply to voice the hope that with the emphasis laid upon current maritime needs in connection with 1952 observance of the day, the country may find itself well on the way, before another Maritime Day observance rolls around, toward a substantial and positive program which will be a guide and an assurance of security through the years ahead.

TEMPORARY EXTENSION OF CERTAIN PROVISIONS OF THE WAR POWERS ACT

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, does the majority leader care to suggest the absence of a quorum?

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I understand the Senator from Nevada desires to call up Senate Joint Resolution 156, which provides for a temporary extension of the War Powers Act. Our procedure will depend to some extent upon the wishes of the distinguished minority leader.

I understand that the joint resolution provides for an extension of the act for 15 days, and that the joint resolution was unanimously approved by the committee.

Although I shall suggest the absence of a quorum in a few minutes, the minority leader advises me that it is satisfactory with him to proceed with the joint resolution.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I may state that there is on the Calendar Order No. 1524, Senate Joint Resolution 156, a joint resolution to continue the effectiveness of certain statutory provisions until June 15, 1952. This joint resolution provides for a continuation of the War Powers Act as it is at the present time. A study of the act is now being made by the Senate Committee on the Judiciary, and will soon be completed. The question is also being studied by the Judiciary Committee of the House, but it has been reported to us that there may be some delay on the floor of that body. So we thought it necessary, in view of the fact that the War Powers Act will expire on the 1st of June, to agree to the Senate joint resolution extending the act until June 15.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the joint resolution?

Mr. McCARRAN. I should like to do so, if the majority leader is agreeable.

Mr. McFARLAND. Yes; that is agreeable. The distinguished minority leader says he has no objection.

Mr. McCARRAN. Then I ask that the joint resolution be considered out of order.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will state the joint resolution by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. Senate Joint Resolution 156, continuing the effective-

ness of certain statutory provisions until June 15, 1952.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator from Nevada whether it is not true that the Committee on the Judiciary unanimously reported the joint resolution with the approval of Senators on both sides; that every Senator present indicated his desire that the joint resolution be passed?

Mr. McCARRAN. That is correct.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the joint resolution?

There being no objection, the joint resolution was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Resolved, etc., That the joint resolution entitled "Joint resolution to continue the effectiveness of certain statutory provisions until June 1, 1952," approved April 14, 1952 (Public Law 313, 82d Cong.), is amended by striking out "June 1, 1952" wherever it appears in such joint resolution and inserting in lieu thereof "June 15, 1952."

HOUSING ACT OF 1952

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business, which is Senate bill 3066.

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 3066) to amend the defense-housing laws, and for other purposes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendments of the Committee on Banking and Currency will be stated.

The amendments were stated, as follows:

On page 2, line 22, after the word "exceed", to strike out "\$2,500,000,000" and insert: "\$1,900,000,000: *And provided further*, That \$400,000,000 of said sum shall be available only for the insurance of mortgages for which no insurance contract or commitment to insure under this act was outstanding on June 30, 1952, and which mortgages (1) cover defense housing programed by the Housing and Home Finance Agency in an area determined by the President or his designee to be a critical defense housing area, or (2) are insured under title VIII of this act, or (3) cover housing intended to be made available primarily for families who are victims of a catastrophe which the President has determined to be a major disaster."

On page 3, line 11, after the word "with", to insert "insured"; in line 14, after the word "words", to insert "insured."

On page 4, line 19, after the word "exceed", to strike out "\$1,552,000,000" and insert "\$1,152,000,000."

On page 5, line 2, after the word "inserting", to strike out "\$4,050,000,000" and insert "\$3,650,000,000"; in line 11, after the word "substituting", to strike out "\$160,000,000" and insert "\$100,000,000"; in line 13, after the word "substituting", to strike out "\$250,000,000" and insert "\$100,000,000."

On page 6, line 7, after the word "inserting", to strike out "\$25,000,000" and insert "\$20,000,000."

On page 9, line 1, after "(3)" to insert "and after 'Virgin Islands,' in section 3"; in line 19, after the word "and", to strike out "such" and insert "an"; in the same line, after the word "additional", to strike out "sums" and insert "\$100,000,000"; in line 20, after the numerals "1953", to strike out the comma and "as the Congress may from time to time determine"; after line 21, to strike out:

"(b) At the end of section 512 just before the period insert a comma and the language 'and to make additional commitments

on and after July 1, 1953, for additional contributions aggregating not more than \$2,000,000 per annum."

"(c) In section 513 just before the last semicolon insert a comma and the language 'and such further amounts on and after July 1, 1953, as the Congress may from time to time determine.'"

And in lieu thereof to insert:

"(b) In section 512, (1) strike 'and 1952' and insert '1952, and 1953', and (11) strike 'and \$2,000,000' and insert '\$2,000,000 and \$2,000,000.'

"(c) In section 513, strike 'and \$10,000,000 on July 1 of each of the years 1950, 1951, and 1952' and insert '\$10,000,000, and \$10,000,000 on July 1 of each of the years 1950, 1951, 1952, and 1953.'"

And after line 13, to insert:

"Sec. 12. The first paragraph of subsection (c) of section 5 of the Home Owners' Loan Act of 1933, as amended, is hereby amended by adding at the end thereof the following new sentence: 'In addition to the loans and investments otherwise authorized, such associations may purchase, subject to all the provisions of this paragraph except the area restriction, loans secured by first liens on improved real estate which are insured under the provisions of the National Housing Act, as amended, or insured as provided in the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, as amended.'"

So as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That this act be cited as the "Housing Act of 1952."

SEC. 2. Section 217 of the National Housing Act, as amended, is hereby amended to read as follows:

"Sec. 217. Notwithstanding limitations contained in any other section of this act on the aggregate amount of principal obligations of mortgages or loans which may be insured (or insured and outstanding at any one time) and on the aggregate amount of contingent liabilities which may be outstanding at any one time under insurance contracts, or commitments to insure, pursuant to any section or title of this act, any such aggregate amount shall, with respect to any section or title of this act (except sec. 2), be prescribed by the President from time to time taking into consideration the needs of national defense and the effect of additional insurance authorizations upon conditions in the building industry and upon the national economy: *Provided*, That the dollar amount of the insurance authorization prescribed by the President at any time with respect to any provision of title VI shall not be greater than authorized by provisions of that title: *And provided further*, That at any time, 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 insurance authorizations under other titles of this act prescribed by the President pursuant to authority contained in this section, less the aggregate dollar amount of all decreases in insurance authorizations under this act prescribed by the President pursuant to authority contained in this section shall not exceed \$1,900,000,000: *And provided further*, That \$400,000,000 of said sum shall be available only for the insurance of mortgages for which no insurance contract or commitment to insure under this act was outstanding on June 30, 1952, and which mortgages (1) cover defense housing programed by the Housing and Home Finance Agency in an area determined by the President or his designee to be a critical defense housing area, or (2) are insured under title VIII of this act, or (3) cover housing intended to be made available primarily for families who are victims of a catastrophe which the President has determined to be a major disaster."

Sec. 3. (a) Section 301 (a) (1) of said act, as amended, is hereby amended—

(1) by striking the words beginning with "insured after April 30, 1948" and ending with the colon at the end of the first proviso thereof and inserting the words: "insured under this act, as amended, or insured or guaranteed under the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, as amended: *Provided*, That no such mortgage, except defense or disaster mortgages as defined in subparagraph (G) hereof, shall be purchased by the association unless insured or guaranteed after February 29, 1952, or purchased pursuant to a commitment made by the association:"

(2) by striking from subparagraph (E) "pursuant to authority contained herein, exceeds 50 percent of the original principal amount of all mortgages made by such mortgagee" and inserting "after February 29, 1952, pursuant to authority contained herein, exceeds 50 percent of the original principal amount of all mortgage loans made by such mortgagee that are insured or guaranteed after February 29, 1952";

(3) by striking the proviso in subparagraph (E) and inserting "*Provided*, That this clause (2) shall not apply to (nor shall any terms therein include) any defense or disaster mortgages as defined in subparagraph (G)"; and

(4) by striking from the proviso in subparagraph (G) "which do not exceed \$252,000,000 outstanding at any one time, if applications for such commitments were received by the Association prior to December 28, 1951, or, in the case of title VIII mortgages, if the Federal Housing Commissioner issued his commitment to insure prior to December 31, 1951, but subsequent to December 27, 1951, and if such commitments of the Association relate to" and inserting "and prior to July 1, 1953, which do not exceed \$1,152,000,000 outstanding at any one time, if such commitments of the Association relate to defense or disaster mortgages. As used in this title III, 'defense or disaster mortgages' means."

(b) Section 302 of said act, as amended, is hereby amended (1) by striking "\$2,750,000,000" and inserting "\$3,650,000,000"; and (2) by adding before the period at the end of the first sentence of said section: "*Provided*, That not more than \$2,750,000,000 of such total amount outstanding at any one time shall relate to mortgages other than defense or disaster mortgages as defined in section 301 (a) (1) (G)."

Sec. 4. Section 313 of the Defense Housing and Community Facilities and Services Act of 1951 is hereby amended by striking out "\$60,000,000" in paragraph (a) thereof and substituting "\$100,000,000" and by striking out "\$50,000,000" in paragraph (b) thereof and substituting "\$100,000,000."

Sec. 5. The first sentence of section 302 (b) of the Defense Housing and Community Facilities and Services Act of 1951 is hereby amended by adding after the words "for reuse at other locations" the words "or existing housing built or acquired by the United States under authority of other law."

Sec. 6. Section 611 of 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 inserting "or section 313 of this act" immediately preceding the parenthetical clause, and by striking out "to this title" at the end of the parenthetical clause and inserting in lieu thereof "thereto."

Sec. 7. The first sentence of section 3 (b) and the first sentence of section 3 (d) of the Alaska Housing Act, approved April 23, 1949, as amended, are hereby amended by striking "\$15,000,000" and inserting "\$20,000,000."

Sec. 8. Title II of the National Housing Act, as amended, is hereby amended by adding the following new section:

"SEC. 218. In any case where an application for mortgage insurance under section 608 of this act was received by the Federal Housing Commissioner on or before March 1, 1950, and a commitment to insure was issued by said Commissioner in accordance therewith any mortgagee who, prior to the expiration of such commitment, applied for insurance of a mortgage under section 207 of this act with respect to the same property or project shall receive credit for all application fees paid in connection with the prior application: *Provided*, That nothing therein shall constitute a waiver of any requirements otherwise applicable to the insurance of mortgages under section 207 of this act."

Sec. 9. The Secretary of the Treasury is hereby authorized and directed from time to time to credit and cancel the note or notes of the Housing and Home Finance Administrator executed and delivered in connection with loans transferred from the Reconstruction Finance Corporation to the Housing and Home Finance Agency pursuant to Reorganization Plan No. 23 of 1950 (64 Stat. 1279), to the extent of the net loss, as determined by the Secretary of the Treasury, sustained by said Agency in the liquidation of defaulted loans. The net loss shall be the sum of the unpaid principal and advances for care and preservation of collateral, together with accrued and unpaid interest on said principal and advances, and all expenses and costs (other than those subject to administrative expense limitations) in connection with the liquidation of defaulted loans, less the amount actually realized by the Housing and Home Finance Agency on account of such defaulted loans.

Sec. 10. (a) The National Housing Act, as amended, is hereby amended—

(1) by adding at the end of section 8 the following new section 9:

"Sec. 9. The provisions of sections 2 and 8 shall be applicable in the several States and Alaska, Hawaii, Puerto Rico, the District of Columbia, Guam, and the Virgin Islands.":

(2) by adding "Guam" after the words "District of Columbia," in each place where they appear in sections 201 (d), 207 (a) (7), 301 (c) (4), 601 (d), and 801 (f);

(3) by inserting in section 214—

(A) the words "or in Guam" after the word "Alaska" in each place where it appears in said section,

(B) the words "or maxima" after the word "maximum", and

(C) the words "or the Government of Guam or any agency or instrumentality thereof" after the words "Alaska Housing Authority" in each place where they appear in said section;

(4) by adding at the end of section 713 the following new subsection (g):

"(g) 'State' shall include the several States and Alaska, Hawaii, Puerto Rico, the District of Columbia, Guam, and the Virgin Islands.": and

(5) by deleting the words "or Territory" in section 403 (a) and inserting in lieu thereof the words "Territory, or possession."

(b) The Home Owners' Loan Act of 1933, as amended, is hereby amended by adding a comma and "Guam," after the words "Puerto Rico" in section 7 thereof.

(c) The Federal Home Loan Bank Act, as amended, is hereby amended by adding "Guam," after "District of Columbia," in section 2 (3) and after "Virgin Islands," in section 3 thereof.

(d) The Defense Housing and Community Facilities and Services Act of 1951 is hereby amended by adding at the end of section 401 the following: "This title shall be applicable in the several States, the District of Columbia, and the Territories and possessions of the United States."

(e) Section 102b of the Housing Act of 1948, as amended, is hereby amended by adding at the end thereof the following: "Such powers, functions, and duties may be exercised in the several States, the District

of Columbia, and the Territories and possessions of the United States."

SEC. 11. Title V of the Housing Act of 1949, as amended, is hereby amended as follows:

(a) In the first sentence of section 511 immediately following the phrase "July 1, 1951," strike the word "and" and insert at the end of the sentence just before the period a comma and the language "and an additional \$100,000,000 on and after July 1, 1953."

(b) In section 512, (1) strike "and 1952" and insert "1952, and 1953", and (ii) strike "and \$2,000,000" and insert "\$2,000,000 and \$2,000,000."

(c) In section 513, strike "and \$10,000,000 on July 1 of each of the years 1950, 1951, and 1952" and insert "\$10,000,000, and \$10,000,000 on July 1 of each of the years 1950, 1951, 1952, and 1953."

SEC. 12. The first paragraph of subsection (c) of section 5 of the Home Owners' Loan Act of 1933, as amended, is hereby amended by adding at the end thereof the following new sentence: "In addition to the loans and investments otherwise authorized, such associations may purchase, subject to all the provisions of this paragraph except the area restriction, loans secured by first liens on improved real estate which are insured under the provisions of the National Housing Act, as amended, or insured as provided in the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, as amended."

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, it is my understanding from the minority members of the Committee on Banking and Currency whom I have been able to contact that they are in accord with regard to this bill. None of them are on the floor at the moment, but I assume, from everything I have been able to learn, that they are in accord with the amendments reported by the committee. So on the part of the minority I am registering no objection.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendments of the committee.

The amendments were agreed to.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The committee amendments having been agreed to, the bill is open to further amendment.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, the chairman of the committee may have other amendments to offer. In order that he may be present, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be vacated, and that further proceedings under the call be dispensed with.

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

The bill is open to further amendment. If there be no further amendments to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, and was read the third time.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill having been read the third time, the question is, Shall it pass?

The bill (S. 3066) was passed.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in

the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks a statement which I have prepared regarding the bill just passed by the Senate. The reason why I did not undertake a thorough explanation of the bill was that it was unanimously reported by the Committee on Banking and Currency and there seemed to be no opposition to it.

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

STATEMENT BY SENATOR MAYBANK

Senate bill 3066 was reported unanimously by the Committee on Banking and Currency. It consists primarily of increases in defense authorizations which are essential to carrying out the Defense Housing and Community Facilities Act, passed by Congress last year.

I wish to call to the particular attention of the Members of the Senate the table on page 1 of the committee's report on the bill, showing the amounts of the increases in the dollar authorizations both in the bill as introduced and as reported by your committee. It will be noted the committee cut the total amount by almost 50 percent. We firmly believe that we have made the maximum reductions in these authorizations which can be made without preventing urgent defense needs from being met in critical defense housing areas. We believe the amounts are adequate, however, to continue operations under the Defense Housing and Community Facilities Act until the next Congress has had full opportunity to consider any further needs.

Since Congress passed the law last year to meet the urgent need for defense housing and community facilities as a result of the conflict in Korea, the one big problem in providing housing for defense workers has been the lack of private funds for housing mortgages. Unfortunately this private housing program for defense areas has been undertaken during a period of general shortages of mortgage money. Furthermore, the principal mortgage lenders have generally avoided investment in needed defense housing in these areas on the apparent ground that it is more risky than investment in other areas where they feel more certain that the housing need will be permanent. This is similar to the attitude which existed in 1941 at the beginning of the FHA's title VI war housing insurance program.

Because a shortage of private money was developing last summer and because of the need of getting defense housing under way, the legislation passed last year included special provisions to permit FNMA to use up to \$200,000,000 of its funds to make advance commitments for the purchase of mortgages to finance defense housing. This has produced the bulk of defense housing on which construction has started. About 80,000 units of defense housing have been programmed under the act and construction has started on less than 17,000 units. The advance commitments under the 1951 act have covered about three-fourths of all the units under construction.

The Banking and Currency Committee has been very concerned about this problem for some time. As I explained in my statement at the time S. 3066 was introduced, your committee held extensive round-table hearings on mortgage financing earlier this year. These hearings were attended by representatives of major sources of mortgage funds, by operative builders, and by appropriate Government officials. The entire problem of financing defense housing was thoroughly considered, and all possible means of meeting the problem were fully explored.

From that meeting it was very clear that the only alternatives to financing private construction of defense housing at this time

are: (1) Direct loans by the Government, (2) the advance commitment procedure of the FNMA.

Your committee has been reluctant to agree to the use of FNMA advance commitment procedure. This is due to the considered judgment of your committee, based on experience of FNMA with advance commitments several years ago, that they should be kept at a minimum and not used as a primary source of funds for the housing programs of the Federal Government. In agreeing to the advance commitment authorization of \$900,000,000 provided in this bill, these important factors were considered:

First, and most important, as indicated above, there is available no other ready alternative except advance commitments to get the needed defense housing started. There has been too much delay already. There is no prospect of the mortgage market changing in sufficient time and to such an extent as to make an adequate supply of mortgage funds available to meet defense housing needs promptly.

Second, the bill contains very definite limitations on the use of the advance commitment authorization. It is limited to the amount required to meet the needs of programed defense housing under the 1951 act, military housing under the Wherry-Maybank Act, and disaster housing. The authorization is limited to June 30, 1953.

Third, since the transfer in 1950 of FNMA to the Housing Agency the operations of the Association have been tightened up generally, and many of the earlier abuses with which we were concerned have been corrected. The Agency has substantially reduced administrative expenses and has carefully conserved its available authorizations, notwithstanding the tight private mortgage market which has existed. Through proper administration, the advance commitment authorization can be conserved and abuses avoided.

Fourth, the general effect of the provisions is restrictive upon long-range operation. Although the increase in FNMA purchasing authority provided in the bill would release some funds for use in the general housing market, all future FNMA operations in that field would be subject to new restrictions as to the eligible base date and percentage of loans made by a lender that may be sold to FNMA. All of the FNMA operations would be further subject to administrative restriction by the fee provisions of the bill, which permit increases in the fees and which are intended to be flexible enough and broad enough to allow FNMA to prevent wholesale dumping by mortgagees of their less desirable loans and to discourage individual mortgagees from selling all their loans to FNMA.

I hope the Administrator of FNMA will use these powers in accordance with changing market conditions and with courage.

Although there is no express provision in the bill on the subject, the authorization of the prior commitment authority for critical defense areas, etc. will have the effect of releasing about \$360,000,000 for regular over-the-counter purchases by FNMA. This will provide an important source of secondary credit for GI home loans as well as some FHA loans in nondefense areas.

The FNMA provisions to which I have just referred are of major interest to the Members of the Senate. However, there are other important provisions of the bill to which I shall only make a brief reference, since most of the Members of the Senate are already quite familiar with the various programs to which they relate. It will be noted how drastically we cut each of the authorizations to what, in your committee's opinion, represents the very minimum possible. I am confident that no one can by the wildest stretch of the imagination accuse us of even prudent generosity. We cut to the bone.

1. **FHA:** The additional \$1,000,000,000 insurance authorization, as originally proposed in the bill, was reduced to a \$400,000,000 increase, and the use of the new authorization was limited to programed defense housing in critical defense-housing areas, military housing under the Wherry-Maybank Act, and disaster housing.

2. **Community facilities:** The proposed increase of \$100,000,000 in the present \$60,000,000 authorization for community facilities was reduced to \$40,000,000, making the total authorization for community facilities \$100,000,000, instead of \$160,000,000 as originally proposed.

3. **Direct housing construction by the Federal Government:** The proposed increase of \$200,000,000 in the present \$50,000,000 authorization for housing under title III of Public Law 139 was reduced to \$50,000,000, making the total authorization for housing under that title \$100,000,000, instead of \$250,000,000 as originally proposed.

4. **Alaska housing:** The proposed \$10,000,000 increase in the present authorization for Alaskan housing was reduced to \$5,000,000, making the total authorization for Alaska housing \$20,000,000, instead of \$25,000,000 as originally proposed.

5. **Farm housing:** Instead of the open-ended extension of the power to make loans for homes and buildings on adequate farms pursuant to section 502 (a) of Public Law 171, the power was extended for 1 year, with authority to make not exceeding an additional \$100,000,000 in such loans.

Instead of the open-ended authorization to make contributions in connection with loans for housing and buildings on potentially adequate farms pursuant to section 503 of Public Law 171, the power was extended for 1 year, with authority to make not exceeding an additional \$2,000,000 in contributions per annum.

Instead of the open-ended extension of the power to make special loans and grants for minor improvements for housing and buildings pursuant to section 504 of Public Law 171, the power was extended 1 year, with authority to make not exceeding an additional \$10,000,000 in such special loans and grants.

6. **Federally chartered savings and loan associations:** In connection with federally chartered savings and loan associations, an amendment was added to eliminate the present provisions of law which limit to 15 percent of assets the amount of mortgages which can be purchased outside the 50-mile limit of the institution's home office, FHA-insured loans, or VA-guaranteed loans.

In conclusion, I want to say that this complicated and difficult bill was worked out by the committee in a spirit of harmony and unity of objective. By a process of give and take and a fair and objective appraisal of the need and the means available to meet the problem, in my humble opinion, we have recommended to the Senate a bill which should involve no controversy, and which, I assure Senators, they should have no hesitancy in fully supporting.

Mr. MAYBANK subsequently said:

Mr. President, I should like to state that, because of the absence of the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], who was extremely busy in the Committee on Public Works, preparing for the Senate a very important bill on aid to highways, he was unable to offer an amendment to the Housing Act of 1952, which I had agreed to accept. He brought the amendment to my attention last week, and I had the staff of the committee give careful study to it. I also consulted the Housing and Home Finance Agency as to their views on the amendment. Both the staff and the agency agreed that it was

a desirable amendment, and, accordingly, I informed the Senator from New Mexico that I would accept his amendment. The bill was passed before the Senator from New Mexico could reach the floor.

I am not going to ask unanimous consent that the bill be reconsidered and the amendment of the Senator from New Mexico be accepted because I realize it may establish a precedent. However, I should like to have this statement appear in the RECORD for the benefit of the Members of the House, in order that some Members of the House may offer the amendment which we had agreed to accept.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I was attending a meeting of the Public Works Committee which has been considering the highway bill. I was delayed until approximately 10 minutes ago. I had discussed the amendment with the Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, the only thought I had was that I did not wish to establish a precedent in the Senate. I want to make a record for the Senator from New Mexico. As I said, he had discussed his amendment with me and also discussed the amendment with the staff. Of course, I could move to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed, but I do not want to delay the Senate. I had a minor amendment which I intended to offer myself, providing that the position of President of FNMA be placed in grade GS-17, but rather than delay the bill's passage I did not move it. If the bill is not reconsidered I shall ask the distinguished chairman of the House Banking and Currency Committee [Mr. SPENCE] to add these amendments to the bill when the House committee considers it.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I have given the reason for the delay. The amendment had been discussed with the Senator from South Carolina. As chairman of the committee, he received a report on the amendment from the Housing and Home Finance Agency, under date of May 15, approving the amendment.

I hope the Senate will bear with me, in view of the fact that it was not a matter of neglect on my part. I was delayed in the Committee on Public Works.

The public-roads bill will be reported to the Senate on Monday, probably, at the latest. I hope the Senate will give unanimous consent to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed, for the purpose of permitting me to offer a very short amendment. I think it will not take half a minute for it to be adopted by the Senate.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I dislike to object, but if we can establish a precedent for such action as has been suggested, we can establish a precedent for similar action to be taken many days after a bill has passed. So I am constrained to object. I am sorry to do so.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Objection is heard.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I regret that I did not give notice of the consideration of other bills.

SOME SIGNIFICANT TRENDS OF AMERICAN GOVERNMENT DURING THE PAST TWO DECADES

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, that our country faces dangerous trends both at home and abroad no one will deny—nor can they—and the trend here in the Nation's Capital toward an ever greater concentration of power in the executive branch constitutes one of the greatest threats to free government anywhere in the world.

Therefore, Mr. President, it is encouraging and heart-warming in these crucial days to know that fine citizens are standing by with calm dignity and profound thought to lend aid and comfort to those of us who are charged with the tremendous responsibility of maintaining the constitutional and economic balance of the Republic.

Mr. President, I hold in my hand a letter from a distinguished citizen of New Jersey which bespeaks some very profound thoughts upon the state of our Nation. I not only commend its reading to every Member of the Senate, but I also strongly urge that Senators seriously study the basic truths which the letter encompasses.

In order that it may be available for future reference I ask unanimous consent that the letter be printed in the body of the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

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

NEWARK, N. J., May 1, 1952.

HON. ROBERT C. HENDRICKSON,
The United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR HENDRICKSON: One of the most significant trends of American Government during the past two decades has been the enormous inflation of the power of the Chief Executive. Historically this development finds its roots in the conditions which existed in the depths of the depression when the very fact of a change in personnel and sudden dramatic executive action had an electrifying psychological effect on the populace. In succeeding years the Presidents have capitalized on this reaction to seize greater and greater powers. The Congress, on the other hand, largely because of obviously poor press agency, and because of the fear of opposing what seemed to be the popular will, surrendered its authority.

Good management in any government, as in any household, requires that authority and responsibility be coextensive. Too often in these past years Congress has yielded to executive pressures and has signed blank checks—yet it has left itself in the position of having to take the blame by not fixing the responsibility at the same time. Too much has been left to executive "discretion."

The opportunity is now afforded to correct the trend. The people are encouraged by the courageous action of Judge Pine who saw that in the balancing of conveniences the consequences of a strike in steel, disastrous as they might well be, would be far less a price to pay than the loss of fundamental American liberties.

Now is the very time for temperate yet bold congressional action to maintain the balance originally provided for by our constitutional form of government. The press reports that Senator WAYNE MORSE will introduce a bill to legislate the steel plant seizure. This, though it will technically solve the administration's dilemma, would be no more of a solution of the fundamental problem than was the surrender of the Reichstag to Adolph Hitler.

On the other hand, the press reports that Representative SMITH of Virginia proposes to introduce a bill to provide for the continuance of production in emergencies by the appointment of a receiver for the employer and for the union. This is a step in the right direction and I respectfully offer the following thoughts for your consideration in connection with the debates and with possible amendments to the bill as it proceeds through Congress:

1. Certain industries have become so large as to be "affected with the public interest" in the sense that occasion may demand their regulation in the public interest. So have certain unions.

2. When conditions of emergency arise that threaten to affect the multitude who are innocent of any participation in the dispute or work stoppage, a Government agency should be authorized to seek the appointment of a receiver for both parties.

3. The agency should not be the President. The agency should be one directly interested in the production. In the case of railroads, telephone or telegraph service, radio or television, it should be the Interstate Commerce Commission or the Federal Communications Commission. In the case of steel or coal this responsibility should be vested in the Department of the Interior or the Department of Commerce. In carrying out this responsibility the agency should be responsible to Congress, as is the Comptroller General, and not to the President.

4. The receivers, when appointed, should operate the business of the employer and the union just as a receiver or trustee does under the acts relating to bankruptcy and reorganization. The parties can continue to negotiate. They will be able to do so without the force of pressure which a seizure of one side alone undoubtedly produces. The receivers can assist the parties in their negotiations. In the event of an impasse between the parties themselves, if the receivers can reach an agreement, the agreement can be embodied in a proposed plan which can then be submitted to the stockholders of the employer and to the members of the union. Then, if the required number on both sides approve, the result would be binding in the same fashion as it is in the case of corporate reorganization.

5. Admittedly this is a very sketchy presentation but it is offered for the more mature deliberation of you and your colleagues.

6. Lastly, there is a great danger in the many laws that depend on the declaration of a national emergency by the President. This danger should be eliminated by giving the President plenary powers (with obvious limitations such as a limitation against executions) but for a very limited period. The law should provide that if Congress is not in session a declaration of an emergency may not be made unless the President shall first have called Congress to convene. A limitation of 72 hours would, in view of rapid means of transportation, provide adequate opportunity for Congress to convene and the declared emergency would end unless Congress saw fit to extend it. Finally, any action taken by the Executive under such authority should create a corresponding right to anyone affected by the action so that he may have redress in damages or otherwise if it should be found that the action was unjustly taken. This would discourage the abuse of such total power.

Total power is a dangerous potential force anywhere, anytime. There are admitted constitutional safeguards against the exercise of total congressional power. Even were this not so I would prefer to see the country's fate directed by a half thousand men chosen from every corner of the country than by a single individual, whoever he might be, who might wake up some early morning and decide he was Napoleon.

Respectfully yours,

JOSEPH J. BIUNNO.

HEARINGS BEFORE COMMITTEE ON LABOR AND PUBLIC WELFARE IN CONNECTION WITH SEIZURE OF STEEL PLANTS

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, there has been a considerable amount of discussion in the Senate between my colleagues and myself concerning the contents of certain hearings before the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare in connection with the steel case. Several of my colleagues have expressed a desire to have published in the RECORD the testimony and examination of Secretary of Defense Lovett in the steel case, in which testimony he discussed the serious nature of the emergency which existed at the eleventh hour, when the President decided to seize the steel mills. They have also suggested that I insert in the RECORD portions of the testimony of Mr. Feinsinger and Mr. Murray on the union shop issue. Therefore, I am about to ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD as a part of my remarks, without taking the time to read it all, the following material.

First, the testimony given at the hearings before the Committee on Armed Services by Secretary of Defense Lovett, covering the questions asked and the answers given at the hearing on the nature of the emergency in the steel case. This testimony was given on April 24, 1952.

Second, the colloquy which took place in the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare on two different occasions between the junior Senator from Oregon and other Senators and Mr. Feinsinger, Chairman of the Wage Stabilization Board, with respect to the union shop issue. These discussions were held on April 15 and April 30, 1952.

Third, the portions of the hearings before the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare which consists of the colloquy that took place between the junior Senator from Oregon and other Senators and Mr. Philip Murray with regard to the union shop issue.

I ask unanimous consent that the material be printed in the body of the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

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

TESTIMONY OF HON. ROBERT A. LOVETT, SECRETARY OF DEFENSE, ON NATURE OF STEEL CRISIS, BEFORE COMMITTEE ON LABOR AND PUBLIC WELFARE, APRIL 24, 1952

The CHAIRMAN. The hearing will come to order, please.

The witness this afternoon is Robert A. Lovett, Secretary of Defense of the United States, principal assistant to the President on matters within the Department of Defense.

We welcome you here this afternoon, Mr. Secretary, and we will be glad to have you make a brief statement.

STATEMENT OF HON. ROBERT A. LOVETT, SECRETARY OF DEFENSE OF THE UNITED STATES

Secretary LOVETT. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

The committee has asked that I appear in connection with the possible effects of a steel strike on the defense programs. That subject was covered in an affidavit which I filed under date of September 14, and if it meets the pleasure of this committee I will read it for the record, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. That will be very satisfactory, sir.

Secretary LOVETT. Robert A. Lovett, being duly sworn, deposes and says that he is the Secretary of Defense of the United States and is the principal assistant to the President in all matters relating to the Department of Defense, and, under the direction of the President, he has direction, authority, and control over the Department of Defense, including the Departments of the Army, Navy, and Air Force, and the Munitions Board.

Pursuant to these statutory duties and in the exercise thereof, he has information relating to the problems of procurement, production, distribution, research, and development concerning the logistics requirements of the Armed Forces of the United States in weapons, arms, munitions, equipment, materials, and all other necessary supplies for the Armed Forces of the United States.

There exists a state of national emergency declared by the President on December 16, 1950. Communist aggression is forcing the free world to fight a limited war on the battlefield and an unlimited war of preparation and production.

United Nations armed forces, largely American, are today fighting a war with Communist armies and air forces in Korea. The French are fighting Communist forces in Indochina. There is a constant threat of further Communist military aggression in other areas. The men actually fighting Communist forces have been armed for the most part by American industry, and they are relying on American industry to supply the weapons and munitions they need in daily combat.

To meet this threat of further aggression, we have deployed military forces in Europe and elsewhere. Friendly nations have joined us and have assigned their own military units to hold the line alone and with our forces. The Russians are warned in the only language they understand that the free world stands united in its determination to remain free. These men on the line which may become the firing line at any time have been armed by western industry, largely American, and they are relying on our industry to supply an essential part of the weapons and munitions they must have to defend themselves and all of us.

We and other nations are training large numbers of men to increase the forces already combat worthy and to replace those who have served their turn and done their duty. In our case, this involves building up the core of our Nation's defense—a well-trained home force, fully equipped with modern weapons and equipment. The weapons and equipment for this great training effort have come and must come largely from American industry.

The steel industry of the United States provides the basic commodity required in the manufacture of substantially all weapons, arms, munitions, and equipment produced in the United States. An adequate and continuing supply of steel is essential to every phase of our defense effort.

The cessation of production of steel for any prolonged period of time would be catastrophic.

It would add to the hazards of our own soldiers, sailors and airmen and of other fighting men in combat with the enemy. It could result in tragedy and disaster.

It would prevent us from adequately arming the military forces now facing the enemy on uneasy fronts.

It would seriously delay us in adequately training and arming their replacements and reinforcements, and in building the core of our Nation's defense, our home force.

For economic and financial reasons our armament program has been "stretched out" approximately a year longer than our military men desired from a purely military

point of view. A cessation of steel production at this time would add materially to the risk the stretch-out already entails, thereby increasing the "calculated risk" we are taking to an unjustifiable point.

We are now using, for production of military end items (guns, tanks, planes, ships, ammunition and other military supplies and equipment), the following percentages of our total national steel production:

Carbon steel, 13.5 percent.

Alloy steel, 36.6 percent.

Stainless steel, 32.4 percent.

Super alloy steel, 84 percent.

In addition to such direct military requirements, those activities directly and indispensably supporting our military effort, such as the atomic energy, petroleum, power, and transportation programs and the program for broadening our industrial base and increasing our war potential, require many millions of tons of steel.

Considerations of national security make it impossible to state publicly the breakdown of use of various types of steel in manufacture of different military weapons and equipment. A few examples which can be given will show the crisis which a steel shut-down would produce. For instance, 35 percent of national production of one form of steel is going into ammunition for the use of our Armed Forces and 80 percent of such ammunition is going to Korea.

Since World War II the Armed Forces have made great progress in increasing the fire power of combat units; the fire power of an infantry division is 50 percent greater today than it was in World War II. We have substituted, insofar as possible, such fire power for man power.

Our combat techniques and objectives require a greatly increased use of steel.

Although Korean truce talks are in progress and the battle lines are relatively stable, our troops are still firing a very substantial volume of artillery ammunition. There has been a tremendous decrease in the number of our casualties in Korea. We are holding the line with ammunition and not with the lives of our troops.

Moreover, a sudden and large-scale resumption of combat in Korea may occur at any time; in such case the demand for ammunition as well as many other types of munitions could vastly increase.

Another specific example of a critical shortage is in stainless steel. Fifteen percent of all stainless steel produced in the United States is used in the manufacture of airplane engines, including jets. No jet engine can be manufactured without substantial quantities of high alloy steels.

Therefore, any curtailment in the production of steel even for a short period of time will have serious effects on the programs of the Department of Defense which are essential to national security. A work stoppage in the steel industry will result immediately in serious curtailment of production of essential weapons and munitions of all kinds; if permitted to continue it would weaken the defense effort in all critical areas and would imperil the safety of our fighting men and that of the Nation.

That is signed Robert A. Lovett, Secretary of Defense.

Subscribed and sworn to before me this 14th day of April 1952, and signed Ralph N. Stohl, Notary Public. My commission expires January 1, 1956.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there any questions from the members of the committee?

Senator MORSE. I have a few questions, Mr. Chairman, that I wish to ask the Secretary.

As a member of the Armed Services Committee of the Senate, Mr. Secretary, I am deeply appreciative of the fact that it is important that my cross-examination be held to questions that will not seek to elicit information which you certainly would not be justified in giving, and would not give

even if the question were asked, that would provide information to the enemy. Yet I want to say by way of preface to my questions that in my opinion the steel case has aroused so much confusion in the thinking of the American people that I believe it very important to impress upon the American people two or three of what I consider to be basic facts in the steel case.

To my way of thinking, as a member of the Armed Services Committee of the Senate, the most important fact is the one that you have covered in this affidavit which I want to emphasize by questioning you in regard to it. I present the fact in the form of this question:

Am I correct in my understanding, Mr. Secretary, that a shutdown of the steel industry for any period of time measured in terms of days would be bound to do great injury to the defense mobilization plans of our Government?

Secretary LOVETT. That is correct, Senator MORSE.

Senator MORSE. Am I correct in my understanding, Mr. Secretary, that the only interest that you had in the steel case up to the point of the Presidential seizure was your interest as Secretary of Defense in doing what you could to urge upon all concerned the importance of keeping the steel mills rolling in the interest of national defense?

Secretary LOVETT. That is absolutely correct, Senator MORSE. I think to be somewhat more responsive, the record should perhaps show that the Department of Defense is not aware of the merits in this dispute, and has had no part in the negotiations. Our sole concern, as you have pointed out, lies to make sure that everyone involved in this as a matter of direct responsibility is aware of the enormous consequences of the steel shutdown. That arises in part from the facts which I have covered in the affidavit and in part from the fact that it is my understanding that once the furnaces are cooled, it takes from 2 to 3 weeks to reheat, so that a 1-day stoppage is in effect not a 1-day stoppage, but automatically a stoppage of several weeks.

Senator MORSE. I am very glad you made that point. I was going to cover it in a question, but I will cover it this way now. Prior to the seizure by the President, am I correct in my understanding that the Defense Establishment was very much concerned about the closing down of the furnaces, because the Defense Establishment had been advised that if the furnaces were closed down for a short period of time measured in terms of hours or 1 or 2 days, it would be impossible to get full production back for at least several days thereafter?

Secretary LOVETT. Yes, sir, that is correct.

Senator MORSE. And as you have already testified, a shutdown of the steel operations of this country even for several days would not have been in the interest of the security of this Nation.

Secretary LOVETT. That is correct, Senator MORSE.

Senator MORSE. Am I correct in my understanding, Mr. Secretary, that neither you nor any of your officials participated in any way in the negotiations in the steel case prior to the seizure by the President?

Secretary LOVETT. That is correct, sir.

Senator MORSE. In fact, it is true, is it not, it was the position of the Defense Establishment that it did not want to be made a party to the seizure as far as the assumption of any administrative duty is concerned, because it has all it can do to handle the regular business of the Defense Establishment?

Secretary LOVETT. Yes, sir. The Defense Department took the position, and we pointed out in addition to the fact that we had not only as much as we could handle, but perhaps more, the fact that we would

then be on both sides of the fence, the principal procurer and also the principal manufacturer, and that seemed to be an unwise position.

Senator MORSE. Mr. Secretary, am I correct in my understanding that prior to the Presidential seizure—as I think this affidavit itself also indicates—you did, in carrying out your obligation to the President as Secretary of Defense advise the President as to the serious consequences you think would flow as far as the defense program is concerned if the mills were allowed to go down?

Secretary LOVETT. The President requested the views of the Department as to the consequences of the steel stoppage, and the substance of what is in this affidavit, but given in considerably more detail, was provided. That was the extent of our participation, sir.

Senator MORSE. Please understand, I am not asking for a disclosure of anything confidential that went on between you and the President, but only for a disclosure as to whether or not I am right in my understanding—and you have already testified that I am—that you advised the President as to the seriousness of a shut-down of the steel industry as far as the defense program is concerned.

Secretary LOVETT. Yes, sir.

Senator MORSE. Now, Mr. Secretary, you have already indicated very clearly that you did not participate in the formation of any recommendation for seizure, but that in substance your advice to the White House was that the defense program required a continuous operation of the steel mills. Would I be correct in my conclusion that as Secretary of Defense, it was your view that some appropriate procedure should be adopted by your government at the time the so-called deadline hour for the strike approached that would at least carry us over that period of time that was necessary to prevent a shut-down until the executive branch of the Government, or the legislative branch of the Government could follow some other course of action that would likewise guarantee the continuous operation of the steel mills?

Secretary LOVETT. Senator MORSE, perhaps I can answer that question from a slightly different angle. The Department of Defense, as you have indicated in your questions, was very gravely concerned about any stoppage because of the time element involved. It is not a thing which shuts down today and can be restored tomorrow. It takes several weeks. In view of the critical situation world-wide, as well as our efforts to rebuild some reasonable position of strength in our Western European allies, it was apparent at once that a stoppage held the gravest possibilities for trouble.

Therefore, the Department naturally would look with alarm at a continuation of the stalemate of some sort in these discussions with the furnaces down.

As to the method of continuing production, the method by which the shut-down was stopped, we of course have no opinion, sir. Our concern was that production should continue. The alternative methods of accomplishing that were not raised with us, and we expressed no opinion on it.

Senator MORSE. Do you agree with me that no matter who was President of the United States at such an hour of crisis, there rested upon him the grave responsibility of doing whatever he could within his position as Chief Executive of this land to keep steel production going?

Secretary LOVETT. Yes, Senator MORSE. I do not see how anyone who is President of the United States in a critical time such as this could allow a major stoppage of steel. And the method of preventing that, as I said earlier, I have no opinion on. I am not aware of the alternatives which could have been taken. But the thought of a stoppage itself is something that I would believe any President would find almost impossible to accept.

Senator MORSE. Mr. Chairman, I want to say that this covers in the main the examination which I wish to put to the Secretary in support of the premise and conclusion that I now state for the record, and if the Secretary believes it is at all a misinterpretation of his views as to the serious situation that existed at the hour the President seized the steel mills, I want him to make a modifying statement in the record at this time.

My statement briefly is this, Mr. Chairman, that I think the American people need to ponder what I think is the fact, the fact to which I think the Secretary of Defense has testified here today, that the defense, the security needs of our country were so serious at the hour the President seized the steel mills that it was essential in protecting the security of this country that steps be taken to keep those steel mills operating without a break in continuity of production. I believe, Mr. Chairman, when all is said and done, that is the underlying operative fact in this entire controversy, and that thereafter it became the duty of both the President and other officials in the executive branch of the Government that determine upon executive policy, and the duty of the Congress, that determines legislative policy, to determine what modifications ought to be put into effect on the seizure order once time permitted reflection and consideration for modification. But irrespective of how the situation got into the serious climax that it had reached at the hour of seizure, the fact remains, as the Secretary of Defense has testified here today, that the defense and security needs of our country were so serious that the obligation rested upon our Government to keep those steel mills in continuous operation. And the one man in our Government who at that hour sat in the position to keep them operating was the President of the United States, and he followed a course of action which many of us in good faith and complete sincerity can disagree with, as far as procedure is concerned. It nevertheless was a course of action that resulted in keeping the steel mills operating. And we now have the opportunity and the time in cool reflection to follow whichever course of action that we, the Congress, may deem advisable, to modify the procedure that the President has adopted, consistent, however, with keeping the steel mills operating.

That is the comment I wanted to make because I do not intend to lose sight of what I think is the most important operative fact in this whole controversy, namely, that at that dark hour when the President seized the steel mills, it was in the security interests of every American citizen that those steel mills be kept operating. And I am going to continue to do what I can to keep the sights of the American people on that fact, and then cooperate as best I can in developing here a legislative program that will make it unnecessary to repeat the procedure that was followed in this case.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you, Senator MORSE, for your observation. I wish to say that I feel convinced of the soundness of your judgment and opinion as you have expressed it here at this time, and I am glad to have it in the record.

Senator HUMPHREY?

Senator HUMPHREY. I have only one or two questions, Mr. Secretary. I am going to expand and possibly develop the line of questioning of Senator MORSE.

You made reference in your affidavit to the so-called stretch-out period of our rearmament, and defense program, by approximately 1 year longer. Is your feeling that that stretch-out period places a greater responsibility upon the Government to maintain a continuity of steel production? In other words, is the stretch-out period plus a threatened strike or cessation of production a further jeopardy to our defense?

Secretary LOVETT. Yes, Senator HUMPHREY. May I answer that at some length, sir?

Senator HUMPHREY. I would like to get your observations because it was a very short paragraph in your affidavit, and I think it has some very important meaning here.

Secretary LOVETT. Going back to the requests of the military department for appropriations, the budget which I recommended to the President for the three military services for fiscal year 1953, total \$55,000,000,000, when reviewed by the Office of Defense Mobilization and the Bureau of the Budget, that amount of appropriations would result in expenditures in the fiscal year 1953 of something estimated by the services to approximate \$70,000,000,000. The Office of Defense Mobilization was also concerned at the accelerating rate of the take by the military departments out of the civilian economy of certain rare alloys and certain metals that were in short supply. But I believe it was the financial aspect which appeared to be controlling. At all events, we were given a limit of expenditures, expenditures in the technical budget sense being a measure of the amount of goods and services which we receive in any one year.

Having received that expenditure limitation, we then had to go back and refigure the entire contract authority aspect of the budget. The reprogramming, the cut-down in the scheduled deliveries as a result of this budgetary necessity, meant that while the ultimate total of aircraft, for example, we would receive, would be the same or in fact might be somewhat larger, we would not receive them as soon as if we had no expenditure limitation.

Therefore, the period of risk before complete modernization of the Air Force was extended substantially by approximately a year in some types. That means, therefore, instead of having an accumulation, a stockage, or instead of accelerating the date of readiness of the various units, we are compelled to rely even more heavily on the reliable daily delivery to us of these items. That runs through the entire fabric of the military production.

Senator HUMPHREY. So current production is even more important with the stretched-out period than if you would have had, let us say, the more compact production program in terms of time.

Secretary LOVETT. That is correct, sir; and it is even more important because we are now in a period of maximum acceleration. I can give you figures which would support that.

The period of maximum acceleration of production in World War II occurred between 1941 and 1942, that is, within a 12-month period, and it amounted to about 220 percent. It is an interesting but I honestly believe a completely useless fact that the rate of production between the end of calendar year 1950 and the end of calendar year 1951 was 222 percent. So the rate of acceleration appears statistically to be the same. Actually we are coming into right now the period when the funds which the Congress gave us in 1950 and 1951 fiscal years are beginning to be delivered. If you recall that it takes 18 to 24 months to make a fighter aircraft, it is clear that funds made available, for example, in January 1951, would not produce the aircraft until a minimum of 18 months thereafter, which would be July 1953. Hence, the stretch-out has had the effect of making more important than ever the rapid build-up to our level-off period of production, and that build-up, even under the stretch-out, requires a doubling of production between December 1951 and December 1952. It is not an easy task at all. It represents doubling production in the 12 months between December 1951 and December 1952.

Senator HUMPHREY. Which observation would lead one to conclude that we are now

just approaching the maximum productive period for this year period of December 1951 to December 1952.

Secretary LOVETT. That is correct, sir.

Senator HUMPHREY. The next question I have is with reference to the figures, and I do not want to probe too deeply on it, with reference to carbon steel, stainless steel, and superalloy steel. Just this very plain and clear-cut question. Are there any stored surpluses of said materials that could have tided us over any period of cessation of steel production?

Secretary LOVETT. Senator HUMPHREY, it is hard to answer in the frame of that question. The materials that the military obtain come through the so-called CMP, the controlled-materials plan, and they are given to us several months in advance on certificates, although they do not go into the work in process stage, we will say, until 6 months after the authority is given. The point, I believe, sir, which you are inquiring about is not that we would run out of steel the day after the strike, or the week after the strike, but with the mills shut down we would, after some period of time which is a matter of guesswork largely, run out.

Senator HUMPHREY. In other words, there would be a lag period as a result of the cessation of production?

Secretary LOVETT. Yes, sir.

Senator HUMPHREY. Your schedule would be interrupted.

Secretary LOVETT. The consequence would be in an alternative. Either we would run out or we would have to take it completely out of the civilian production.

You will recall, sir, that the first protective step which the Office of Defense Mobilization took was to freeze all steel deliveries. That is an indication of what would happen in a more dramatic form if the steel mills shut down.

Senator HUMPHREY. In your final paragraph, where you say, "Any curtailment in the production of steel even for a short period of time will have serious effects on the programs of the Department of Defense which are essential to national security," would you care to give us any general observation on what you mean by "a short period of time," recognizing the intricate nature of steel production as you have noted earlier?

Secretary LOVETT. I tried to bring that out more fully in testimony today, Senator. That was in there for two reasons. We noticed references in the press from time to time that a short shut-down might be the worst we would have to face. Our feeling is that there is no such thing as a short stoppage, because of the peculiarity of the industry, and notably the extraordinarily long time it takes to reheat a furnace once it is cooled. It is a very long process, and of course a costly one. So that even if technically the strike existed only 2 days, that in itself would mean something well over 3 weeks before we got back into production.

Senator HUMPHREY. And if the furnaces were completely cooled—let us say you had a strike over a period of time for 1 or 2 weeks, or let us say 2 weeks—then you would extend somewhat the duration before you could get back into full production; is that right?

Secretary LOVETT. Yes, sir. You have to add the period of the work stoppage to the period of the reheating of the furnaces. It varies between certain types, I am informed. I am not an expert on this. But it is somewhere on the order of 2 to 3 weeks for the average big furnace. So if you had a week's stoppage, you would have to add to that the period of reheating the furnace.

Senator HUMPHREY. And all during that period of time there would be no production of steel, and then you would be faced again with the problem of reestablishing normal plant operations which within itself would

call for some time, at least a few days. Would that be a fair statement?

Secretary LOVETT. That is right, sir.

Senator HUMPHREY. The chairman was just mentioning to me the possibility as to whether or not a shut-down of such duration, namely, a shut-down, let us say, to a strike or work stoppage, plus the technical detail involved, that would have some impairment to other industries related to the Defense Establishment?

Secretary LOVETT. Very seriously; yes, sir.

Senator HUMPHREY. So you have steel as a basic commodity fully integrated into the whole defense-production program, and would, therefore, have a carry-over into other aspects of production?

Secretary LOVETT. Yes, sir. It would notably, for example, hit the supporting industries, as for example atomic energy, petroleum, power, transportation. The defense machine, Senator HUMPHREY, is one which rests on industry to a degree that is rarely understood. The form of mobilization which we have undertaken is an effort to avoid the wasteful chewing up of metals and building final end items of the military and then storing them somewhere. It is a little bit like the family who eats off the stove.

They do not cook all of their meals for a month at one cooking, but rely on the grocer and the butcher and the dairyman delivering food daily and cooking it daily. The military are almost exactly that way. We could, of course, go into full mobilization, pay no attention to the consequences of the country, which I think would be devastating, store everything, and then shut the plants down. That would be horribly wasteful, and I think would lead us into a trap which would perhaps shake our economy and thereby please the Soviets. The alternative, therefore, is to have moving, living production lines, and take the equipment off that as needed, and have in those lines the expansion and acceleration characteristics which would be necessary in case of full mobilization.

Hence, the continuity of the line is vital to the military establishment not merely in the end items, but in all the things that go into military establishments and that touches almost every item you can think of.

Senator HUMPHREY. Mr. Secretary, without making any value judgment on our part as to the manner in which the President acted, the form of his action—which I surely do not ask you to answer—it is to be clearly understood, then, from your testimony that whatever action took place in the light of the circumstances as they existed, that that action had as its first requirement the continuation, the full continuity of maximum production for every single day, is that correct?

Secretary LOVETT. Senator, I, of course, have no knowledge of the advice given to the President by others on this matter.

Senator HUMPHREY. But from the Department of Defense point of view.

Secretary LOVETT. From the point of view of the Department of Defense, any stoppage of steel output was in our opinion an aggravation of a degree of risk that we have already taken to the point where we felt compelled in answer to the President's question to indicate the degree of danger which this country would face if we did not get a reliable daily supply of steel.

Senator HUMPHREY. And as you have noted in your statement, by the stretch-out of approximately a year you had already assumed a calculated risk on the basis of the military requirements.

Secretary LOVETT. Senator Humphrey, the risk is excessive in my opinion right now with the full budget allowed us. My testimony before the Houses of Congress has so indicated.

Senator HUMPHREY. I am very grateful to you, Mr. Secretary. Thank you.

Senator IVES. Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask a few questions, if I may.

The CHAIRMAN. Senator IVES.

Senator IVES. Mr. Secretary, I note in your reference to steel production, you quote percentage-wise as it were. Are you at liberty to give the amount of tonnage in any instance?

Secretary LOVETT. No, sir, I am not.

Senator IVES. I think that is a rather important item in all of this. It is very fundamental. For instance, I am curious to know how much tonnage of the total amount of tonnage which I assume is somewhere in the vicinity of 150,000,000 tons at the present rate of production, how much of that tonnage is being used by the Defense Department or in the defense effort.

Secretary LOVETT. We can provide that percentage for you.

Senator IVES. Off the record?

Secretary LOVETT. Yes, sir.

Senator IVES. I see. There is one more question along that line that I would like to ask. Is it your opinion that the amount of steel now being produced is insufficient to permit the dropping of controls over steel? We have been given to understand, for example—I do not know whether it has come to the attention of this particular committee; it has of other committees of which I am a member—that there is ample steel at the present time outside of structural steel. If there is ample steel, and if the Department of Defense does not need structural steel—and I suppose the Department may need structural steel—but if it should not, there would be no need for controls; is that correct?

Secretary LOVETT. That is a very technical question which lies outside my field. I think I can be reasonably responsive from the point of view of the Department's interest in this by saying that in anticipation of the problem of a steel strike—which, of course, we have been apprehensive about for 90 days—we tried to find out if there was some way in which we could concentrate into a certain number of plants all of the military requirements. I do not recall the figures in detail, but in the order of magnitude I suppose that 20 to 30 of the big plants would supply the military and suppose there are a total of 300 in the country; that would mean that 270 approximately would be left for civilian uses. However, the number of different alloys—the number of different kinds of steel which are required—run across the whole spectrum of the steel industry, so that it is virtually impossible, except after the most careful work, which would take months and months, to take out of these hundreds of mills the various percentages that are procured by our contractors because the Department of Defense does not buy the steel. It goes to an engine company and says it wants so many jets—we will say 2,000 jets. The contractor with the Department of Defense then goes to the steel man and his metallurgists agree on the quantity and type of steel, and he himself puts his order in on that basis.

Senator IVES. I see your point. I assume that the one person who would probably be more acquainted with the over-all picture, both domestic and defense, with respect to production of steel would be the Director of Defense Mobilization?

Secretary LOVETT. That is correct; that is his field.

Senator IVES. I thought you might be able to answer, but I appreciate the situation in which you find yourself. There is one question I want to raise. When I came in you and Senator Morse were on a dissertation of this question of seizure. I agree with the comment that I think both of you agreed on—to the effect that there is not much use now crying over spilled milk. In other words, how we got there. Our job now is to get out of it. There is time enough later when we get in perhaps a political campaign to place blame for the predicament we are in.

But I would like to raise one point. You would not go so far as to say that seizure is the only alternative by which to avoid a stoppage of steel production?

Secretary LOVETT. Senator IVES, I think I covered that point before you came in.

Senator IVES. I did not hear all of it.

Secretary LOVETT. I said we had no knowledge of the various alternative courses of action, that the mechanics, the procedures to keep this thing going were not in our province at all. The question which Senator MORSE asked was, I think, a hypothetical one. Could any President avoid the responsibility of keeping the steel production up?

My answer to that was that I thought in the present critical times steel had to be produced, but that I did not know what the alternatives were or whether there was some other way. I think myself there are several alternatives, but that does not lie in the area in which the Defense Department is concerned.

Senator IVES. I misunderstood your position from your answer before. That is why I wanted to clear it up. What little I have heard of it, I thought you were assuming that seizure was the only alternative. I apologize for not hearing the question.

Senator MORSE. I am sure my good friend from New York would be glad to hear me say it was not the position the Secretary took. I also want to assure him that the junior Senator from Oregon thinks that some other procedures should have been followed than the one that was followed.

Senator IVES. You have already offered some comment, have you not?

Senator MORSE. My question to the Secretary was simply to the point that having reached the eleventh hour, was there any obligation in his opinion on any President, no matter who he might be, in the White House, to do whatever was necessary to keep the steel mills going.

Senator IVES. Mr. Secretary, in order to clear that again, that does not necessarily mean that any President who might be in the White House might choose the correct way to do that.

Senator MORSE. He might make a mistake. But it is still important that he keep them going, and that he did.

Senator HUMPHREY. Lest there be any doubt, Mr. Secretary, whatever the alternative, as I understand it, it required continuity in production.

Secretary LOVETT. Yes.

Senator HUMPHREY. If there had been any cessation of production over a prolonged period of time, let us say 2 or 3 weeks, would it have been necessary for the Defense Department then to have requisitioned even more sternly and more drastically the available steel, and thereby deny other areas of the economy?

Secretary LOVETT. I think that would have been inevitable.

Senator HUMPHREY. Would it, for example, have been necessary for the Defense Department to have required steel which now goes into such civilian items as, let us say, farm machinery? Would there have been a priority for atomic energy development, munitions and artillery over that?

Secretary LOVETT. I think the Office of Defense Mobilization, in considering the requirements, would have had to give a clear and overriding priority to the basic military requirements, and those of the atomic energy, power and similar items associated directly with the military.

Senator HUMPHREY. As the pool becomes restricted, in other words, the essentiality of high priority for end item military equipment would have been increased and augmented?

Secretary LOVETT. That is correct, sir.

Senator HUMPHREY. Are there any other questions? If not, Mr. Secretary, as the temporary acting Chairman, I want to ex-

press the gratitude and appreciation of the committee for your attendance. May I say on behalf of Senator MURRAY, the Chairman, that your cooperation has been much appreciated.

We will stand in recess at the call of the Chair for the continuation of these hearings.

Secretary LOVETT. Thank you very much, sir.

TESTIMONY OF MR. NATHAN FEINSINGER, CHAIRMAN OF THE WAGE STABILIZATION BOARD, ON UNION-SHOP ISSUE, BEFORE THE COMMITTEE ON LABOR AND PUBLIC WELFARE, APRIL 15, 1952

Mr. FEINSINGER. Union shops now exist in the steel producing and fabricating industry. Crucible Steel, a steel-producing company, has a modified union-shop agreement. Several of the largest steel-producing companies which are parties to this case, United States Steel, Bethlehem, Jones & Laughlin, have union shops, some of quite recent origin with their railroad subsidiary, their steamship subsidiaries, their coal-producing subsidiary. In recommending the union shop the Board left the form and type of the conditions to be negotiated by the parties. The Board was faced with the choice of recommending the union shop in this case, or announcing that it would never recommend the union shop in any case. Please remember that Congress itself has authorized the union shop, which today means an open union and protection of a member against loss of his job, even though expelled from the union, provided only that he continues to pay his dues.

Senator TAFT, one of the sponsors of the act, said in advocating this provision in the Taft-Hartley Act, quoting in part, "In other words, what we do in effect is to say that no one can get a free ride in such a shop," and finally, and most significantly, he said, "I think the justice of such an arrangement should be clear."

I believe that to be ample authority for the Board's recommendation, particularly when viewed in the light of the recommendation of a recent emergency board in the railroad industry. It would be quite inconsistent whether you said one is an ad hoc agency and the other is a continuing agency, they are both agencies of the Government, for two agencies to take totally inconsistent positions on such a basic issue.

Remember, we did not do anything beyond endorsing the kind of union shop that Congress had authorized and saying to the parties, "You go back into bargaining and work out the kind of union-shop agreement we should have." That is all I have to say.

Senator MORSE. Do you mind if I interrupt, or are you through with your statement?

Mr. FEINSINGER. Yes.

Senator MORSE. I would like to ask a question or two if I may, because I have some appreciation of the problem this Board is faced with in the so-called union security or union-shop issue. When you refer to Mr. TAFT's statement and to the provisions of the Taft-Hartley law, which legalize the union shop, and illegalize the old closed shop, are you not, however, referring to a law that simply makes a statement of public policy as to the kind of a union-employer relationship and as to the kind of a shop which can exist as the result of free collective bargaining negotiations?

Mr. FEINSINGER. That is correct.

Senator MORSE. And that when the Congress placed its stamp of approval as a matter of public policy upon this kind of a union shop in American industry, subject to the voluntary agreement of the parties in settling individual disputes, it did not in any sense, did it, say that it should be imposed upon an employer by any governmental agency?

Mr. FEINSINGER. That is correct, nor did this governmental agency impose it on the employer. We did not grant the union shop. We could not.

Senator MORSE. That is my next question. It is true that you did not grant the union shop. You did not order the union shop, but as a Government agency you recommended that it be adopted by the parties to the dispute.

Mr. FEINSINGER. That they negotiate a union shop by agreement.

Senator MORSE. That they negotiate a union shop by agreement, leaving the details as to its form up to them.

Mr. FEINSINGER. Such as whether old employees did or did not have to join, whether new employees could escape after a year if they found life unbearable in the union. Those are all matters of form or type or condition to be negotiated by the parties as they are in American industry quite generally.

Senator MORSE. Let me make clear before making my next comment that I fully appreciate that it is easy for me to sit on the sidelines and raise a question as to a public policy of recommending a union shop on the part of any board, whether it is your board, or the railway emergency board or any other, because I cannot answer the question, "Was you there, Charlie?" I did not have to go through the cases as you gentlemen did. But nevertheless, as a Senator, I have certain responsibilities, legislatively speaking, to these matters of public policy, and with that comment, I ask you this question: On the basis of your experience in the field of labor relations, do you think that when you as a Wage Stabilization Board recommended a union shop to these parties, that as far as the union was concerned, they took it for granted they had won a decision on the union shop issue?

Mr. FEINSINGER. I think that is a fair statement.

Senator MORSE. I am not going to discuss this matter much further, because I do not think it would be fair or proper for me to do so because I have my responsibilities as a legislator, and you had your responsibilities as the Chairman of this Stabilization Board.

I want to be exceedingly fair to the Board. Am I correct in my understanding that the parties, both the steel companies and the union, voluntarily submitted evidence and argument and information on the union-shop issue?

Mr. FEINSINGER. That is correct, sir.

Senator MORSE. Did the steel companies at any time say to members of the Board that we just think this issue is beyond the jurisdiction of this Board, and therefore will not present argument or evidence in respect to it.

Mr. FEINSINGER. No, they did not. They could not in the light of the record, which I would like to explore for a moment.

Senator MORSE. You go ahead.

Mr. FEINSINGER. Then I would like to come back to one other comment you made.

The old Wage Stabilization Board, which had no disputes functions, folded up, for all practical purposes, around the middle of February. For several months the Government considered ways and means of getting the Board reconstituted and considered whether or not it should be given disputes jurisdiction.

The Defense Mobilization Advisory Board, with industry dissenting, recommended to the President that the Wage Stabilization Board be reconstituted as an 18-man board, and that it be given jurisdiction to make recommendations for the settlement of labor disputes in a well-defined area, that is, where the Defense Department certified that a dispute, or rather, a strike or interruption of production, would seriously impair the defense effort.

The question raised and discussed during the meetings of the Defense Mobilization Board was whether or not the jurisdiction of such a board in dispute cases should extend to noneconomic issues, which by definition includes the union shop. The President signed the executive order which gave to our Board jurisdiction over noneconomic issues, including the union shop, and economic issues.

When the Board was reconstituted, the same fight was made by industry against the inclusion in the Board's jurisdiction of authority to make recommendations on noneconomic issues, including the union shop. What was the fight all about? Everybody knew that if the steel negotiations resulted in an impasse, that the President would refer that case to the Board, and that one of the issues would be the union shop. Every member of the Board, when he took his oath of office under Executive Order 10233, knew that he would be called upon to pass on the question of the union shop in the steel case or in some other case. It is also before us in the Boeing and A. F. of L. Machinists case. It is before us in the Douglas and UAW-CIO case. As a matter of fact, Senator, a few weeks before the steel case came to the Board, the industry members of our Board, so they tell me, caucused to determine whether they should stay on the Board, in view of the imminence of the steel case, which would involve the union shop. They decided they would stay on, to their credit. I am proud of every member of our Board, all of whom have contributed to what I regard as the most successful record of handling labor disputes in the history of the United States. I make that as a statement for the record, and I am prepared to support it.

The Allen resolution in the House, before its amendment, challenged the jurisdiction of our Board, having in mind particularly the union-shop issue. The revised Allen resolution in the House withdraws that feature of the original resolution, for the plain and simple reason that a simple check of the records will show that it was intended that the Board should have jurisdiction in dispute cases over economic and noneconomic issues, including the union shop.

Our industry members, in their dissent—and it was very vigorous dissent—did not make the charge or the claim or the allegation that we were exceeding our jurisdiction.

One other thing. The public members tried to get the industry members to go along with us on a proposal to send the whole issue back to the parties to settle through collective bargaining. That is where it belongs. In negotiations, as you know, sometimes it is traded off for something else. If it is given, the union gives up some money. If it is not given, the union gets some more money. That is the way those things go. That was our idea: Send it back with the whole kettle of fish, and let the parties settle it.

The industry members wanted it sent back, provided that we would wash our hands of it completely, which would be wrong, in my judgment, because we would have it right back where we started on December 22, because any one issue unsettled would mean that the whole dispute was unsettled, and the President would have to recertify the whole shebang to us.

On a previous comment of yours that it might not be proper for a Government agency under any circumstances to recommend that the parties negotiate a union-shop agreement, I am grateful for your recognition of the distinction between the Government granting or ordering it, and the Government saying to the employer, "We think you ought to negotiate, in the light of the fact that General Motors has it. It is not a communistic organization. It believes in protecting the liberties of its workers." And Allis-

Chalmers, which appeared before this Congress on many occasions to protect the liberty of these workers at a time when there was some reason to believe they were not being protected, has recently signed a union-shop agreement of the GM type, to cite two examples.

You say, "Why should a Government agency do it?" You were not with this Board, that is true, but you rendered most distinguished service on the War Labor Board in World War II. You know more about this stuff than I do, Senator.

Senator MORSE. That is not true. That is the only untruthful statement you have made in the hearing, that I know about.

Mr. FEINSINGER. This same question arose in World War II during the President's joint labor-management public conference before our Board was set up, and the employers said, "Let's maintain the status quo. If you have got a closed shop, you keep it. If you have got an open shop, you keep it." That was the only point of disagreement.

You recall President Roosevelt, so the story goes, took a blue pencil and drew a line through that one. He said, "I am interested only in what you agree on, not what you disagree on."

The issue came to our Board when it was set up, with no guideposts. What did we do? After a number of different starts, we evolved the concept of maintenance of membership. The steel companies, employers generally, fought against maintenance of membership on the ground that it was unpatriotic; that it impaired the liberty of the individual, and so forth and so on.

The other day, Douglas Aircraft got up. They had fought against it, too. I said, "You have got maintenance of membership in your contract now, haven't you?" And they said, "Sure, now we have renewed it since you gave it to us."

"How do you like it?"

"We like it fine." The maintenance of membership agreement that you voted for was much more drastic than the union shop that we recommended in this steel case, because of the change in legislation since then. The maintenance of membership clause you voted for, Senator, provided at least as to men who were then members, you have got to stay in the union—

Senator MORSE. I drafted it in the Norma-Hoffman case, but I want to say something about it.

Mr. FEINSINGER. Under the maintenance of membership clause by the War Labor Board put into the steel contract, if a man was a member of the union he had to remain a member in good standing. If he lost his membership for any reason whatsoever, if he spat in the face of the business agent—or it did not have to be as drastic as that—if he ran against him in such cases, the union could go to the boss and say, "Fire that man." The boss would have to fire him. Under the union-shop agreement, nobody loses his job in the plant in relation to his union membership, even though he is expelled from the union, as long as he pays his dues. So in contrast with the innovation instituted by the War Labor Board in a comparable period—and believe me, I think this emergency is just as serious as that, if not more so—we were mild in our recommendation.

Senator MORSE. Mr. Chairman, it will take me just a minute further. In fairness to Mr. Feinsinger, I should make this brief comment.

I am very glad he has made the statement he has made, pointing out for the record that there is no question as to the jurisdiction of this Board to pass on the union-shop issue. The parties themselves submitted themselves to that jurisdiction. I am glad he has made that statement.

I am not going to sit here and argue with Mr. Feinsinger on an honest, reasonable difference of judgment as to what the policy

of the Government ought to be in taking jurisdiction over the union-shop issue. He has referred to the War Labor Board history. I only want to say this: We were operating under a no-strike, no-lockout agreement on the part of industry and labor, and it was obvious there were attempts on the part of some segments of industry to use that no-strike, no-lockout agreement as a device for busting unions all over this country. Where they had union shops and closed shops or other union arrangements, they would take advantage of this agreement to break the unions.

On the other hand, there were unions that did not have union shops and closed shops that thought they could take advantage of the no-strike, no-lockout agreement to establish union shops and closed shops across this country, because an employer's hands were tied in that he could not lock out any more than the union could strike in these great defense plants.

Mr. Feinsinger is quite right. We had to work out a compromise, and we struggled for weeks trying to work out a compromise getting both industry and labor to come along with us.

My recollection of the compromise is briefly this: As a matter of Board policy, we said, "We are going to work out some kind of a union security or union maintenance provision to protect the unions existing in these plants." And that was the union maintenance clause of the Norma-Hoffman case, based upon the dissenting opinion of the employers in the International Harvester case. It became the standard union maintenance clause of the War Labor Board. It did not establish a union shop or a closed shop, as such, but provided for the security of the unions already existing in defense plants.

Second, we established, as Board policy, the rule that if any employer already did not have a union shop, we would not order one imposed upon him. If he did not have a closed shop, we would not order one imposed on him.

We adopted the policy we would not by Board mandate impose a union or closed shop. In some of the arbitration cases where the parties voluntarily submitted the issue to a Board arbitrator, I think the record will show, as I recall—and I have not refreshed my memory on this for a long time—that in some of those instances the union shops were granted by the arbitrator, but with the express consent of the parties in terms of reference to the arbitrator.

Mr. FEINSINGER. Or where it was common in the industry. You are correct.

Senator MORSE. And the parties submitted the specific issue to jurisdiction of the arbitrator. In some of those cases, they did not come to the Board. They came to the Board only for the purpose of having an arbitrator assigned. The parties said, "We would like to try to bargain this out between ourselves. If we cannot, we will arbitrate it. We ask you to appoint the arbitrators."

We appointed arbitrators who took jurisdiction, but with the express consent of the parties.

I close by saying I was of the opinion then, and I had been of the opinion previous to my service on the War Labor Board as a private arbitrator, that the Board should not take jurisdiction over the union-shop issue and order it, as such, or an arbitrator should not take jurisdiction over it and order it as such, unless the parties by the terms of the arbitration reference agreed that he should be the deciding mind on the union-shop issue.

As a legislator, and knowing what a difficult issue this is from the standpoint of public opinion, I am still of the opinion that as a matter of policy the Government should not follow a course of action that looks as though we are ordering a union shop. I have an honest difference of opinion with

Mr. Feinsinger on that. As a legislator, I am going to do what I can to put my view on this issue in legislative form. I do not know what success I will have.

Mr. FEINSINGER. I would like to pay myself the compliment of believing had you not been a legislator in the last couple of months but had sat in the chair next to mine on the Board, you would have done exactly what we did.

I would like to say this: The War Labor Board had a tough job. You did a great job as a member of that Board. You sat in the spot I am sitting in now on more than one occasion, and defended the Board. You had an all-out no strike, no lockout pledge. We have not.

Senator MORSE. I am frank to say it made my job easier.

Mr. FEINSINGER. You had the patriotic stimulus of an all-out war. We have not. I am all the more proud of the record of this Board because it has been made without the assistance of a no-strike, no-lockout pledge, without the patriotic stimulus of an all-out war, and with nothing but power to make recommendations or suggestions, not even directive orders. And finally, I stated in my opinion, according to the Board's recommendations, that I thought they were fair and equitable, and not unstabilizing. I am still of that opinion.

The President, I was happy to note, endorsed that opinion in no uncertain terms. I am confident that when the gentlemen of this committee and the gentlemen in the House and the Senate and the members of the American public fully understand the Board's recommendations, they, too, will approve.

Thank you very much.

TESTIMONY OF MR. NATHAN FEINSINGER, CHAIRMAN OF THE WAGE STABILIZATION BOARD, BEFORE THE COMMITTEE ON LABOR AND PUBLIC WELFARE, APRIL 30, 1952, DEALING WITH THE UNION-SHOP ISSUE AND RELATED ISSUES

Senator MORSE. I want to clear up one point as far as my position in the case is concerned. The junior Senator from Oregon has taken the position that under the Constitution of the United States any President, irrespective of who he may be, has the inherent power in an hour of great crisis where the security of this country needs protection to proceed to exercise executive power to protect the people of this country in that crisis, subject to the subsequent check of the Congress of the United States, and that he owes a duty when he exercises such alleged inherent power to proceed forthwith to get the sanction from the Congress of the United States.

That has been the position of the junior Senator from Oregon for years on this highly debatable constitutional point, which for the first time in all our history was settled yesterday in one decision by a lower Federal court.

I am a good enough lawyer, I hope, to recognize that, as long as that decision stands, it is the law of the land and the junior Senator from Oregon intends to comply with that decision and urge all other citizens to comply with that decision, unless a Supreme Court decision subsequently changes that decision.

In other words, I held to a theory of inherent Presidential power which I have felt under the Constitution a President should be allowed to exercise if it is to be a dynamic and not a static Constitution.

If you take the position that the President of the United States is helpless in the hour of crisis, irrespective of what faults he may have committed in getting himself into a position where the hour of crisis arose, then you are sustaining a static conception of the Constitution and not a dynamic one.

If that is the law, then we are going to have to adjust to it. It does not remove one

iota the obligation of this Congress to proceed to take legislative action that will protect the interests of this country in an hour of crisis.

May I say I have tremendous respect for the cold logic of the decision that was handed down yesterday, but one does not have to stretch his imagination very far to recognize that you are going to run the danger of needing a dynamic rule of constitutional law if certain events should happen in this country, to wit, suppose as we sit here this afternoon or the Congress in session tomorrow, the whole capital, with its inhabitants were wiped out by a bomb, and the people of the country were confronted with the fact that they had no Congress to which the President might go for immediate legislation.

Why, it is absurd to assume, in my judgment, as a matter of constitutional doctrine, that the Chief Executive of this land does not have the power to take those Executive steps necessary to protect the security of the people of this country under those circumstances.

But we at least now have the duty to pass some legislation that would cover any President in the future under those circumstances by putting on the books some standing legislation that will legislatively regularize the procedure and authorize the President in such an emergency to take those steps such as seizure in this case, to protect the welfare of the country.

May I say that if the Congress will only step up to what I think is its legislative responsibility, it is better that the Congress handle emergency disputes by legislation. On that point I agree with the Senator from Minnesota.

I, too, have shared the view there was a legislative obligation, but I want to make very clear that, as far as the decision of yesterday is concerned, it certainly reversed the junior Senator from Oregon on one point he has held over the years: That under Executive power in article 2 of the Constitution there is an inherent power for the Chief Executive to protect the security of our people in an hour of crisis if that crisis should arise. Until that decision is changed I am going to stand by it as one who recognizes you cannot have a government by law unless you follow the court decree once that court decree comes down.

Senator HUMPHREY. I want to say to the Senator from Oregon again, with his penetrating analysis of the problem with which I associate myself fully, as I have with other analyses of these difficult measures, a great disservice has been done the American public and the American Government by the charges of dictatorship which have been leveled on the President, when, in fact, the whole judicial process has been preserved and there has never been a dictator that ever stayed in by judicial procedure.

I am confident those of us in the Congress and in the executive branch of this Government are going to abide by the law of the land.

The Senator is correct when he says a judicial decision is as much a law of the land as Congress until such decision may be reversed, if it should be.

Again I say there has been this lack of proper definition of terms. It was as in the old days when somebody was for a minimum wage. They called him a Communist. When the President acted in terms of what he thought to be the public interest they said that he is a dictator, which only befuddles the American people as to the understanding of the real meaning of dictatorship, which is the abolition of legislative government and of the judicial process.

It is not only the abuse of the Executive power; it is all three. The sooner we drive that point home for a little elementary political understanding and science in this country, the better off we will be.

Those who have made these charges again have muddied up the waters of political thinking of the American people. The dictatorship means complete abolition of the protection of the law. It means a complete abolition of the constitutional procedures.

I think Judge Pine's decision has proved conclusively beyond a shadow of a doubt this is a Government of law which follows procedures as established in the Constitution and in the public law of this land.

I would again rebuke those who have seen fit, in order to fan emotions, to talk about a dictatorship at a time when the procedures of law were at work in this country and at work objectively and methodically.

I want to give my personal views for the record because I feel we have not only a responsibility to legislate, but we have a responsibility to get the record perfectly clear as members of this committee as to what our views are and how we regard our responsibilities as legislators in this complex case.

The CHAIRMAN. I think it is very important we should have these views that have been expressed in the record. It indicates to me that I should say at this time that I am willing to call a special executive session immediately following the conclusion of this hearing this afternoon. It does seem to me there is a great need for swift action in this matter.

Mr. FEINSINGER. And, incidentally, you asked last time, Senator MORSE, whether the companies had challenged the jurisdiction of the Board to pass on the union-shop issue. We have found a reference. It is panel hearings, February 8, 1952, page 1609:

"Mr. MURRAY. I am not disagreeing with you"—this is Mr. Gall, to whom he is addressing himself.

"I am not disagreeing with you as to what the position of the Board should be with respect to those matters."

This discussion was on the union shop.

"But I am trying to get clear in my own mind the position of the industry here that the Board should not or must not assume jurisdiction over this matter."

"Mr. GALL. It has jurisdiction over this matter."

"Mr. MURRAY. All right."

Mr. Gall is counsel for Youngstown Sheet & Tube.

I don't know that that adds anything, except that it gives you the reference to the record itself.

Senator MORSE. I think it adds a great deal, Mr. Feinsinger. I think it puts the companies in a position where they apparently waived any objection to the jurisdiction of the Board over the union-shop issue.

Mr. FEINSINGER. To make a recommendation on it?

Senator MORSE. To make a recommendation on it.

Mr. FEINSINGER. That is right.

Senator MORSE. In other words, I think it puts the industry in a position somewhat similar to the position of the parties in a private arbitration, where they get into a dispute over the nature of the shop that shall be operated by the employer, and they come to an arbitrator, and they say, "We want you to decide for us on the basis of the record we make before you, whether we should or should not have a union shop."

As I said the other day, I think that if the parties want to make that clear submission of an issue to an arbitrator, and the arbitrator wants to assume jurisdiction over that issue, it is of their making. That, however, is a private matter between the parties and the arbitrator.

There is the second matter involved in this, on which you and I have a respectful difference of opinion as to a question of public policy, whether or not a Government board, even though the parties are willing to have the Government board decide it for them, should, as a matter of public policy,

take jurisdiction over a union-shop issue or say to the parties, "Now, listen. You take that one back to collective bargaining, because, as a matter of public policy, we are not going to rule, even though the evidence would clearly support the recommendation, that we think you ought to adopt a union shop in your plant." You and I understand our honest difference of opinion over that matter, as a matter of public policy.

I just hold to the view that even if the parties say to a Government board, "Please decide this one for us," I think it is a mistake for the Government to put a Government sanction, and that is what it amounts to, on imposing a union shop upon the employers.

But there is certainly great merit to the argument against me on it. I recognize that. And you know that this just happens to go to a view of mine. I think that is one of the points that we ought to always kick back into collective bargaining and say, "Listen, we are not going to be your scapegoat on that one. If you are willing to have us decide it for you, you ought to be willing to spend the hours that it takes to iron it out between yourselves on your own evidence, or you ought to keep it away from us by going out and getting yourself a private arbitrator in no way connected with the Government to decide that one for you."

Now, that just happens to be a position on public policy that I take. But let me say, and I will be through with this, Mr. Chairman and Mr. Feinsinger, that I thoroughly understand the position in which the public members of this Board found themselves on this union-shop matter; and with the waiver of jurisdiction on the part of the steel industry, I do not think they have got a kick coming, as they are kicking in their advertisements. I do not think they have got a kick coming from the standpoint of their activity in this case, with the result that they got from waiving their jurisdiction. After all, they waived the jurisdiction. My criticism of it goes to the matter of governmental policy, and on that I have a respectful difference with the Board.

May I say this, Mr. Chairman, because the witness is now through with his testimony—

TESTIMONY GIVEN BY MR. PHILIP MURRAY ON UNION SHOP ISSUE BEFORE THE COMMITTEE ON LABOR AND PUBLIC WELFARE, APRIL 23, 1952

Mr. MURRAY. These companies are not strangers to the union shop. They have agreed to the union shop with the United Mine Workers, with several maritime unions, with the Brotherhood of Carpenters, and even—as these contracts show—with the United Steelworkers of America. They have made these agreements without a strike or threat of a strike and they have done so as recently as November 1951. The great issue of principle which the steel companies are now attempting to pretend in this union shop dispute is a phony and a fraud. It is a smoke screen put up by the companies to hide the real issues.

Senator MORSE. Do you mind if I interrupt at this point, or would you prefer to finish reading all your comments?

Mr. MURRAY. No, I would be perfectly willing to stop.

Senator MORSE. In this last paragraph on page 14, where you talk about these union shop agreements with the United Mine Workers, and the Brotherhood of Carpenters and several other unions, you point out that "They have made these agreements without a strike or threat of a strike and they have done so as recently as November 1951." In each instance they have reached their agreements by collective bargaining, have they not, and not by way of a recommendation or decision of a Government agency?

Mr. MURRAY. I should say that I am not quite sure as to all of that, Senator MORSE.

It may be that in some of the railroad situations, they negotiated contracts with our union as the result of the mediation of the union shop issue by the Railway Mediation Board.

Senator MORSE. Let me say I can understand and appreciate your point of view.

Mr. MURRAY. I think in the Mine Workers case, it came out of an arbitration proceeding.

Senator MORSE. I can appreciate and understand your position in regard to the attitude that these companies are taking toward the union shop as far as their emphasis on principle is concerned insofar as their previous commitments through collective bargaining negotiations to a union shop are concerned. But I point out most respectfully that irrespective of the attitude of these parties, we do have a public policy question, with which I find myself in disagreement with most of the union leaders of America, as you well know, as to whether or not the Government as such ought to take the position that as a result of governmental intervention in a case a union shop should be imposed upon an employer unless the parties by free collective bargaining can reach it by agreement. From a legislator's standpoint, from a Congressional standpoint, we just have to face that issue, as to whether or not it is sound public policy for the Government to accord to a board or commission in the absence of a voluntary agreement between the parties, in the absence of a free collective bargaining agreement between the parties, the power to say to any American employer, "You should apply in your plant a union shop."

Mr. Feinsinger before this committee the other day admitted, and he had no choice but to admit it, it seemed to me, in answer to a question I put to him, as to whether or not he did not think that when this Wage Stabilization Board recommended this union shop in this case, as far as the workers are concerned, they felt they won a decision for a union shop. I would feel that if I were a worker; I would feel that if I were you, head of the Steelworkers Union, I got a decision for a union shop. And that raises this question of public policy as to whether the Government, when you people cannot agree between yourselves, should in effect impose it on you. I think it is a mistake to look to the Government for that kind of a union benefit. I think if you cannot get it by free collective bargaining, you are going to hurt yourself in the long run by taking it from the Government.

I asked Mr. Feinsinger the other day on this question of jurisdiction to what extent there was a voluntary submission to the union-shop issue so that a finding might be made—I have not reached any conclusion on it yet because I have not studied the transcript—as to whether in this case what the parties in effect did is what parties sometimes do in voluntary arbitration; they come to an arbitrator and say, "We here and now make the union-shop issue an arbitrable issue, and we say to you, 'We want you to decide it for us on the basis of the record which we make before you, and we agree that your decision shall be final and binding on that issue.'"

I have always held that under those circumstances, a union shop might be granted by an arbitrator, when they make very clear to him that they are making him their judge, although I always say to the parties, "You are foolish to give that kind of jurisdiction to an arbitrator." But if you do, then he can render the decision.

Now, on the question of public policy, Mr. Murray, I think we have to get beyond the steel operators. I do not think you settle it by saying that their attitude, as a matter of principle, is an attitude of fraud and phoniness. It may be so, but that does not change the fact that we in the Congress have a great public-policy obligation, I think,

to perform in determining whether or not, legislatively, we ought to countenance an agency of the Government granting a union-shop provision. I think you ought to get it by agreement, and not by Government mandate.

Now, take a crack at it. That is no news to you. You have heard me say that for years.

Mr. MURRAY. I know you and I are in perfect disagreement about that philosophy, and I want to express my point of view on this matter now.

You urge that there should be collective bargaining. All right. What do you do when you do not have any collective bargaining? What do you do when you cannot strike? What do you do when you do not exercise the right through the use of your economic strike as a result of collective bargaining? What do you do when the country interposes itself from the standpoint of either seizure or use of an injunction? What do you do when you are told that under no circumstances can you stop the production of steel? What do you do when you are completely frustrated every step you take in the field of collective bargaining? What are the people supposed to do under these circumstances? Five separate times in this particular situation, due to the urgency of our national needs here, the steelworkers, in response to requests from the President of the United States, have postponed strike action on these questions. What happens? Disagreement ensues. A strike is about to take place. The President says to the steelworkers' union, "You must not strike." An important decision has to be made by the steelworkers' union. True, it is thinking of Korea, true it is thinking of communism, true it is thinking of this world conflict, true it is thinking of the importance of the constant production of steel to meet the needs of our Nation and our allies. Hence, we have no collective bargaining. You cannot by any stretch of the imagination use your economic power. So what happens?

The President of the United States addresses a communication to the industry and one to the union, and he says, "Let us have no quarreling or bickering about this. Let us have no stoppage in the production of steel. The country needs steel. Whatever you are quarreling about, take it to the Wage Stabilization Board, and I can assure you that whatever your disputes may be that have been properly certified to the Board, they will be passed upon on the basis of their merit."

I started out by building the premise here upon which the Board assumed its jurisdiction. The jurisdiction of the Wage Stabilization Board did not come about as a result of a Presidential dictum, but rather a recommendation from the President's Advisory Board to him. He accepted their recommendation. All right. When the dispute went to the Wage Stabilization Board in this situation, all of it went. The dispute was not segregated. The President did not say, "You can take up for settlement with the Wage Stabilization Board a paragraph about military service, seniority, about incentives, about wages," but the President said, "You can take all of your dispute. It is a package. Take it there."

The companies received the same communication I received. I did not want to go to the Government. I like to bargain these issues out, even to the point of where disagreement ensues, exercising what I believe to be our God-given right to strike. But when inhibitions operate that definitely preclude the use of your economic power, and in the national interest you submit your dispute to an impartial tribunal, that is all you can do. So we did that, we did that under the rule, Senator MORSE. We had only one rule to govern us, and that was the code prescribed for the Government of the

Wage Stabilization Board's conduct by the regulations set up for it. And so we took all of our dispute over there.

The companies took the dispute over there. The union took its dispute over there. The companies disagreed with the union about the union shop before the Wage Stabilization Board, but they had a lengthy legal submission on the whole matter. They submitted their case to this court. The union submitted its case. The company said that they did not believe that the decision of the Board could be made mandatory on anything. That is true. But they added that any recommendation that the Board might make with respect to the union shop or any other matter would be sufficiently compelling to require the parties to negotiate an agreement upon its basis.

Now, I can understand, Senator Morse, the very sincere and natural objections that you may have to things of this description being done where there has been collective bargaining. But in major industry that affects the national interest, particularly in the steel industry, naked experience is more realistic than any other kind of philosophy that either you or I may care to advance. We were confronted with the realities of life here, the facts of life. The fact then was that our organization in a state of complete desperation to meet the needs of the American people postponed its strike for a period of 99 days, and it did so voluntarily in the hope that agreement could be reached by collective bargaining. This is the 23d day of April. It is now 122 days since this dispute originated, and we have gone through that tortuous period of examination before a board, and when our union decided to go before this Board over here in the city of Washington to submit its case, it assumed terrific hazards, hazards because the lives and the health and the welfare of 2,000,000 people were directly involved, 850,000 of them actually employed in the industry.

What do you do under conditions such as this? Do you expose your organization to a national strike where the stoppage of the production of steel might endanger our national defense effort, or do you comport yourself to the wishes of your Government and its people, and take your case before a tribunal. That is what we did.

I have submitted irrefutable evidence here that is not susceptible to any type of successful contradiction, that at no stage of these proceedings did we have bargaining upon anything, including the union shop. It is true that at one stage of the proceedings in the city of Pittsburgh, while the negotiation committee was to meet with the United States Steel Co., Mr. Stephens said, "Well, if you want the union shop, how much are you prepared to give for it." The principle. That type of bartering. Principle. We took our case, it was the only thing we could do, and we took all of it, all of the matters that were certified legally, to the Wage Stabilization Board, and we left ourselves at the mercy of that Board. And the Board made its recommendations, and I swear to God that is above me in this room in this day, as I breathe and I live, I did not like the Wage Stabilization Board's recommendations. I expressed my very sincere displeasure about them, but I accepted them. And in accepting them, I compromised the position of 850,000 steelworkers in the national interest again, done in the national interest, done in the interest of our people.

Yes, the Wage Stabilization Board has made its recommendations on union shop and other matters. It has made its recommendations within the framework of its policies and the regulations established for the conduct of its affairs, and the steelworkers have accepted them. When we will even get them, or any part of them, I do not know.

We have a group of people, Senator Morse, who are aroused. They are indignant; they are back home today. They have suffered their loss of their wage increases that should have been given them January 1, and they are suffering because their wage standards are lagging, lagging, lagging behind comparable industries all over the United States.

Senator MORSE, Mr. Chairman.
Mr. MURRAY. I say to you frankly and candidly, Senator, whatever differences you and I may have, I know they are of the nature that is sincere. But I should point up for the information of the committee, appreciating the sincerity of your position in these matters, that we are in no position to collectively bargain with this industry. We have not been. I do not know how we can. The only bargaining that we have had has been the bargaining before the Wage Stabilization Board. That is the bargaining. We were thrust before the Wage Stabilization Board by our Government, perhaps rightfully so. I am not one of those citizens that take occasion to quarrel with my Government where there is a grave national interest involved in the matter. I am prepared to assume all of the hazards incident to the statements I make here this morning when I say to the millions of organized workers in the national CIO and the steelworkers, no matter what my individual responsibilities may be that run to the members that pay dues to these organizations, my prime interest is in my country, and were it not, I would not be before this Senate committee this afternoon, and I would not have been before a Wage Stabilization Board. I would not be arguing about this thing. So please believe me that we have taken recourse to everything that we could take recourse to under these circumstances to reach agreement with this industry.

Senator MORSE, Mr. Chairman, I want to say something for just a minute or two, because I do not think Mr. Murray asked any rhetorical questions. He and I do not carry on discussions on the basis of rhetorical questions.

Mr. MURRAY. No.
Senator MORSE. He is very sincere in his statement. I am glad he made his statement. I am glad to have it in the record. But I want to say very briefly what I think the matter of public policy in issue really is, and I recognize the position in which Mr. Murray, as the leader of a great union, finds himself in a time of emergency in regard to the various issues coming before the Board. But he asks me what would I do on such matters as this union shop issue, and I will tell him what I would do as a representative of the Government. It is no criticism of what the union has done. If I were Mr. Murray and I could get a board to assume jurisdiction over a union security matter, such as the union shop, and I could get the employers to submit to that jurisdiction and go to a decision on an agreement that whatever the recommendation of the board would be would be binding upon me, I would consider that I had not only served my union well, but I had won a great gain for the union.

But the point I want to stress is that I think Mr. Murray and his union and every other union is in exactly the same spot in this emergency that they were in during World War II, because I happen to hold to the point of view that I think the situation is just about as serious as World War II, in view of the developments on the international front. And therefore, as a matter of public policy, I think it is the duty of the Government when they place restraints upon a union and employer as far as locking out and striking is concerned—and those restraints are on these people today just as strongly as though we had a so-called national no-strike, no-lock-out agreement, or had a law that forbid strikes or lock-outs

during the emergency—I think as Mr. Murray has said, the moral obligation is there to keep production going. But there are some basic questions of public policy that I do not think can be ignored in time of an emergency. My answer to his question what would I do if I were a member of a board, I would take the position that during the period of the emergency, I would not let an employer destroy a union, and I would not let a union take advantage of the emergency to get through the Government the type of shop it did not have before the emergency started. I would say for the duration, boys, that issue is out, unless you can reach that one by voluntary agreement. But we will follow a policy that will protect your status, and we will not let the employer destroy you.

I am inclined to think that if you were given protection on the economic front, if your wages and your hours were protected, if you get a fair decision from the Government on those, and your union status as it existed at the beginning of the emergency were protected, you would come through the emergency not with a weak union, but with a strong union.

Therefore, I would say, Mr. Murray, I would hold you, as far as the Government mandate is concerned, to exactly the kind of shop you had when you went into the emergency.

Mr. MURRAY. I want to point out a little inconsistency in what you say, Senator.

Senator MORSE. All right; let us hear it.
Mr. MURRAY. You were on the Board in 1942, when you gave the steelworkers maintenance of membership and union security, were you not?

Senator MORSE. I was. I fought for it.
Mr. MURRAY. There was a war on. There was a union security proposition before your Board at that time.

Senator MORSE. That is right.
Mr. MURRAY. It was a world war.
Senator MORSE. And we took the position—

Mr. MURRAY. And you took the position that the steelworkers should be given union security.

Senator MORSE. No, that you could not have a union shop, you could not have a closed shop, and the employer could not have an open shop; what we would try to do was to work out an agreement that would protect your security and union maintenance.

Mr. MURRAY. I think, Senator—

Senator MORSE. Union maintenance was the agreement. Nobody had to join a union.

Mr. MURRAY. In the most friendly fashion imaginable, I think you are a little inconsistent there.

Senator MORSE. Look at the facts. Did anybody have to join your union?

Mr. MURRAY. Well, of course, if a man joined a union, he had to stay.

Senator MORSE. We did not make anyone join the union.

Mr. MURRAY. You changed the status—

Senator MORSE. We told you—

Mr. MURRAY. Because you required under your rule at that time, Senator—let us be frank about it—

Senator MORSE. We told you what our policy would be.

Mr. MURRAY. I do not want to get into an argument.

Senator MORSE. We said you cannot have a union shop and you did not get one.

Mr. MURRAY. Wait a minute. All right, we did not, but you changed the status during the war. We had no maintenance of membership, Senator.

Senator MORSE. We protected your security because you could not strike.

Mr. MURRAY. Wait a minute. You know what you said. You said, "I am going to change your status, Mr. Murray, and give you a better form of union security because everybody that joins your union now has to

stay and stay put." We did not have that before.

Senator MORSE. If he decides to join.

Mr. MURRAY. Well, before that he did not have to, you see.

Senator MORSE. But that is the question of public policy we faced in protecting union status from open-shop drives by employers. It was a far cry from a union shop.

Mr. MURRAY. But you did make a declaration of public policy on that.

Senator MORSE. Sure we did make a declaration of public policy to not let the employer break you with an open shop, and not let you impose on the employer either a union or closed shop, and it is a public policy that stood the test.

Mr. MURRAY. Let me point this up, and I am not going to get into any argument, with Senator MORSE, of all people in the world.

Senator MORSE. We do not disagree on that.

Mr. MURRAY. At any rate, Senator, you and I are the type of people that like to comport ourselves to the rules of the game, do we not?

Senator MORSE. We insist on it.

Mr. MURRAY. We have a rule in this man's country. It is not the purpose, or I do not suppose that it is your purpose to make your change in rules retroactive, that is, your suggested change. For example, the rule of the game for the present is that the Board can rightfully assume jurisdiction over problems affecting union shop. You do not disagree with me about that?

Senator MORSE. No, we had that jurisdiction, too.

Mr. MURRAY. I know, but the Board has that jurisdiction.

Mr. GOLDBERG. You asserted it actually last time.

Mr. MURRAY. Wait a minute. They have that rule. That is the rule we comport ourselves to. That is the kind of game we play now, everybody. Everybody has got to comport himself to the rules. So in comporting ourselves to these rules, we go to the Wage Board with these matters, and the Board under the rules exercise the right to assume jurisdiction.

Senator MORSE. I do not question that.

Mr. MURRAY. Then what is all the argument about?

Senator MORSE. I am raising the question, however, of the over-all public policy—

Mr. MURRAY. But you are not raising the question that affects the rule of the Wage Stabilization Board in this case.

Senator MORSE. I think they have jurisdiction over the union-shop issue. I do not question that. But I question the wisdom of coming forward with a policy that results in effect in having the Government impose a union shop, because I think it is publicly unacceptable.

Senator DOUGLAS. Mr. Chairman, may I ask the Senator from Oregon a question?

Senator MORSE. Surely.

The CHAIRMAN. Yes, you may. We like to have a little diversion once in a while.

Mr. MURRAY. I will get a breath of fresh air now.

Senator DOUGLAS. I would like to ask the Senator from Oregon whether he would object to having the question as to whether or not the union shop should be put into effect submitted to an election of the workers involved; that is, the election not to give the union the right to propose the union shop, as was the original provision of the Taft-Hartley, but as to whether or not the union shop shall go into effect. So that if the vote was favorable, it would not be imposed by the Government. It would not necessarily result from collective bargaining—

Mr. MURRAY. We had that kind of an election, Senator. In the steel industry.

Senator MORSE. Of course, I think the answer to the question of the Senator from Illinois is that the question itself ignores one whole side of the public-policy feature,

namely, the managerial side of the question. Do you want to put the vote to the employers, too, and if they both vote for it, then apply it?

Senator DOUGLAS. No. Then you get back into collective bargaining.

Senator MORSE. Surely; that is where I think you ought to have it.

Senator DOUGLAS. The issue as to whether or not an employer would bargain with the union was originally a matter of collective bargaining. The question as to whether or not certain labor practices should be outlawed was originally a matter of collective bargaining. By the Wagner Act these were made conditions antecedent prior to collective bargaining. The query that I am raising now is whether the question of the union shop, not the closed shop, might not be made a condition outside either Government arbitration or collective bargaining, as to the question whether the workers themselves wish it, subject to certain precautions so that it will not be a closed union, subject possibly to protection of individual members once they are in the union.

Senator MORSE. That would be balanced fairly only on condition that the employer was a party to an agreement to that kind of an election and said that if they vote for a union shop, we will put it in our plant.

Senator HUMPHREY. I want to get my interpretation of this, because this is not something new before this committee. I generally agree with my able and distinguished colleague and friend from Oregon, Senator MORSE, but in this issue I was prone to disagree long before he presented this argument. We have discussed this before. Senator MORSE, along with the rest of us, is a member of the committee which published the report which had only one dissent, the individual views of Mr. TAFT, which are here in this report, and I want to read to him a sentence in reference—

Senator MORSE. Do not tell me you have a sleeper in there.

Senator HUMPHREY. There is no such thing as a sleeper in the report from a committee on which the Senator from Oregon is a member. I guarantee you that. It is impossible. He knows every word. This report is the result of a series of hearings before a Subcommittee on Labor and Labor-Management Relations when we had Mr. Wilson in, Dr. Taylor, Eric Johnston, Dr. Fleming, and other individuals that were concerned with the decision which had been arrived or the recommendation which had been arrived at by the Mobilization Advisory Committee, and its recommendation to the President. We went into the dispute powers of the Wage Stabilization Board, its economic and its noneconomic aspects or functions. I quote:

"Another point at issue was whether the Board should handle noneconomic disputes, and in the case of the chamber of commerce's position, as expressed at our hearings, the handling of economic disputes which could not require action by the Wage Stabilization Board under its wage regulations. In our judgment, the realities of collective bargaining are such that it would be unrealistic to isolate economic from noneconomic disputes as appropriate subjects of Wage Stabilization Board handling. When the union and management bargain, they bargain on a package basis, which includes both economic and noneconomic matters."

Now, I also recall that in the hearings on this there was considerable discussion, and we discussed the so-called package aspect of the presentation of the grievances to the Wage Stabilization Board. As I see it, in this case, the issue as to whether or not the union shop or maintenance of membership or seniority, whatever the issue may be, that issue as to whether the Wage Stabilization Board had powers to act in that field has

already been settled. It was settled by the Executive order. It was settled by the fact that the Lucas amendment in the House of Representatives was defeated. It was settled by the fact that a similar amendment which was proposed in the Senate was not called up for debate or action because of the defeat in the House. It is clear public policy that the Wage Stabilization Board was to have both economic and noneconomic dispute functions and powers.

Now, the President certifies this dispute to the Wage Stabilization Board. What is the dispute? Let us assume that there was only one thing that was in disagreement. Let us assume you had agreed on wages. Let us assume you had agreed on differential pay, premium pay, incentives. Let us assume that you had agreed on everything but the No. 1 issue which threatened the public security because of the cessation of steel production was the union shop. Let us assume that was the only issue.

Now, I ask my friend from Oregon, if the only issue was the union-shop issue, and yet that was a big enough issue to compel a stoppage of work under the Executive order, under the interpretation of public policy from that Executive order, what would the Wage Stabilization Board do if you did not want a strike? Let us assume that this was the only issue and it easily could be. There have been strikes over less than a union-shop issue. In other words, is the union shop to be ignored?

Senator MORSE. I can give you a very brief reply.

Senator HUMPHREY. Good.

Senator MORSE. First, this paragraph I recall in the report. I agree with that paragraph. It is not my position on the union-shop issue that a board should not take jurisdiction over the so-called noneconomic issues. Contrary, they have to take jurisdiction over noneconomic issues as well as economic issues. The War Labor Board had such jurisdiction, too. We could have adopted a policy of closed shop and union shop. But we adopted a policy which pointed out that it would be very unfair to take advantage of an emergency situation in which employers were not free to lock-out and workers were not free to strike, and they certainly had a moral obligation to do neither, to then impose upon them a kind of employer-worker arrangement that certainly I think ought to be limited entirely to collective bargaining.

Senator HUMPHREY. I understand and appreciate that point of view.

Senator MORSE. My second point is that all I am saying is that as a matter of public policy in an emergency, I do not think the Government should say to the parties, "This closed or union shop you must accept."

Now, your hypothetical: Suppose you got a situation in which you are going to have a strike unless the Government yields to a demand for a union shop, and suppose you accept my other premise, that as a matter of public policy, it is not sound for the Government to impose it upon the employer. Then, believe me, I would use all the force of Government possible to stop that strike, if I adopted the policy that it was not in the interest of public policy to grant a union shop. I think Phil Murray and his union will be so much stronger if they get their union shop eventually by collective bargaining than by way of this Government decision that I am going to continue to say I think as a matter of public policy they should not get it by Government order.

Senator HUMPHREY. Let me say to the Senator from Oregon that if one is willing to accept his assumptions, if one is willing to accept the predicated assumptions he has, then, of course, you come out to the logic of his conclusion. But the simple fact of the matter is that the Wage Stabilization Board, in accepting and being given power to handle

disputes, both economic and noneconomic, did not have any proviso. It did not say provided that you do not talk about union shop, provided that you do not talk about seniority. It was an open-end agreement, so to speak, or an open-end grant of power to the Wage Stabilization Board.

Now, I want to say this in deference to the Senator, that he is not speaking about what the realities are. He is saying if he had his way, if he could have drawn up the Executive order, that he would not have permitted this to happen, and I think that is a plausible argument. I am not denying that. But the fact of the matter is, Senator, you did not have your way. I did not have my way. What actually happened is that the advisory board recommended to the President, the President sent down an Executive order, that Executive order was debated in the Congress, in the Lucas amendment in the House. It was defeated and withdrawn in the Senate of the United States, so public policy has been established. That is my position.

Now, I want to say further, maintenance of membership in 1942 was a new type of union security handed down by the War Labor Board, and it was as big an advance in 1942 as union shop is in 1952, which has been agreed to by the Congress of the United States, even in the Taft-Hartley law, where you have certain provisions for the union shop.

Senator MORSE. My dear Senator, when you protect the status quo, you are not adopting a new policy. You are just maintaining a status quo.

MUTUAL SECURITY ACT OF 1952

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 1505, Senate bill 3086.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will state the bill by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 3086) to amend the Mutual Security Act of 1951, and for other purposes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Arizona.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 3086), to amend the Mutual Security Act of 1951, and for other purposes.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the call of the roll be rescinded, and that further proceedings in connection with the call of the roll be dispensed with.

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

Mr. WELKER. Mr. President, on behalf of myself, the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], the Senator from Montana [Mr. ECTON], the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER], the Senator from Utah [Mr. BENNETT], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. DWORSHAK], the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER], the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BUTLER], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MALONE], and the Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER], I send to the desk an amendment to cut the Mutual Security Act of 1951 by \$1,000,000,000.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is the Senator from Idaho offering the amendment?

Mr. WELKER. I offer the amendment, to be printed and lie on the table.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is the Senator from Idaho actually offering the amendment, to be pending; or is he merely presenting the amendment, to have it printed and to lie on the table?

Mr. WELKER. Mr. President, I offer the amendment.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will be printed, and be considered as the pending question.

The amendment offered by Mr. WELKER, for himself and other Senators, is as follows:

On page 3, line 2, strike out "\$3,620,317,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$3,095,634,000."

On page 3, line 15, strike out "\$1,588,922,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$1,358,644,000."

On page 4, lines 9 and 10, strike out "\$529,614,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$452,858,000."

On page 4, line 20, strike out "\$48,038,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$41,076,000."

On page 5, line 4, strike out "\$56,772,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$48,544,000."

On page 5, line 7, strike out "\$66,380,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$56,760,000."

On page 5, line 20, strike out "\$533,859,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$456,488,000."

On page 6, line 5, strike out "\$356,354,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$304,708,000."

On page 8, line 2, strike out "\$54,501,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$46,602,000."

On page 8, line 4, strike out "\$19,215,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$16,430,000."

On page 10 line 9, strike out "\$8,734,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$7,468,000."

On page 10, line 25, strike out "\$2,446,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$2,092,000."

On page 14 line 18, strike out "\$14,848,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$12,696,000."

Mr. WELKER. Mr. President, on behalf of myself, the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], the Senator from Montana [Mr. ECTON], the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER], the Senator from Utah [Mr. BENNETT], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. DWORSHAK], the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER], the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BUTLER], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MALONE], and the Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER], I now submit an amendment cutting the Mutual Security Act of 1951 in the sum of \$500,000,000.

The VICE PRESIDENT. At this time, that amendment can only be printed and lie on the table.

Mr. WELKER. I so understand.

The VICE PRESIDENT. That will be done.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, unless some Senator wishes to speak at this time, I am about to suggest a recess.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arizona yield to me?

Mr. McFARLAND. I yield.

Mr. DWORSHAK. I canceled engagements in my home State for today and tomorrow because I believed the veracity of the majority leader to be unchal-

lengeable. However, I understand that now, at 12:35 p. m., on Friday, it is proposed that the Senate take a recess until Monday. Is that correct?

Mr. McFARLAND. Yes; that is our program. We had before us, for consideration today, the housing bill, which we were informed would require 1 or 2 days of debate before it could be passed. However, that bill was disposed of in less than 30 minutes.

Now, the mutual-security bill has been made the unfinished business, but there does not seem to be present any Senator who wishes to speak on the bill at this time.

Thus, it would seem that the only thing for us to do now would be to take a recess.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Why do we not proceed to vote on the bill?

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, will the majority leader yield to me?

Mr. McFARLAND. I yield.

Mr. CONNALLY. The original schedule was to have the mutual-security bill considered today, but, on the importunities of the Senator from Arizona, the majority leader, and other Senators, we agreed not to have that bill come before the Senate until Monday, because it was desired to have the Senate consider, first, the housing bill.

Now, because the housing bill has unexpectedly been passed in a short time, whereas it was believed that today would be spent in windjamming, some Senators desire, contrary to agreement to proceed with the consideration of the mutual-security bill.

I have notified many members of the Foreign Relations Committee and other Senators that the mutual-security bill would not be taken up until Monday. The Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH], who is a very strong advocate of the bill as it now stands, has made, upon those assurances, an appointment to speak in New Jersey today. Therefore he cannot be here today, inasmuch as he will be in New Jersey.

So, Mr. President, I insist on standing by the original agreement, namely, that on Monday we proceed with the mutual-security bill.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. President, will the majority leader yield to me?

Mr. McFARLAND. I yield.

Mr. DWORSHAK. I think other Senators have a right to insist that we follow the schedule originally announced by the majority leader, which was not only that we would have evening sessions this week, but also that we would be in session on Saturday. Is not that what the majority leader announced?

Mr. McFARLAND. Originally I did give notice in regard to a Saturday session, but I qualified it by saying, "If we do not finish the immigration bill before then." Under those circumstances, inasmuch as the announcement was qualified in that way, some Senators now object to having a Saturday session.

It was thought that the defense housing bill could be disposed of today, but that it would require some time. I first said the Senate would meet at 10 o'clock today. However, Senators expressed the opinion that the defense housing bill could be passed easily within half a day.

So the Senate met at 12 o'clock. Instead of requiring a half day, the bill was disposed of within a few minutes. I gave notice that the disposition of the defense housing bill would be followed by consideration of the mutual security bill. Senators have not expected that a vote would be taken upon that bill today; but I should have liked very much to have speeches or statements made today on it. I cannot always know, nor can any other Senator, just how long it will take to consider and dispose of a bill. There is other proposed legislation which I should be happy to have the Senate proceed with, except that it is customary to give advance notice when measures are to be taken up.

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

Mr. McFARLAND. I yield to the Senator from Idaho.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Is it not true that, 2 weeks ago, when the senior Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND] made a motion to refer the mutual security bill to the Armed Services Committee, the majority leader and other Senators criticized, if they did not condemn, those who supported the motion, charging that it would cause unnecessary delay in the consideration of this important measure? Is that not true?

Mr. McFARLAND. That is true; and it did not necessarily delay it. It has also delayed the work of the Senate. Had I known, or had there been any way in the world for me to know, that the defense housing bill would require not more than 30 minutes, we would now be considering the mutual security bill, which has been made the unfinished business. If any Senator desires to speak on it, I shall be glad to have him do so. But I repeat, it is impossible for me to know in advance how much time will be required for the consideration and disposition of a bill. It was stated that it would probably take 2 days to consider and dispose of the defense housing bill.

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

Mr. McFARLAND. I yield.

Mr. DWORSHAK. If Senators who a few weeks ago supported the motion to refer the Mutual Security Act were necessarily delaying action on that vital measure, is it not true that those who today take the position that we can wait until Monday to proceed with the consideration of the pending bill are likewise necessarily delaying its consideration?

Mr. McFARLAND. No, Mr. President. The pending bill is in a different situation. The House is presently considering similar legislation, and quite a number of Senators wanted to wait until the House had acted on it. The House, I presume, will dispose of its bill on the same subject today. That makes the situation altogether different than would ordinarily be the case.

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

Mr. McFARLAND. I yield.

Mr. DWORSHAK. What is there that can be done to better advantage on Monday or Tuesday than today and tomorrow?

Mr. McFARLAND. Oh, I agree with my distinguished friend that the Senate should be working today.

Mr. DWORSHAK. And also tomorrow, as the majority leader advised us. That notice has resulted in the cancellation of numerous engagements on the part of those of us who have very rare opportunities to return to our respective States, some of which are located 2,500 miles away from Washington. It is unfair to have notice given us that the Senate would be in session Friday, Friday evening, and Saturday, and then to change the entire program.

Mr. McFARLAND. I may say to the Senator from Idaho that the notice which was given in regard to a session on Saturday was not definite. Had it been a definite notice, the Senate would hold a session on Saturday. However, the notice in regard to a Saturday session was qualified. We were to meet on Saturday, if in the meantime we had not disposed of the immigration bill. Possibly the Senator from Idaho knows of a better way of obtaining the presence of Senators on the floor than I have been able to discover, but I venture to say he would find it very difficult to obtain a quorum in the Senate today.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. President, I am merely contending that to change the program now is unfair to Members of the Senate who canceled engagements in their home States in order to be present for the consideration of important business in the Senate. If we are to make a practice of failing to adhere to announced programs, if we not only change a program with respect to a session on Saturday, but also change an announced program for Friday, by sitting not longer than 30 or 40 minutes, then I ask in all sincerity, how shall we be able to rely hereafter upon programs announced by the majority leader? When may we be sure that we are free to make engagements without a probability of having to cancel them later? Can the majority leader advise us in that regard?

Mr. McFARLAND. As the majority leader is able to rely upon Senators, just as the Senator from Idaho may rely upon the majority leader.

Mr. President, I resent any inference that the Senator from Idaho cannot rely upon announcements made by the majority leader, merely because we have taken up a bill and have disposed of it sooner than had been expected. Possibly the distinguished Senator from Idaho would still like to speak on the defense-housing bill, and take all day on it. If so, I should be willing to have him do so.

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

Mr. McFARLAND. I yield.

Mr. DWORSHAK. I had no intention of casting any reflection upon the integrity or veracity of the majority leader. I was merely trying to assist him in adhering to a rigid schedule designed to expedite the transaction of the business of the Senate, in order that Congress might adjourn before Christmas.

Mr. McFARLAND. The Senator from Idaho has been most helpful in that regard. I may say that if every other Senator were as cooperative as the Senator

from Idaho has been, Congress would be able to adjourn soon. I understand his position. Like certain other Senators, he lives a long way from Washington. Some Senators do not live far away, and when Friday afternoon comes they disappear. If I could have my way about it, I should like at this time to proceed with the consideration of the pending bill.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. McFARLAND. I yield to the Senator from Virginia.

Mr. ROBERTSON. The majority leader will recall that before the recess was taken yesterday the junior Senator from Virginia said that the defense housing bill was in his opinion a conservative bill, that our committee were virtually unanimous in reporting it, and that the Senator from Virginia anticipated neither extended debate nor the offering of many amendments to the bill today. Everyone who was present when the Senate recessed last evening, or who has had the opportunity of consulting the program as it appears today in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, knows that the majority leader had announced that the mutual security bill would follow disposition of the defense housing bill. I feel that the majority leader is eminently correct in his insistence that we proceed with the consideration of that proposed legislation today.

The majority leader indicated tentatively that, if the consideration of the immigration bill were unduly delayed, there might be a session on Saturday.

However, following the disposition of the immigration bill, he indicated that the Senate would not be in session on Saturday, but that we would today proceed with the consideration of the Mutual Security Act of 1952. I think he is very right in insisting that that program be followed.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, yesterday afternoon, before the Senate recessed, I expressed the hope that the Senate would make good progress in the consideration of the mutual security bill today, provided the defense housing bill was passed in the meantime. I knew that certain Senators did not desire to speak today on the mutual security bill; and, incidentally, I did not think we would reach a vote on that bill on Saturday. Of course, Mr. President, if those who are in charge of legislation do not want to go forward, I have no way of compelling them to do so. That is all there is to it.

JET TRANSPORT AIRCRAFT

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, last week I had the honor of testifying before the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, with regard to my bill S. 2344, to provide for the payment of a construction differential subsidy to American flag international air carriers. In the course of my testimony, I took occasion to express my views upon the attitude of the Air Force, so far as their attitude was ascertainable, with respect to the development of jet transport aircraft for civil aviation.

From the Acting Secretary of the Air Force, I have received a letter which I think will prove of substantial interest to many of my colleagues. Therefore, I now ask unanimous consent that this letter may be printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

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

DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE,
Washington, May 16, 1952.

HON. PAT McCARRAN,
United States Senate.

DEAR SENATOR McCARRAN: I have carefully noted your testimony appearing in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for May 14, which you gave before the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce on the development of jet transport aircraft, and I am writing to you to clarify the Air Force position in this regard.

The Air Force has long recognized the necessity for the United States to retain its position of leadership in civil aviation, and has consistently supported efforts to achieve such leadership. Our position has been that the Department of Defense should cooperate in the development of jet transport aircraft for civil aviation in a manner and to the extent consistent with its overall responsibilities. Such development should not, of course, interfere with existing defense programs, nor involve Department of Defense funds.

It is my understanding that the position of the Department of Defense is that it generally favors adequate prototype jet transport development at any time that it can be carried on without interfering with the critically important military aviation program.

Assuming that such interference is avoidable under existing circumstances, it is my personal belief that steps looking toward the development of a suitable jet transport for civil aviation could be initiated at this time.

Sincerely yours,

R. L. GILPATRICK,
Acting Secretary of the Air Force.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, the important thing in this letter is the statement that the Department of Defense takes the position of favoring the development of prototype jet transport aircraft; and that the Acting Secretary of the Air Force believes that steps looking toward the development of a suitable jet transport for civil aviation could be initiated at this time.

AMENDMENT TO SECTION 8 OF THE CIVIL SERVICE RETIREMENT ACT OF 1930

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, I should like to serve notice that I am interested in a bill which I shall ask to have considered by the Senate after the unfinished business has been concluded, or as soon thereafter as the majority leader will permit it to be taken up. I refer to Calendar No. 1408, Senate bill 2968, to amend section 8 of the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended. It is a bill sponsored by the junior Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS] and the junior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. DUFF]. It was reported unanimously by the Committee on Postoffice and Civil Service. When it was reached on the last call of the calendar, some Senator ob-

jected, and it was stated at that time that we should give the bill a little further study than could be afforded in 5 minutes, to which I agreed. But I believe we can consider and dispose of the bill in 30 minutes at any time the majority leader thinks it can be brought up for consideration.

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

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I yield.

Mr. BRIDGES. Is it not a bill that will increase tremendously the cost of the Retirement Act?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. It will increase the cost approximately \$60,000,000 over a term of years.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, will the Senator from South Carolina yield?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I yield.

Mr. SMATHERS. The bill would not require any new appropriation; the money would come out of the funds set aside by the civil-service workers. They have a fund of \$4,500,000,000. The provisions of the bill are to apply for a period of 2 years or until a commission is established to decide whether such funds can be used in the future.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. It is provided that if the cost of living drops below what it was in April 1948 the increase is automatically cut off.

Mr. BRIDGES. Let me say to the Senator from South Carolina and the Senator from Florida that I listened this morning, on the Appropriations Committee, to testimony concerning the civil service retirement fund; and I have read something about it. According to the information I received, it must be watched carefully, because there is apprehension on the part of many persons who are contributing to civil-service retirement as to what may happen to the integrity of the fund if it is not safeguarded. I can think of no more disillusioning thing that could happen to retired civil-service employees than to have the fund dissipated. While the bill may be a very fine bill, and for aught I know, it is, I do think it should be carefully considered. I should want to know more about it than I know today.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. We have done for railroad men practically the same thing the bill provides, and it has been done for the military.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator from South Carolina yield?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I should like to substantiate what the Senator from New Hampshire has said. The House appropriated \$321,000,000 which is substantially under the amount which will have to be paid out if interest is to be included. Actually, Mr. Ramspeck estimates that \$321,709,000 will be the required cash disbursement from the fund this year. The House appropriated only \$321,000,000; the Senate subcommittee this morning voted to restore \$709,000 to bring the amount up to the actual cash disbursement.

If I correctly understand the bill, it would add approximately \$62,000,000.

We have not appropriated enough money; I think what the Senator wants is perfectly proper, but I believe we should consider the bill very carefully in view of what the House has done with relation to the appropriation this year.

I ask the Senator from New Hampshire if I have correctly stated the situation.

Mr. BRIDGES. I think the Senator from Massachusetts made a correct statement. The point I want to make is that it would be a cruel disillusionment if we should allow the integrity of the fund to be impaired. The Senate committee had to add to the amount appropriated by the House in order to bring it up sufficiently to meet the payments this year. Therefore, while the objective sought is ideal, I think, nevertheless, because of the jeopardy of the fund, I should like to have the bill looked over very carefully.

The VICE PRESIDENT. There is no request pending before the Senate in regard to the bill.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I am not asking at the present time that the bill be considered, but I serve notice on the Senate that I want it taken up and discussed at an early date. We fully realize that the Government will have to pay into the fund sums in the future as in the past, and probably a little bit more; but in large part the fund is provided by Government workers. So far as the workers are concerned, they are not on social security. Some persons are receiving more out of social security, into which they pay 1½ percent, than these Government workers who pay 6 percent are getting. That is the situation which is developing. I feel that every cent we pay into the fund is well spent, because the workers themselves are matching the Government contribution to a much greater extent than is being done by those under the social security.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I am not questioning what the Senator is attempting to do. As I said to the Senator from South Carolina and the Senator from Florida, for aught I know at the moment, probably they are fully justified in proposing this amendment to the law. The only thing I wish to emphasize is that the integrity of the civil-service fund, about which we have just heard testimony in the Appropriations Committee, must be preserved. I know it is a burden upon the Government from year to year. I know the House did not appropriate sufficient money to keep it in balance this year, and the Senate might have to even the amount.

For these reasons, when the bill comes before the Senate, I hope the distinguished Senator from Florida, who reported it, and the distinguished Senator from South Carolina, who is chairman of the committee, will have available all the facts and figures so that we can lay the cards on the table, consider all the circumstances, and know what we are doing.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. That is what we want to do.

Mr. SMATHERS. I may say to the Senator from New Hampshire that we

held hearings on this bill on four separate days. We had before us the Chairman of the Civil Service Commission and also the other two members of the Commission. We took testimony from both sides. We wish to maintain the integrity of the civil service fund as much as anyone else does. On the other hand, there is at the moment an inequity resulting to retired annuitants. The problem is rather complicated, and I do not think this is the time to debate it. However, we hope the majority leader will schedule the bill for an early date, so that we can debate it, bring out all the facts, and let the Senate pass upon it.

Mr. McFARLAND. If I had known that the Senate would have been free so early this afternoon, I would have given notice that the bill would be taken up this afternoon. But under the circumstances, that is not feasible.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT— APPROVAL OF BILLS

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries, and he announced that on May 21, 1952, the President had approved and signed the following acts:

S. 897. An act for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Thanos Mellos, Michel Mellos, and Hermine Fahn; and

S. 2463. An act for the relief of Harvey T. Gracely.

REPORT OF CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT (H. DOC. NO. 281)

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a message from the President of the United States, transmitting the annual report of the Civil Service Commission, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1951, which was read and referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

(For text of President's message, see House proceedings for today.)

PENSION TO CERTAIN VETERANS AND THEIR DEPENDENTS—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT (H. DOC. NO. 473)

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a message from the President of the United States, informing the Congress that he had approved the bill (H. R. 4387) to increase the annual income limitations governing the payment of pension to certain veterans and their dependents, and the bill (H. R. 4394) to provide certain increases in the monthly rates of compensation and pension payable to veterans and their dependents, and for other purposes, which was read and referred to the Committee on Finance.

(For text of President's message, see House proceedings for today.)

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 the consideration of executive business.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGE REFERRED

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a message from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which was referred to the Committee on Armed Services.

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

The VICE PRESIDENT. Reports of committees are in order. If there be none, the clerk will state the nominations on the calendar.

GOVERNOR, CANAL ZONE

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Brig. Gen. John States Seybold, United States Army, to be Governor of the Canal Zone.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

IN THE NAVY

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Navy.

Mr. McFARLAND. I ask that the nominations in the Navy be confirmed en bloc.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nominations in the Navy are confirmed en bloc.

ARMED SERVICES

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, from the Committee on Armed Services, I report favorably the nominations for promotion or original appointment of approximately 3,200 officers in the armed services.

The highest rank to which any of these officers is being promoted is the grade of major in the Army and lieutenant—junior grade—in the Navy. These nominations have been before the Committee on Armed Services for several days, and no objections have been received to the promotions or appointments of any individuals on the lists. The report of the committee is unanimous.

In order to save the expense of printing, in the Executive Calendar, all the names, I ask unanimous consent that the nominations be confirmed and the President notified.

Mr. President, ordinarily the names would have to lie over 1 day after being reported to the Senate. However, the names having already been published when the nominations were received, they have been before all Members of the Senate and have been before the committee for more than a week. In order to save the \$600 or \$800 which would have to be expended to print all 3,200 names in the executive calendar, I ask that the usual period of layover be dispensed with, and that the nominations be confirmed en bloc.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the nominations are confirmed en bloc.

The President will be immediately notified of all nominations this day confirmed.

VICE ADM. CHARLES T. JOY, UNITED STATES NAVY

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I wish briefly to call the attention of the Senate to the fact that Vice Adm. Charles T. Joy, United States Navy, whose nomination to be Superintendent of the United States Naval Academy has been confirmed today, is the Admiral Joy representing the United Nations, who has been conducting the truce negotiations in Korea for so long. I am sure a word of appreciation is in order for his long patience, his endurance, and the very fine manner in which he has carried on representing the humanities of the United Nations.

I thought it appropriate to call his special assignment to the attention of the Senate. He will soon be returning to become Superintendent of the United States Naval Academy, where I am sure he will continue his distinguished career in the naval service with credit to himself.

RECESS TO MONDAY

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, as in legislative session, I move that the Senate stand in recess until 12 o'clock noon next Monday.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 1 o'clock and 5 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess to Monday, May 26, 1952, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate May 23 (legislative day of May 12), 1952:

IN THE NAVY

The following-named women officers of the Navy for permanent promotion to the grade of lieutenant (junior grade) in the line and Supply Corps as indicated, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

LINE

Rosemarie S. Armstrong	Dolores H. Henry
Marion L. Baird	Katherine V. Iams
Emily C. Bittner	Marjorie H. Kaff
Dorothy A. Borbidge	Elizabeth A. McClean
Margaret L. Boyce	Catherine J. Miles
Claire M. Clark	Eleanor A. Ovitt
Betty M. Corredera	Elizabeth A. Read
Dorothy J. Darr	Ada Lou Reed
Barbara J. Dobson	Susan K. Reed
Nancy A. Dutton	Marjorie L. Richardson
Ludean S. Earnest	Jeanne M. Schrupf
Margaret M. Fitzgerald	Virginia D. Smith
Gloria J. Folger	Audrey R. Speckman
Leona J. Fox	Allyn E. Thompson
Jimmie E. Fralic	Alice J. Wardenga
Dorothy H. Funk	Joan E. Zook
Mary A. Hawbolt	

SUPPLY CORPS

Debbie P. Belka	Elizabeth B. McQuiston
Alys G. Dauchess	
Betty J. Emery	Patricia E. Schulze
Ruth D. Forman	

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate May 23 (legislative day of May 12), 1952:

GOVERNOR, CANAL ZONE

Brig. Gen. John States Seybold, United States Army, to be Governor of the Canal Zone.

IN THE NAVY

Vice Adm. Charles T. Joy, United States Navy, to have the grade, rank, pay, and allowances of a vice admiral while serving as Superintendent, United States Naval Academy.

Vice Adm. Robert P. Briscoe, United States Navy, to have the grade, rank, pay, and allowances of a vice admiral while serving as commander, Naval Forces, Far East.

Rear Adm. Ralph A. Ofstie, United States Navy, to have the grade, rank, pay, and allowances of a vice admiral while serving as a fleet commander.

Capt. Ira H. Nunn, United States Navy, to be Judge Advocate General of the Navy, with the rank of rear admiral, for a term of 4 years.

IN THE ARMY

The nominations of the following-named officers for appointment, by transfer, in the Judge Advocate General's Corps, Regular Army of the United States:

Maj. Richard deForest Cleverly, O21862.

Maj. Richard Farris Ludeman, O22233.

Capt. John Baker, O24704.

Capt. Frank Ovid Hamilton, O24532.

Capt. Robert Francis Maguire, O37528.

Capt. John TeSelle, O50055.

The nominations of John Edward Aber et al., for promotion in the Regular Army of the United States, under the provisions of sections 502 and 509 of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947, which were confirmed today, were received by the Senate on May 16, 1952, and appear in full in the Senate proceedings of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for that date, under the caption "Nominations," beginning with the name of Maj. Richard deForest Cleverly, which appears on page 5337, and ending with the name of Margaret Mary Shea, which appears on page 5343.

The nominations of Aloysius F. Bertrand et al., for appointment in the Regular Army, which were confirmed today, were received by the Senate on May 16, 1952, and appear in full in the Senate proceedings of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for that date, under the caption "Nominations," beginning with the name of Aloysius F. Bertrand, which appears on page 5335, and ending with the name of Amos D. Glad, which is shown on page 5337.

IN THE NAVY

The nominations of John F. Hardesty et al., for appointment in the Navy, which were confirmed today, were received by the Senate on May 15, 1952, and appear in full in the Senate proceedings of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for that date, under the caption "Nominations," beginning with the name of John F. Hardesty, which is shown on page 5242, and ending with the name of Samuel F. Leader, which is shown on page 5243.

The nominations of Craig B. Aalyson et al., for appointment in the Navy, which were confirmed today, were received by the Senate on May 12, 1952, and appear in full in the Senate proceedings of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for that date, under the caption "Nominations," beginning with the name of Craig B. Aalyson, which is shown on page 5040, and ending with the name of Marjorie Wilson, which is shown on page 5042.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

FRIDAY, MAY 23, 1952

The House met at 11 o'clock a. m.
Rev. Edward Gardiner Latch, D. D., pastor, Metropolitan Memorial Methodist Church, Washington, D. C., offered the following prayer:

O God, Our Father, who art man's rock of refuge in every age and whose creative spirit dost ever summon us to new frontiers of thought and action—we

pause in Thy presence to acknowledge our dependence upon Thee and to offer unto Thee the devotion of our hearts.

We pray that we, with all the people of our country, may be open to the leadership of Thy spirit. As man by his scientific inventions has made the world into one neighborhood, grant that he by his spiritual cooperation may make the world into one brotherhood.

Lay Thou Thy hand in blessing upon each one of us. Give us grace to keep Thy commandments, make us gentle and honest, men and women of good understanding and genuine sympathy, a company of Thy children seeking first of all Thy will for us and for our Nation.

Help us to think clearly, to speak kindly, to do justly and to live worthily. We ask these blessings in the name of Jesus Christ, who is the hope of our world, Amen.

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

REVISION OF LAWS RELATING TO IMMIGRATION, NATURALIZATION, AND NATIONALITY

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 5678) to revise the laws relating to immigration, naturalization, and nationality; and for other purposes, with Senate amendments thereto, disagree to the amendments of the Senate, and agree to the conference requested by the Senate.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none and appoints the following conferees: MESSRS. WALTER, CHELF, WILSON of Texas, DONOHUE, GRAHAM, MISS THOMPSON of Michigan, and Mr. CASE.

CHEESE POLICY

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

Mr. SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, the restrictions on imports of cheese provided for in section 104 of the Defense Production Act are not in accord with the defense needs of the United States. Our entire defense program is based on strengthening our allies and other friendly countries so that they can withstand aggression from the Soviet Union and its satellites and lessen the current defense burden borne by the American taxpayer.

Yet, in the face of this fact, and in the very law which is supposed to strengthen our own defense production, we have inserted an amendment, a joker, which actually weakens our allies and will increase the need for defense outlays on the part of our own taxpayers.

Our allies urgently need the dollars they were obtaining through their sales of cheese to this country. They need the dollars to purchase raw materials from

the world market for their own defense production. They need the dollars also in order to buy food and other products necessary to prevent civilian discontent from becoming a serious political problem. Our alliance cannot exist on empty bellies and substandard living conditions. The amount of dollars lost to our allies and other friendly countries as a result of the cheese restriction is not large, in itself, but the trend which the restrictions portend and their basic irrationality cause anxiety to our friends and feed the fires of distrust and suspicion about our ultimate objectives. Therefore I oppose section 104 of the Defense Production Act and strongly believe that it should be deleted from the 1952 version of the act.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. WIDNALL asked and was given permission to address the House for 5 minutes on Monday next, following the legislative business of the day and any special orders heretofore entered.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 83]

Aandahl	Eaton	Nelson
Albert	Engle	O'Toole
Allen, Ill.	Gamble	Patterson
Armstrong	Hale	Poulsen
Beall	Hall,	Powell
Beckworth	Leonard W.	Reams
Blatnik	Hart	Redden
Bonner	Havenner	Sabath
Bosone	Hays, Ohio	St. George
Boykin	Hébert	Sasscer
Bramblett	Herlong	Scott, Hardie
Bray	Herter	Scudder
Buffett	Hoeven	Secrest
Carlyle	Hoilfield	Sheppard
Celler	Hunter	Stigler
Chatham	Irving	Stockman
Cooley	Jackson, Calif.	Taber
Cox	Johnson	Tackett
Cunningham	Jones,	Talle
Dague	Hamilton C.	Teague
Dawson	Kearney	Vinson
Deane	Kennedy	Welch
Dempsey	Kerr	Werdell
D'Ewart	King, Calif.	Wheeler
Dingell	McGrath	Wickersham
Dondero	McKinnon	Wood, Ga.
Dorn	Miller, Calif.	Wood, Idaho
Doughton	Morris	
Doyle	Moulder	

The SPEAKER. On this roll call 347 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Landers, its enrolling clerk, announced that the Senate had passed, with an amendment in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 5678. An act to revise the laws relating to immigration, naturalization, and nationality; and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendment to the foregoing bill, requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. McCARRAN, Mr. EASTLAND, Mr. O'CONNOR, Mr. SMITH of North Carolina, Mr. WILEY, Mr. FERGUSON, and Mr. JENNER to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed a joint resolution of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. J. Res. 156. Joint resolution to continue the effectiveness of certain statutory provisions until June 15, 1952.

The message also announced that the Vice President has appointed Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina and Mr. LANGER members of the joint select committee on the part of the Senate, as provided for in the act of August 5, 1939, entitled "An act to provide for the disposition of certain records of the United States Government," for the disposition of executive papers referred to in the report of the Archivist of the United States numbered 52-21.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

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

On May 16, 1952:

H. R. 4262. An act relating to the height of the building known as 2400 Sixteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.; and

H. J. Res. 445. Joint resolution authorizing the President of the United States to proclaim the 7-day period beginning May 18, 1952, as Olympic Week.

On May 19, 1952:

H. R. 5715. An act to increase certain pay and allowances for members of the uniformed services, and for other purposes.

On May 21, 1952:

H. R. 1949. An act to retrocede to the State of Illinois jurisdiction over one hundred fifty-four and two-tenths acres of land used in connection with the Chain of Rocks Canal, Madison County, Ill.;

H. R. 2962. An act for the relief of Maude S. Burman;

H. R. 3401. An act to make certain increases in the annuities of annuitants under the Foreign Service retirement and disability system;

H. R. 4902. An act to permit the importation free of duty of racing shells to be used in connection with preparations for the 1952 Olympic Games;

H. R. 5998. An act to amend the excise tax on photographic apparatus;

H. R. 6863. An act to make provision for suitable accommodations for the Bureau of Customs and certain other Government services at El Paso, Tex., and for other purposes;

H. R. 7189. An act to amend the provisions of the Internal Revenue Code which relate to machine guns and short-barreled firearms, so as to impose a tax on the making of sawed-off shotguns and to extend such provisions to Alaska and Hawaii, and for other purposes; and

H. J. Res. 422. Joint resolution to permit articles imported from foreign countries for the purpose of exhibition at the Washington State-Far East International Trade Fair, Seattle, Wash., to be admitted without payment of tariff, and for other purposes.

On May 22, 1952:

H. R. 1499. An act to amend the act approved August 4, 1919, as amended, providing additional aid for the American Printing House for the Blind; and

H. R. 5282. An act to amend section 2800 (a) (5) of the Internal Revenue Code.

RECORDS OF THE JOINT COMMITTEE ON HOUSING

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following resolution (S. Res. 316) from the Senate.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That the House of Representatives be, and it is hereby, respectfully requested to authorize and direct the file clerk of the House to grant permission to the Subcommittee on Privileges and Elections of the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, or its counsel, to examine the records of the Joint Committee on Housing of the Eightieth Congress.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution (H. Res. 649).

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That in accordance with the request contained in Senate Resolution 316, Eighty-second Congress, the Clerk of the House shall direct the file clerk of the House to grant permission to the Subcommittee on Privileges and Elections of the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, or its counsel, to examine the records of the Joint Committee on Housing of the Eightieth Congress.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ADMINISTRATION OF GRANTS FOR SLUM CLEARANCE

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (S. 2786) to amend section 106 (c) of the Housing Act of 1949.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, will the gentleman explain the bill?

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, this is the bill which was reported unanimously by the Committee on Banking and Currency of the Senate and passed unanimously by the Banking and Currency Committee of the House.

It provides that grants for slum clearance may be made as the work progresses. It is the same system that has been authorized in Federal road construction, and airport construction, and in the National Science Foundation. It will enable municipalities to proceed with these projects and effect an economy in the administration of this law.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 106 (c) of the Housing Act of 1949 is hereby amended by striking out the word "and" at the end of paragraph (6); by striking out the period at the end of paragraph (7) and inserting in lieu thereof a semicolon and the word

"and"; and by adding the following new paragraph:

"(8) make advance or progress payments on account of any capital grant contracted to be made pursuant to this title, notwithstanding the provisions of section 3648 of the Revised Statutes, as amended, or any other provisions of this title."

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.

PROGRAM FOR WEEK OF MAY 26

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute to ask the majority leader about the program for next week.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Monday will be District day, and I have been informed that 12 bills will come up. If the gentleman wishes me to, I will list them, but I cannot guarantee they will be called up in the order in which they are presently listed:

S. 1342, detention of animals and autos until charges are paid.

S. 1533, designates a Floyd B. Olson Memorial Triangle.

S. 1822, amends juvenile court bill.

S. 2605, amends certain tax laws.

S. 2735, liens on automobiles.

S. 2736, index of mortgages, Recorder of Deeds.

S. 2871, amends section 548, Code of Laws, Recorder of Deeds.

H. R. 5768, amend Boxing Act.

H. R. 6811, increase gasoline tax.

H. R. 6557, employment of minors.

H. R. 6943, seniority rights, Fire Department.

H. R. 7253, conveyance of land to Columbia Hospital.

On Tuesday the bill, H. R. 7340, Federal Aid Road Act of 1952, will be called up for consideration.

On Wednesday and Thursday, House Joint Resolution 430, involving approval of the Puerto Rican Constitution, will be considered.

If a bill is reported out of the Committee on the Judiciary with reference to the extension of emergency statutory powers, that will be considered. I am putting it on the program. It may come up next week. I am announcing that so Members will be aware of the probability of it coming up next week.

Friday, being Memorial Day, there will be no session and, of course, that applies to Saturday also.

The usual reservation is made that any further program will be announced later and conference reports may be called up at any time.

In reference to the tidelands bill, I cannot give the House any information at this time except that if the bill is vetoed, and I have no knowledge that it will, it would have to be acted on by the Senate first.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. That bill has been sent to the President?

Mr. McCORMACK. Yes.

COMMUNICATION FROM HER MAJESTY QUEEN ELIZABETH II—LETTER FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following letter from the President of the United States, which was read:

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, May 22, 1952.

HON. SAM RAYBURN,
Speaker of the House of
Representatives.

MY DEAR MR. SPEAKER: I am transmitting herewith a copy of a letter I have received from Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth II, asking me to convey to the Members of the House of Representatives her deep appreciation for their sentiments of sympathy and their tribute to the memory of His late Majesty.

Very sincerely yours,

HARRY TRUMAN.

BUCKINGHAM PALACE, May 7, 1952.
THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA.

MR. PRESIDENT: I have received your letter dated the 4th day of March, with which you sent to me the texts of resolutions directed respectively by the United States Senate to my governments in the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland and in the other countries of the Commonwealth and by the United States House of Representatives to my government in the United Kingdom.

In thanking you for your kindness in forwarding these resolutions and for the personal sympathy which you have expressed toward me in doing so, I request that you will be good enough to convey to the Senate and the House of Representatives my deep appreciation of the sentiments to which they have given expression and of their tributes to the memory of His late Majesty.

My government in the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland have already received the texts of these resolutions from His Excellency the Ambassador of the United States of America at my court, through whose good offices their thanks have been transmitted to the Senate and the House of Representatives.

I have communicated the text of the Senate resolution to my governments in the other countries of the Commonwealth and I avail myself of this opportunity to renew to you, Mr. President, the assurances of my invariable friendship and highest esteem.

Your sincere friend,

ELIZABETH R.

MUTUAL SECURITY ACT OF 1952

MR. RICHARDS. 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. 7005) to amend the Mutual Security Act of 1951, 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. 7005, with MR. COOPER in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. When the Committee rose on yesterday the Clerk had read through section 3 of the committee amendment. Are there any further amendments to section 3?

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

MR. CHAIRMAN, in the course of discussing one of the amendments early yesterday, and earlier in the general debate a few days ago, I had a colloquy with one of my colleagues with reference to India when we were debating whether or not we were meeting with any success any place in the foreign policy of this Government and in the containment of or the fight against communism. Then last night I brought to the attention of the Committee the perilous situation as it exists today worldwide.

MR. CHAIRMAN, I brought to your attention the fact that the negotiations in Korea are now at an absolute standstill and that the Communists are threatening additional aggression there. I mentioned that General Ridgway told the Senate his staff officers had advised him that the Russians are massing on the Chinese border.

I mentioned as well the delicacy of the negotiations with Western Germany at Bonn. Then, I brought to your attention the border warfare with the Portuguese in the Macao possession of China. Now I direct your attention to the additional fact that the Russians are exerting pressure once more on Iran by bringing to your acquaintance more of the same pattern.

With reference to India, Mr. Chairman, I want to read to you this article from New Delhi, India. It is dated May 22.

NEHRU POLICIES AGAINST REDS WIN APPROVAL
NEW DELHI, INDIA, May 22.—Parliament overwhelmingly approved the Government's anti-Communist policies today after Prime Minister Nehru lashed out against Red "bigots of this new religion."

The voice vote drowned out the objections of the 27-member Communist bloc.

India "will never pay the price the Soviet Union and China have paid to achieve progress," Nehru said. He described Communist slogans and doctrines as completely out of date.

This is additional evidence, Mr. Chairman, of the clearly developing success of our foreign policy, not only in the Far East but bit by bit and step by step on the entire perimeter of the Soviets throughout the world.

MR. RIVERS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word, and ask unanimous consent to proceed out of order.

THE CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

MR. RIVERS. Mr. Chairman, West Point Academy has long afforded an education to the officers of the United States Army comparable to, if not exceeding, that of any other school of higher learning in this world. Americans everywhere take pride in the scholastic record of the Academy and in the accomplishments of the men who have been graduated therefrom. In and out of military life they have distinguished themselves in every field of enterprise.

Superficially, it does seem strange that, despite the law, the curricula, and the training afforded at West Point, the United States Department of the Air

Force, which has no special training academy of its own comparable to Annapolis and West Point, could not this year obtain its quota out of the graduating class of 1952.

Primarily, I would say that the cause of the failure of West Point to meet its Air Force quota is directly due the fact that the graduates were taught little or nothing about the Air Force. Therefore, I might ask, how could they be expected to evaluate service to the Nation of the Air Force in terms of the things it had to offer them? General Dorn himself declared that "Training at West Point was geared more to the Army than to the Air Force."

What General Dorn did not point out as one of the possible reasons was that in the full 4-year curriculum now taught at West Point there is a mere 23 hours devoted to instructions with respect to the mission, the organization, and the techniques of aviation.

There is no question but that West Point is more geared to the Army than it is to the Air Force, inasmuch as West Point Academy has turned out probably the most skilled civil, electrical, and hydraulic engineers, as well as the finest Army leaders, in the world. The monumental accomplishments of the United States Army engineers are tributes to their West Point education. The great hydroelectric dams, the massive revetments on the Mississippi and Missouri Rivers, and other flood-control projects, the highways which they have bullded throughout the world, their conquests of the swamps at Panama, and the building of the locks on the Panama Canal itself are all monuments of triumph to the might of the United States Corps of Engineers.

West Point-trained men lead the world in the development of and the fighting with tanks, antitank artillery, fixed and mobile artillery pieces, huge long-range field guns, bazookas, hand grenades, bridge building, antitank artillery, anti-aircraft artillery, and all other types of armament for offensive as well as defensive ground warfare.

No school in the world affords its pupils a greater education in preparing them for Signal Corps operations than does West Point. Skills in wired communications, telegraphy, telephony, coaxial and carrier cables, and light-weight circuits enabled our fighting forces, at the very fighting front in all theaters of World War II, to send as well as receive as many as 18 telephone messages over a single pair of telephone wires with no one voice or conversation impinging itself or interrupting any other.

In addition to extensive courses in logistics, the Academy curriculum covers the fields of mathematics, history, logic, rhetoric, literature, and languages, and is probably second to no other university course in the United States.

Personally, I cannot understand just what General Dorn actually meant when he stated that the Air Force officers at West Point are unimpressive, as compared with the Army officers. Both are graduates of the Academy. Did he mean that the Air Force officers do not have

the power to impress, the power to excite attention? Just what he actually meant, I do not know.

General Dorn further stated that "the Army officers at the Academy looked better, were more direct." By "looked better" did he mean Army officers delve deeper into subjects under study than do the Air Force officers, or did he mean that the Army officers are simply better looking? In other words, are Air Force officers uglier looking than are Army officers? If, perchance, that be the reason for the failure on the part of the Air Force to attract more volunteers from the 1952 graduating class at West Point, then the qualifications and criteria established by the Academy should be changed. They should specify that only physical attractive instructor personnel should be assigned to the Academy in the future.

Is it any wonder that when young West Point cadets visit various air bases they are unimpressed, that their visits created the impression that as young air officers there would be too much in mechanics and techniques to attract them?

Is it any wonder, therefore, that the West Point cadets at the completion of their courses select the infantry, the artillery, the engineers, the Signal Corps, or the armored services, rather than the United States Air Force? How could it be otherwise with but 23 hours of scholastic training in their entire 4-year course devoted to aviation subjects?

Every modern Air Force bomber, be it prop or jet driven, is in itself a virtual scientific laboratory flying at speeds upward of 500 or 600 miles an hour, 8 or 10 miles above the surface of the earth. There is hardly an art or a science known to man that has not been invoked in the design, construction, operation, and maintenance of the modern aircraft. Copper, tin, lead, zinc, steel, plastics of various composition, cotton, linen, ramie, silk, wood, various characteristics of electrical currents, circuits, communications, radio, radar, a veritable catalog of meters activated by alcohol, air, oil, gas, and a thousand and one other materials and gadgets are subject to the personal control of men who, at the same time, must be skilled in astronomy and navigation, the operation of radio, radar, and photography, and who sit at the stick and pilot the ship in battle high above the clouds.

Could any young man comprehend the problems of aviation and the opportunities open to them if their attention was scarcely directed to their consideration in their studies at the Academy? Certainly a pen or pencil slipped somewhere when General Dorn cited the second reason why West Point cadets did not volunteer for Air Force service when he stated:

Cadets know more about the Army and, therefore, have more confidence in it.

No more persuasive evidence could be offered showing lack of scholastic training and education in aerodynamics afforded the West Point cadet than to have graduates state that "they had no confidence in the Air Force."

Mr. Chairman, remember that this is the Air Force in which the American

people have a capital investment of billions of dollars.

Remember that this is the Air Force in which the American people have long had justifiable pride and upon which they depend in a large measure for the peace and security of this country.

Remember that this is the Air Force for which this very Congress appropriated billions, and that the words spoken in derogation thereof have been attributed by an Army spokesman to the young militarily trained men upon whom this Congress and the American people rely to administer and operate the affairs of the United States Air Force in the precarious years that lie ahead.

When certain graduates made statements that "if they chose the Air Force as a career that they would be too much in mechanics and techniques" they were on firm ground. No words could more appropriately express the minimum of training in the field of aviation afforded them at West Point than the realization on their part of their own incompetency to adequately enter upon Air Force duties. For any group of graduates, however, to state that the Air Force afforded "little or no opportunity for leadership in or out of combat" is entirely at variance with the facts and wholly indicative of their patent lack of instruction.

Certainly it is scientific knowledge, highly developed technical skills, and great physical courage that enable men to fly on wings of metal. To state that "aviation is devoid of opportunity for leadership" again shows how completely the West Point curricula and studies failed to impress upon the minds of its student body the tremendous importance of and opportunity afforded for service to this country and for leadership in its Air Force.

When a group, squadron, or flight commander leads his F-86 sabre jets up over the Yalu River in North Korea and encounters large forces of the Russian-Chinese-Communist MIG-15 jets, it is no horde or mass of pilots that win those air battles in the skies. It is altogether individual initiative, leadership, skill, intelligence, and superior training in tactics that have attained and maintained a kill ratio of eight Russian MIG-15's to one in favor of our F-86 pilots.

When a 20-year-old Air Force navigator leads a bomber formation into combat over an enemy target, who is there to gainsay the fact that he is not assuming and discharging a tremendous responsibility? Who is there who will deny the fact that the greatest leadership that can be demonstrated is exemplified by the men of the United States Air Force who stand on guard night and day to defend the 150,000,000 Americans from an attack by enemy planes and the catastrophe that would follow in the wake of such atomic attack?

Mr. Chairman, not alone is there tremendous opportunity for leadership in the air, but the Air Force has never failed to emphasize the need of a highly developed ground leadership in all ranks of service.

Air Force squadron commanders and all officers in the chain of command necessarily must have distinguished at-

tributes of leadership in order to obtain the maximum efficiency from the men in the air—the maximum efficiency in the use of all our resources, the elimination of morale problems—as well as every other requirement that might make for the greatest efficiency and economy in the operation of our great air power.

One reason attributed for the failure to obtain the Air Force quota was that "cadets were unimpressed with the so-called Air Force glamor." We who know Gen. Curtis LeMay, commanding general of the Strategic Air Command, know that he is not the type of leader who puts any glamor-happy boy at the controls of the great intercontinental bombers, our B-36's. Equally well we know that when the Air Force commanders place a quarter-million-dollar jet fighter airplane in the hands of one single lone Air Force pilot, and send him streaking at 600 or 800 miles an hour from his home base on a combat mission, that that is a serious business to be entrusted only to qualified and capable pilots.

Mr. Chairman, I want you to vision with me the enormity of the task of taking West Point or Annapolis graduates, with all of their formal education, and training them in the science of aerodynamics. Not alone do they have to have extended instruction and training in the operations of high-frequency circuits and in all forms of electronics, in the operation of the air-to-ground and air-to-air radios, but also in radar, in all phases of air combat operations, in intelligence, psychological warfare, photography, weather, communication, airplane armament, maintenance, transportation, supply, installation engineering, airplane production procurement, finance, personnel, research and development, and a veritable catalog of other subjects, not one of which was ever touched upon in the military or naval academies.

Without further elaboration, it is only logical to conclude that the Air Force has a tremendous variety of career fields which are apparently and entirely unknown to West Point graduates, and in which they could be of inestimable service both to themselves and to their country.

Mr. Chairman, we in Congress who appoint cadets to both the Naval and Military Academies of the Nation know how ardently one boy might prefer to go to the Naval Academy, while another chooses the Army as his career.

I have made appointments of boys whose ambitions from childhood had been to get in one or the other Academy. Instinctively, some boys want to serve at sea, others want to become great engineers, others want to be commanders of tank squadrons, others choose artillery and other branches of the land or naval forces. It is to be expected that if and when they pass the examinations they will find themselves in the Academy of their choice.

It seems superfluous to point out to this body that the skills afforded at West Point in bridge building, in tank warfare, in the use of light and heavy artillery, in the ground maneuvers common to the infantry, in the use of bazookas, or in

ground communications are worth little or nothing to cadets who, upon graduation from West Point, become pilots, navigators, or bombardiers, in the United States Air Force.

What this Nation needs today, over and above all other things, in order to preserve the peace of this world and insure the defenses of our country against future attack are young men who are altogether skilled and specialized and expert in flying the heavens effectively on man-made wings.

This country needs a source of highly militarily air-minded manpower that can take up and in the future efficiently operate and maintain the United States Air Force with a minimum expenditure of the taxpayers' dollars. That end, Mr. Chairman, can only be achieved through the immediate establishment of a United States Academy of the Air.

The sum of \$10,000,000 is needed in order to plan and design the academy and its necessary structures. This planning and designing is of itself a time-consuming job, but, of a certainty, it should be started at once.

Mr. Chairman, \$10,000,000 is but a small per centum of the total appropriations made by us in this session of Congress. It is an amount equal to about what the executive department will disburse every 20 minutes of every night and day in the coming year.

Ten million dollars is almost an infinitesimal sum when measured against the appropriations that we will make for foreign aid. It is a small percentage of the vast sums that we are expending for researches in a half-dozen fields—and but a drop in the bucket as compared with the sums that we are spending for developing a newer and a better atom bomb.

In addition to the \$10,000,000 needful and necessary for the planning and the designing of the new Air Force Academy—another \$10,000,000 would enable the Air Force to start an interim academy in order to begin at once to train the future leaders of our Air Force in the years that will be consumed in the design and the construction of the permanent institution.

I would have you believe with me that the expenditure of this \$20,000,000 would be returned to the Treasury Department a hundredfold in the eventual economies and savings in the operation of our Air Force that would be effected by the immediate passage of H. R. 4574 introduced into this House by the honored and respected chairman of the Armed Services Committee, our own beloved CARL VINSON.

Mr. Chairman, I know that this House is today economy-minded. I know that we have slashed and slashed every appropriation that has been brought to this floor. However, I think that the building of a separate Air Force Academy is one measure that would and should meet with the approval of the vast majority of the Members of this House. So let us proceed at once to the adoption and passage of H. R. 4574, looking toward the eventual establishment of a permanent Academy of the Air.

In order that all may acquaint themselves with the release made by any Army

spokesman I am including as part of my remarks an article entitled "West Point Cadets List Reasons for Choosing Army Over Air Force," as written by Martin S. Hayden.

The article is as follows:

WEST POINT CADETS LIST REASONS FOR CHOOSING ARMY OVER AIR FORCE
(By Martin S. Hayden)

The reasons of 20 graduating West Point cadets for rejecting Air Force glamor and extra pay in favor of careers with the lowly Infantry are revealed at the Pentagon in answer to charges that the new officers fear aerial combat.

The fact that the Air Force, for the first time in history, failed to get its 25 per cent quota from the 1952 West Point class was recently reported by some American writers as another facet of the "sit-down strike" by Air Force reservists unwilling to fly. It was subsequently grabbed up by a gloating Radio Moscow.

In answer, the Army revealed that, while passing up pilots' careers, the graduating cadets oversubscribed the quotas for both the infantry and for hazardous training with airborne troops. At the same time, Brig. Gen. Frank Dorn, of the Army Public Relations Division, released a memorandum to his superiors, relating explanations given by one cadet group for preferring the dirt of ground combat to the more glamorized life of a pilot.

REASONS LISTED

The 20 cadets had been brought to the Pentagon for an orientation course. After questioning them, General Dorn reported as follows their 11 reasons for rejecting the chance for pilot training and Air Force careers:

1. Air Force officers stationed at West Point were unimpressive. By comparison, the Army officers at the Academy looked better, were more direct, took more interest in cadets, and, in general, presented the look of leaders.

2. Training at West Point was geared more to the Army than the Air Force. Cadets know more about the Army and, therefore, have more confidence in it.

3. Visits to Air Force bases left cadets unimpressed and created the impression that as young officers they would be too much in mechanics and techniques, but would neither lead nor command men.

4. The Air Force offered little or no opportunity to lead men, either in combat or out of it.

5. The Army's foundation is leadership. This means that, as young officers, they would work with troops and lead men. Continual references were made to leadership and the very strong desires of the cadets to be leaders.

UNIMPRESSED BY GLAMOR

6. Cadets were unimpressed with so-called Air Force glamor and flying pay. The glamor was brushed aside as having no real meaning. The extra pay did not constitute a deciding motive.

7. The Army emphasized the individual, whereas the Air Force and Marine Corps emphasized the group or mass. Rather oddly, this was brought out in relation to the public information programs of the services where the Army's emphasis on the individual soldier was considered to mean a direct interest in the man as an individual.

8. The Army offers more opportunity for advanced education than the Air Force.

9. The Army offers more variety than the Air Force, not only in conventional branches, but in guided missiles, aviation, atomic weapons, airborne, armored, etc.

10. The Army offers better opportunities for promotion than the Air Force; this was a surprising statement but several cadets believed it to be so.

11. In the Air Force, if an officer is not a pilot, or if, for physical reasons, he goes off flying status, he has no chance for advancement or worth-while assignments.

NOT STARRY-EYED

The general's memo added that, "although no one said so, even after a little prodding on my part, I got the definite impression that most of the cadets felt they would be prouder to be in the Army than the Air Force.

"However," General Dorn added, "they were not starry-eyed about their ideas on this subject. All who had chosen the Army plainly indicated that the Army could do more for them, and that they could get more from the Army."

The statistics, as prepared by West Point authorities, show that 208 cadets from a graduating class of 528 showed some interest in pilot training and were given special physical examinations and 173 passed them. But, of this number, only 112 selected pilot training while 15 others, who had failed the extreme physical test, asked for Air Force ground assignment. The total—127 volunteers—was 4 short of the established Air Force quota.

OTHERS OVER QUOTA

By comparison the infantry, with a quota of 172, got 174 volunteers; the armored service got its full quota of 39; the artillery got 99 against a quota of 98; and the Signal Corps got 28 against a quota of 27. West Point assignments of junior officers to quartermaster, ordnance, and other noncombat arms are not made.

Pentagon records show that 117 of the graduates selecting infantry asked for airborne duty, as did 32 of the artillerymen, 15 of the engineers, and two of those seeking armored service. Of this total of 167 wanting either to parachute or glide into combat, it is estimated that there are training places for about 125 and airborne assignments for about 50.

A survey of the Academy selections showed that the top academic men in the class who have first preference as to assignment set the pattern for ground combat. Of the first 16 men in the class at the time selections were made, 4 chose infantry, 3 armor, 7 engineers, 1 artillery, and 1 Air Force.

The five hundred and twenty-eighth, and last man in the class, chose the Air Force.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. GROSS: On page 15, strike out lines 15 through 24.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, this amendment eliminates "not less than \$25,000,000" to be handed over to the Spanish dictatorship of Franco, and in addition to the millions previously heaped on that regime of tyranny.

Actually, Spain apparently does not want American dollars. We have the word of the Spanish Ambassador in Portugal, one Nicolas Franco, for that.

Not long ago the London Daily Express quoted this mouthpiece of the dictator as saying, and I quote:

Spain's commercial position, her natural economic future, lies with Britain. Her need (that is, Spain's need) for sterling is far more imperative than her need for dollars.

This is enough, right here, for me to say with enthusiasm, "Let Britain have Spain and let Britain furnish the dole to that country from now on."

But wait. There is more to come from the Spanish Ambassador in Portugal.

After saying Spain is far more interested in sterling—the British pound—he says, and I quote again:

Spain wants to see the pound strong again because she (Spain) cannot be and does not want to be dependent on the dollar.

As though this is not enough, the Spanish Ambassador declares:

Europe, with its African possessions, could form a third world bloc for trade and defense. This would extend from Scandinavia to the Cape of Good Hope. Together with her empires she could develop immense economic and industrial resources. Such a bloc—

Now please get this—

such a bloc would offset the possibility of either America or Russia doing anything without the consent of Europe.

So says the Spanish Ambassador in Portugal, Senor Nicolas Franco. I do not know whether he is related to Francisco Franco, the Spanish dictator, but I say he has given us plenty of additional reasons, other than degrading the American people by doing business with a dictator, to boot Spain out of this bill. My amendment will do exactly that.

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

Mr. Chairman, I am opposed to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa because I think that Spain can form a very appropriate area in the defense of the free world against communism. As a matter of fact, I was responsible for including Spain in this particular bill for the first time, because it was my belief that this Congress had acted upon two previous occasions and that nothing had been done. This particular amendment under consideration, as I recall, was offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. ZABLOCKI], and I do not know of any opposition within the committee to it.

I feel that we have a great deal to gain with the inclusion of Spain. I think also that not only can Spain be a bulwark in the Western European defense system but because of her cultural contacts she can strengthen the ties which bind this country, Latin America, and Spain that much more.

I am not talking about dictators because we are supporting dictators in other parts of the world, but I am talking about free, non-Communist countries. I believe that American assistance to Spain will be of great benefit to that country, and perhaps bring about a greater degree of freedom there. I sincerely hope that in view of the facts the committee will vote down this amendment and allow the retention of this amount in the way of funds for Spain.

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

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. The gentleman from Iowa has stated that Franco is not desirous of cooperation with the United States in the mutual security effort. Is it not true that just the other day over the news wires it was announced that the United States was reported making good progress in negotiating three aid agreements, two military and one eco-

conomic, with Spain? The agreements will provide for American arms shipments to Spain, especially weapons, transport and communications equipment needed by the Spanish Army. Further plans for training the Spanish army and air officers also may be included. The agreements will give the United States several air bases in Spain along with anchorage rights for American warships in key Spanish ports. Also the negotiations are opening the way for a larger flow of American financial and technical aid to Spain under the Mutual Security Program. Is it not also true that Franco's government is fully cooperating with the United States in the mutual-security effort?

Mr. MANSFIELD. That is correct. I think the House should know that the gentleman from Wisconsin who has just now addressed us was the chairman of a subcommittee which spent some time in Spain, and did a very comprehensive and thorough job there.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. I thank the gentleman for that compliment. May I call the attention of the gentleman from Iowa to the subcommittee supplemental report on Spain, particularly to page 84. The subcommittee reports its observation on the attitude of Spain toward participation in defense.

Mr. MANSFIELD. May I say also before I yield to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. Gross] who has been seeking to ask me a question for some minutes, that every military authority who has been before the committee has said that Spain is vital to Western Europe.

I now yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. How does the gentleman from Montana reconcile the statement made by the Spanish Ambassador to Portugal with the statement just read apparently representing the view of Franco as to all the things he is going to give to the so-called free world?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I do not know the source of the gentleman's information.

Mr. GROSS. I gave it to the gentleman.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I heard what he had to say, but I will not go on the word of a Spanish Ambassador to Portugal to decide what we should do in this country. I think we ought to keep in mind that as far as Portugal is concerned, it is not defensible unless Spain is brought in.

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

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin. I want to compliment the gentleman from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD] and the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. ZABLOCKI] for opposing this amendment to the bill. If there is any area of Europe where geographically the defense of Western Europe seems to be at a high point, it seems to me it is the Iberian Peninsula, that is, Spain, particularly in view of the Pyrennes Mountains just to the north. I think it is one of the bastions of Europe, and it is very important that it be included in the provisions for Europe.

Mr. MANSFIELD. There is no question about it. I hope the House will vote down this amendment.

Mr. RICHARDS. It is a fact, is it not, I will ask the gentleman from Montana, that this \$25,000,000 does not add to the over-all amount but is part of the funds provided for?

Mr. MANSFIELD. That is correct.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Chairman, I wish to express my strong opposition to the proposed amendment. I believe that the Foreign Affairs Committee has gone thoroughly into this question of assistance to Spain, and its recommendations reflect sound judgment based on the analysis of all available information.

Just a few months ago I had the privilege of heading a special study mission which, among other countries, visited Spain. The subcommittee recommended that assistance be extended to Spain because of the potential value of Spanish contribution to the mutual security effort, and because this potential value cannot be realized without aid.

I want to take this opportunity to recount some of the major factors which motivated that recommendation. The most immediate value of Spain for the mutual defense effort of Western Europe lies in the geographical advantages which Spain offers for air and naval bases. Construction of air and naval bases behind the Pyrenees, which in themselves constitute a natural defense barrier, would greatly supplement other defense installations in Western Europe, which are more immediately exposed to attack. It would give the entire European defense program an added strength, and place at its disposal a strategically important area.

We should also remember that Spain is invaluable in the defense of the Mediterranean, by controlling the west entrance to that sea. I am certain that I need not point out that through the Mediterranean attacks can be directed against the so-called belly of Europe, against Northern Africa, and the Middle East. Consequently, Spain plays a strategic role in the defense of those areas.

Before issuing its recommendations, the subcommittee also considered the potential value of Spanish armed forces to the defense of Europe. At present, Spain has a large but poorly equipped army and a well-trained corps of officers. It is one of the largest and toughest armies in Europe, its manpower strength being estimated at 700,000, of which 400,000 are under arms, including 35,000 officers.

This army, however, is largely equipped with light arms only. They need heavy equipment in quantities. In addition, Spain has a limited fleet and some 300 combat planes in mediocre operating condition. The strength of each can be considerably augmented, bringing them to the level of effective instruments of mutual defense.

We should also bear in mind the marked friendly attitude on the part of the people of Spain and on the part of the Franco government toward the United States. The government has indicated its willingness to enter into military and economic agreements. If we do not conclude such agreements, written in terms of mutual security and mutually beneficial to both nations, we will

be guilty of inexcusable shortsightedness.

I would like to mention one more factor. Spain is a Christian nation, and there is no question that the great majority of its people is strongly anti-Communist. Furthermore, Generalissimo Franco expressed a willingness for Spanish troops to fight communism wherever necessary, not only on Spanish soil.

I feel that these considerations are vitally important, and that they—not any personal prejudices or the dictates of false economy—should determine our attitude and action on the proposed assistance to Spain. The fact remains that Spain can contribute very much to European defense; that her people and government, whatever the shortcomings of its form, are willing to enter into closer ties with us for that purpose; and that her people will fight communism wherever it may be necessary to do so.

It is because of these considerations that I am strongly opposed to the amendment which would eliminate assistance to Spain from this bill, and I earnestly hope that the membership of this body, weighing impartially the help which Spain can give us in this all-out struggle for survival, will defeat the amendment.

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

Mr. Chairman, this is my first mention on this bill. It is not often that I find myself in accord with my Midwest colleague from Iowa [Mr. Gross], but I want to say that I want to support him on this amendment.

I had every intention yesterday that when we reached section 3 of offering this same amendment.

Let me recall to your attention the occasion yesterday when the amendment to limit aid to Tito was before the House. I want to tell you here and now that I subscribe to the remarks of the gentleman from New York [Mrs. KELLY], except that I would like to substitute for the word "Tito" the word "Franco" and substitute for the name "Yugoslavia" the name "Spain." I am not willing here to pay the price that is involved for whatever little advantage may come to us by keeping it in the bill, because I have no more faith in Franco of Spain and the government he represents than I have in Tito of Yugoslavia. Neither one of them are democracies; neither one of them are dependable, and I am not willing to pay that price.

I shall support the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa.

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

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. Gross) there were—ayes 9, noes 107.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. CURTIS of Missouri: Page 15, line 14, after "authorized", insert a new paragraph as follows:

"Not to exceed \$43,000,000 of the money authorized in the preceding paragraph may be spent for Austria."

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, this is a cut of \$43,000,000. The amount in the budget for Austria is \$86,000,000. It is perfectly true that we have cut the sum total of this section by about \$615,000,000. It is possible, of course, to say that you could absorb this particular \$43,000,000 cut that I am proposing in the \$600,000,000 cut out of the larger figure, \$1,600,000,000, but I feel that this should be specifically pointed out so that we actually will save this \$43,000,000 and the cut can be applied elsewhere.

In reference to this matter of Austria, there is very little in the hearings, but you will find mention of Austria on page 60 of the committee report and you will find information on pages 761 and 762 of the committee hearings. There is also a chart, which incidentally is not a very revealing one, on page 751 that has to do with Austria. There is some other reference material in the selected tables on the proposed Mutual Security Act, which is a committee print. On page 40 of this committee print you will find the budget for Austria. I might state that all of this information is in the most general terms, as most of this information is, and it is difficult to run details down. Suffice it to say, though, that the \$86,000,000 that has been asked for is simply to balance Austria's budget.

In balancing that budget I want to call your attention to what we are doing. On page 762, on top of the page, the committee hearings reveal this:

During fiscal year 1953 Austria will provide local currency equivalent to \$23,000,000 to pay French, British, and Soviet occupation costs. The United States Government has been on a pay-as-you-go basis since 1945.

It is very obvious that the United States Government is paying the \$23,000,000 for French, British, and Soviet occupation costs. If Austria needs this money and if this is really a mutual program, I submit that certainly our State Department should not permit France and Great Britain to take money from Austria when we in effect are putting it back again. And positively we should not be paying for the Soviet occupation costs.

On the preceding page, 751, you will find in subsection (c) the statement:

The significant economic facts in Austria are:

(c) "The drain of Austrian resources by the U. S. S. R. occupation authorities as the result of (1) unrequited exports from output of the 350 enterprises confiscated by the U. S. S. R. under the pretext that these assets were German property; (2) failure of the Soviet-controlled enterprises to pay taxes."

These are given as some of the reasons for the plight of Austria. Obviously there is a lot of work to be done by our State Department in establishing a firmer position in Austria. It is obvious we are paying blackmail in that country to Soviet Russia.

I want to point out another thing. I refer to Austria's debts, and this will be found on page 20 of the committee print of selected tables. Austria's internal debt is \$609,000,000, its external debt is only \$12,000,000, and that is only one-

third of their gross national products. If you will notice the situation in the case of the United States, we have a national debt of \$259,000,000,000 as opposed to gross national products of \$321,000,000,000. If you will go down that list you will notice that the nations that have the poorest ratios as far as national debt is concerned, are Great Britain and the United States, the so-called victor nations. Their budget situation is much worse than the countries in Europe who were either neutral or our enemies in the last war, and Austria of course is among these nations.

Mr. Chairman, we know of Austria mainly through history, but actually we are now talking about 6,800,000 people. Austria has been cut to this pitiful size over the years. The United States is responsible among four nations for Austria. The United States area in Austria is one-fourth, and includes less than 1,700,000 people, about the size of metropolitan St. Louis. That is the number that you are asked to vote \$86,000,000 for and I am requesting by my amendment that that amount be cut back to \$43,000,000 which is more in accord with realism. This is the way to eliminate loose dollars.

Mr. RICHARDS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. Chairman, as we all know, Austria is one of the most critical and vulnerable spots in Europe and the whole defense setup for Europe. I know of no more critical spot at the present time unless it is Berlin itself.

I call the attention of the members of the committee to the fact that the \$86,000,000 requested as economic support for Austria has already been affected by the cut made by the Foreign Affairs Committee and the Committee of the Whole. As introduced, title I of the bill carried \$1,819,200,000 for economic support. The cuts made by the Foreign Affairs Committee and by the Committee of the Whole have now reduced it nearly 50 percent, to \$1,022,000,000. If we are going to do anything in Europe at all, it would be a grievous mistake to put any further limitation on Austria at this time.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. The Foreign Affairs Committee, I do not believe, cut that. The amount asked for was \$86,000,000. You have given them everything they asked for. It is simply balancing their budget.

Mr. RICHARDS. The \$86,000,000 is included in the defense-support figure which was further cut yesterday by the Vorys amendment over a half-billion dollars.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. My \$43,000,000 would not be in addition to the Committee of the Whole cut of yesterday. As a matter of fact, if you applied the proportionate cut to Austria, it would be a little more than the \$43,000,000 I am trying to cut it back to.

Mr. RICHARDS. I understand that, but the amount in title 1 of the bill was

cut to the bone through the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. VORYS].

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

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

Mr. BUSBEY. Is it not a fact that the situation in Austria is absolutely hopeless as far as getting a treaty is concerned? When I was there last September I had a conference with our Ambassador, Walter Donnelly, who in my opinion is doing a good job, and he said that they had had 259 conferences with the Soviets trying to bring about some kind of a treaty and that they are no further along than when they started.

Mr. RICHARDS. If the position in Austria is hopeless, the position in Berlin is hopeless, the position in Korea is hopeless, and a great many other positions in opposition to communism will have to be defined as hopeless. I am not going to agree that our position in Austria is hopeless.

Mr. HUGH D. SCOTT, JR. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pending amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I had not intended to speak on this bill because there is a great deal in it I do not understand. I do not know whether it is right to cut this \$500,000,000 or whether it is right to keep it in. I do not believe I have heard adequate evidence here indicating that we are either right or wrong in the cut. I have a great deal of doubt in my own mind as to how I am going to vote on that particular issue.

But as to Austria I have no doubt whatever. In the first place, Austria is, according to all the evidence, the most anti-Communist country in Europe. More than that, as the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs said, if we cannot hold on in Austria then we cannot hold on in Berlin. I believe it is one of the key spots for the defense of the collective security of the free world.

Again, it seems to me that Austria is a listening post to us, a source of valuable information from Czechoslovakia and from Hungary. Much information is received by radio free Europe, for example, from these countries behind the iron curtain by way of Austria. The government of that country is conservative. It has held the line valiantly and bravely. They are loyal friends. The amount involved is not great, and I think it would be a deadly mistake to slap in the face the Austrian Government, beleaguered as it is by our bitter enemy, the Soviets.

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

Mr. HUGH D. SCOTT, JR. I yield to the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. RICHARDS. May I make this additional observation to the very pertinent remarks the gentleman has just made?

The record shows that in Austria, occupied as it is, never at any time in any election has more than 5 percent of the Austrian vote gone Communist.

Mr. HUGH D. SCOTT, JR. The gentleman is entirely correct. The Austrian people are brave, staunch friends.

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

Mr. HUGH D. SCOTT, JR. I yield to the gentleman from Montana.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I want to agree with what the gentleman from Pennsylvania has said. Every word is true.

Is it not a further fact that we have an additional responsibility in Austria, because we have an occupying Army in a liberated country, and this Government, which cannot become self-sufficient, is the furthest bridgehead into the Soviets.

Mr. HUGH D. SCOTT, JR. The gentleman is correct.

Every effort we have made to secure a treaty with Austria has been impeded by the Soviet Government, and if we do not give Austria this small amount of money we are minimizing our chances for success.

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

Mr. HUGH D. SCOTT, JR. I yield to the gentleman from Connecticut.

Mr. RIBICOFF. Is it not correct that, as the chairman has said, our position in Austria is not hopeless, but if we cut this aid Austria's position would then become hopeless?

Mr. HUGH D. SCOTT, JR. It might well so happen.

Mr. RIBICOFF. And that is because of their very difficult economic situation. And is it not true that we are in Austria by virtue of a four-power agreement? If we withdrew or were forced out of Austria, it would be a great blow to America prestige, and it could then be said all over the world that the Soviet Union forced the United States out of its position in Austria.

Mr. HUGH D. SCOTT, JR. I agree with the gentleman.

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

Mr. HUGH D. SCOTT, JR. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. EBERHARTER. I thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania for bringing to the attention of the Members on the floor the true facts about Austria, one of the best friends the United States has had ever since commencement of negotiations for peace, and the rock upon which we can help to build up the rest of the world. I want to congratulate the gentleman for bringing to the attention of the Members of the House the true facts.

Mr. HUGH D. SCOTT, JR. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HUGH D. SCOTT, JR. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. I agree with everything said about the importance of Austria. I do not want to talk in generalities; I want to talk in details. Here is the question and the one question only: \$23,000,000 of the occupation costs of France, Britain, and ourselves is being paid by us. Now, this is a mutual program. I am not talking about the importance of Austria, about how to give them money. This is a mutual defense

bill. Let us get some work done on it and talk in details instead of generalities. Austria is important, sure.

Mr. HUGH D. SCOTT, JR. I respect the gentleman's views.

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

Mr. HUGH D. SCOTT, JR. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. JONAS. I take this position: I think the gentleman from Pennsylvania agrees with me that the amendment which the gentleman from Missouri is offering will not cure the evil he is complaining of. You are merely cutting \$86,000,000 in half by supporting that amendment, and if you have the same evil repercussions from \$43,000,000 remaining, you are not doing anything by voting for the amendment.

Mr. HUGH D. SCOTT, JR. The gentleman raises a point which I think goes to the whole bill, and that is the policy of the Congress to cut in round numbers or even fractions, and I do not think cutting in round numbers or even fractions indicates that we have carefully worked this thing out in detail. I am not convinced of that. I hope the amendment will be defeated.

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

Mr. Chairman, I have no particular interest in the pending amendment. I do, however, want to call the attention of the gentleman from Missouri and the other Members of this House to the fact that this is not an appropriation bill.

I have heard a lot of talk about details. This is not the place for the discussion of details. What the House is doing in this bill is authorizing a program; and, generally, in authorizing a program, we do not place dollar limits on the program that is authorized. It is customary in most authorization bills coming before this House to simply authorize certain activities, and then to leave it to the Committee on Appropriations to determine which of those activities shall be undertaken and how much shall be appropriated by the Congress for those activities.

At the beginning of this program we could have given a general authorization to continue over a period of years, or during the emergency. I am in absolute accord with the action of this House in not following that plan. I think the program should be reviewed annually by the Congress. But you now have before you an authorization bill. It is not intended that this bill shall deal with details; it is a bill to outline a general program.

I have the privilege of serving as chairman of the subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations that will consider the mutual security appropriation bill. After the authorization bill is passed, then our committee will begin hearings on the appropriation bill. We will go into every single detail, and I promise you that we will consider each country. We will not only consider Austria; we will consider Yugoslavia; we will consider every country in Europe; we will consider the countries in Asia which are to receive aid.

I have just returned from an official 30,000-mile trip to the Pacific, where we covered Korea, Formosa, Okinawa, and the other points where this aid will be applied. I have some first-hand information. We will take copious testimony as to the details of this entire program. Then when the appropriation bill comes before this body, you will still have a chance to make any changes in any appropriation, or any item, that you see fit.

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

Mr. GARY. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. JENSEN. I must say I cannot agree with the gentleman when he says it is the duty of the legislative committee to specify where this money is to be spent. The gentleman knows that the Committee on Appropriations does not have the time to go into all these details to any degree comparative to what the legislative committee does.

Mr. GARY. I do not agree with the gentleman at all. Our appropriation subcommittee does go into far greater detail on this program than the legislative committee does.

Mr. JENSEN. The appropriations committee has been criticised no end for writing legislation in appropriation bills, and I think to some degree justly so. Certainly, if the legislative committee does not have the authority to specify where this money shall be spent—

Mr. GARY. I do not yield further to the gentleman. I want to make this statement. I certainly am not questioning the authority of this House to make any change in this bill it desires. What I am saying is that this is an authorization bill, and it does not necessarily follow that the amounts that are authorized in this bill will be appropriated. These amounts will be subsequently considered by the appropriations committee. They will then be considered again by the House. At that time the House will have an opportunity to take up individual items and to make any changes it sees fit to make. Therefore, I think that we should not take the chance of absolutely crippling this program by putting too stringent limitations on the appropriations committee.

Mr. RICHARDS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment do now close.

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

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Missouri.

The amendment was rejected.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. GWINN: On page 15, line 14, after "authorized" insert a new sentence as follows: "Whenever an item authorized for procurement under this paragraph is under either domestic allocation or price controls in the United States, it shall be purchased by General Services Administration and furnished to the recipient nation as a commodity in lieu of dollar grants for their own procurement."

Mr. GWINN. Mr. Chairman, I regret that the emergency of the subject

covered here did not give me time to take the subject up with the chairman of the committee. I just received the proposed amendment this morning.

This amendment enables our Government to buy copper, lead, and zinc at our market prices and subject to our price controls and limitations and send the commodity in lieu of dollars to participating countries. It enables the Government to send the commodity itself abroad instead of establishing a credit, as the act provides. By sending dollars abroad the foreign countries go into the Chilean market and bid up the price of these scarce metals to the detriment of our consumers of metal. Our consumers of these metals, particularly copper, are under price controls of 27.5 cents a pound. In all countries where there is price control on these metals, they are in an impossible position to compete in a world market which runs copper as high as 55 cents a pound.

Our Government must be the buyer of these metals and make them available to foreign countries, instead of giving dollars to many foreign buyers who bid up the world prices. If many buyers go about paying whatever price they want to pay to build up, even excessive stockpiles of these scarce materials that obviously makes prices rise higher than one buyer in the market will make.

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

Mr. GWINN. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. MORTON. If I understand the gentleman's amendment correctly, if for instance, \$1,000,000 goes to England to purchase lead, copper, or some other material, instead of giving them the \$1,000,000 we give them the \$1,000,000 worth of that material.

Mr. GWINN. That is correct.

Mr. MORTON. You are not cutting in any way the benefits under this act?

Mr. GWINN. We are not cutting in any way the benefits under this act, we are simply changing dollars ourselves, while we have control of the dollars, into the commodity and sending the commodity in lieu of the dollars.

Mr. MORTON. You are also stopping this bidding by four or five governments, with our money, mostly, on these various materials.

Mr. GWINN. That is it. Our own dollars in foreign hands are bidding up the prices so that our own domestic consumers cannot even bid in the market because our consumers are limited to 27.5 cents a pound.

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

Mr. GWINN. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. MEADER. I noticed the language of the gentleman's amendment is mandatory and requires the General Services Administrator to buy the copper.

Does that mean that if the Mutual Security Agency decides to give Greece copper that the General Services Administration is required to buy copper, perhaps domestically, and take it away from the domestic consumers of copper?

Mr. GWINN. It works that way now. Here is a bid, for example, that comes

out of Greece, circulated in our own domestic market for copper at a price much higher than our own consumers can pay.

Mr. MEADER. I wonder if the gentleman will yield further?

Mr. GWINN. I yield.

Mr. MEADER. Would he mind making the language of the amendment permissive rather than mandatory? Because I am very much concerned that the automobile industry, for example, which has had limitations because of shortages of copper, might be further limited by taking from our domestic available copper amounts to send to Greece because of a determination made by the Mutual Security Agency?

Mr. GWINN. I think that is a proper amendment.

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

Mr. GWINN. I yield.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Is not the practical effect of the gentleman's amendment to say that until we can control the world price, which the gentleman's amendment would not do, that in effect you are going to be taking the stocks of our own natural resources and force us to send those abroad, whereas these foreign countries could buy in the world market and buy stocks up in other parts of the world?

Mr. GWINN. I think not. I think the agency has the power to decide whether it will or not grant those dollars. If it is going to grant dollars, this amendment simply requires them to give copper instead of the dollars.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Under the gentleman's amendment the only place they could get the copper, so long as the world market is not controlled at the same level as our internal price control, the only place to get the copper is in the United States; therefore we would be using up United States raw material.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired. (On request of Mr. MASON, and by unanimous consent, Mr. GWINN was allowed to proceed for two additional minutes.)

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. GWINN. I yield.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. If the gentleman follows my reasoning thus far, then in effect not only will we be using up our own raw materials, but we will be using them up faster than we can produce them and we will be cutting down on the amount available to our own industries, as has been previously brought out.

Mr. GWINN. May I say to the gentleman from New York that we produce about 60 percent of the copper we consume; the rest we get primarily from Chile.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. That is correct.

Mr. GWINN. This amendment contemplates that we are going to buy this excess copper in Chile, but instead of letting our own dollars go abroad to come back to Chile we control the dollars and to some extent we do control the prices we pay in Chile.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. But that has not worked out so far.

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

Mr. GWINN. I yield.

Mr. MASON. As I understand the gentleman's amendment, it simply means that the United States itself would go into that world market and purchase this copper to be sent wherever it is to go.

Mr. GWINN. Exactly so.

Mr. MASON. And now our own private industry has to go into the world market to buy that 40 percent of the copper that it needs and we do not produce, and it is competing against these dollars that we send abroad.

Mr. GWINN. Exactly so; and the effect is that our own stocks of copper, lead, and zinc are going down while stocks of these scarce materials of other countries of the world with our dollars are being built up excessively.

Mr. MASON. Personally I think the gentleman's amendment is a good, common-sense amendment and will result in our own private industries having more copper to use rather than less.

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

Mr. GWINN. I yield.

Mr. RIBICOFF. What disturbs me is that this is more interference of Government in private industry; in other words, you are allowing the United States Government to go abroad and make purchases in its own name and therefore compete with private enterprise.

Mr. MASON. No; they are competing with other countries.

Mr. GWINN. Let me answer the gentleman. We have so completely controlled domestically the price of copper, lead, and zinc that our own domestic consumers cannot pay more than 27½ cents a pound for copper.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has again expired.

Mr. DURHAM. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I am sure the gentleman from New York offers this amendment in good faith in trying to do something constructive, but at the present time we are in this kind of situation. Of course the General Services Administration does all of the purchasing for the stockpiling items of these strategic and critical materials.

As to just how this would affect the contracts we have with Chile for copper, with India for manganese, and with all these other countries I do not know, but it is so broad and extensive that it goes almost around the world. I do not know how many countries this amendment would involve, but probably many more than we think just on the face of it. For instance, there is no way for us to go into Chile and say to Chile that she has got to sell us copper at 25 cents a pound because we have price control.

Chile today is holding out for 6 cents above the world price right at the present time, and there is no way for us to control it. We have agreements with them, of course, to buy as much copper as we can get. But when that contract runs out that is the end of it, and there is no way to force them to renew it or sell at a lower price.

Copper is but one metal; there are 60 or 70 other strategic and critical ma-

terial items that will be affected. I am not just sure as to how the General Services can carry out and make effective such an amendment, because at the present time we have already agreed under the international agreement on division of these raw materials.

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

Mr. DURHAM. I yield.

Mr. VORYS. As I understand, General Services is acquiring—it is the instrumentality for building up our strategic materials.

Mr. DURHAM. It purchases them all at the present time.

Mr. VORYS. It is the machinery for purchasing strategic materials?

Mr. DURHAM. That is correct; it administers and makes the contracts.

Mr. VORYS. General Services, as I understand, has had nothing to do with procurement in this program at the present time; so this amendment would be bringing something new into this program.

Mr. DURHAM. I do not know how it would affect the international agreement on the distribution of raw materials at the present time. It is rather far-reaching, and I hope the Committee will vote it down.

Mr. VORYS. May I say that our purpose with reference to strategic materials under this bill was to tie it in with the strategic-materials program carried on outside this bill. I fear that this amendment will mess things up as far as strategic materials are concerned. It looks to me as if it would require all of the purchasing to be done in this country which I hope will not be the case.

Mr. DURHAM. That is right. You would have General Services conducting two programs here. It would be trying to secure raw material for the stockpile in this country and also it would be a distribution agency. I do not know whether they would take it and put it in one bag or which bag they would put it in.

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

Mr. DURHAM. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. MASON. In the purchasing of this under international agreements, so much is allotted to each country?

Mr. DURHAM. Supposedly so.

Mr. MASON. It has a quota assigned?

Mr. DURHAM. Yes.

Mr. MASON. If General Services is purchasing for Greece or Turkey, or some place, they would have to stay within the quota assigned to Greece or Turkey, just as if Greece or Turkey were buying it for themselves with our dollars?

Mr. DURHAM. Yes.

Mr. MASON. So that it would not change the international agreements one particle.

Mr. DURHAM. On the other hand, what are you going to do with your stockpile in this country? Are you going to deplete it? Take cobalt, copper, and dozens of others.

Mr. MASON. I understand that. We are purchasing them all around the world for our stockpile.

Mr. DURHAM. That is correct.

Mr. MASON. We are purchasing our quota under international agreements. If we become the agent of Greece or Turkey to purchase their quotas, that does not have any effect upon our own.

Mr. DURHAM. Of course, all countries have not entered into this international agreement on the distribution of raw material. This is just a few countries.

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

Mr. DURHAM. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. SHAFER. The gentleman is very much interested in our defense stockpile program.

Mr. DURHAM. Yes; so is the gentleman from Michigan. He has been very helpful in that respect, and this country ought to thank him for the rubber quotas today.

Mr. SHAFER. I just wondered if he has any information as to the amount of copper that has been taken out of our defense stockpile program to be shipped overseas?

Mr. DURHAM. As far as I know, none has been taken to be shipped overseas, but there has been some diverted to industry.

Mr. SHAFER. To industry as the result of enormous shipments over to Europe.

Mr. DURHAM. Yes; but from other countries which we could not obtain.

AMERICAN AND FREE WORLD SECURITY

I. The basis of American foreign policy:

A. A sound, democratic foreign policy is designed to preserve the security of the Nation. American foreign policy is no exception to the rule.

B. In today's dangerous world, national security cannot be achieved by any simple formula. Our well-being is directly tied to the security of the other free peoples. It is no simple matter to preserve and build that united strength which the free world must have if freedom is to survive.

C. The foundation stone of American foreign policy today is the mutual-security program. And that program is firmly rooted in the belief that America cannot go it alone.

II. America's need for allies:

A. The threat posed by Soviet communism is so great that—should it get out of hand—America alone could never cope with it. Consider, if you will, the nature of that threat:

First. The Soviets are dedicated to global conquest. The Lenin-Stalinist ideology makes that very clear. Soviet actions since the closing months of World War II make it even clearer. The subversion of Eastern Europe, the attempt to drive the western allies out of Berlin, the effort to take over Greece, the aggression in Korea—all of these things are representative of international communism's designs for global control.

Second. The Soviet threat makes itself felt at every level—the political, the economic, the psychological, and the military. During 1952, the Soviet Union will devote 35 percent of its gross national products—more than \$60,000,000,000—to military purposes. It is

spending more than a billion dollars annually on propaganda alone. The budget proposed calls for spending the equivalent of 20 percent of our gross national product for defense purposes during fiscal 1953. Our expenditure for our overseas informational campaign during the current fiscal year is less than one-tenth of what the Soviets are spending.

Three. In terms of raw power, the Soviet threat is very, very real. The Soviet Union, its satellites, and its Chinese allies together control some two-fifths of the earth's land surface, very close to half—more than 800,000,000—of the world's people, a vast share of the globe's natural resources. The Soviet bloc also has available millions of trained ground troops and a seasoned air force. It is estimated that the Soviet Union alone has between 175 and 200 divisions on active duty.

B. Unless America retains her friends in the free world, we will lose the edge we now have in the global struggle for power. The loss of Western Europe, for example, would see us outmanned, outgunned, and outproduced:

First. Take industrial production. Western Europe produces 28 percent or more of the world's steel, about the same percentage of the world's electric power, 32 percent of the world's hard coal. Western Europe also boasts almost half of the world's sea-going merchant tonnage—49 percent. Soviet-bloc figures, percentage, for steel, coal, and electric power are 18, 27, and 15 percent respectively. Therefore, the control of Western Europe would give the Soviets the upper hand in coal and very close to it in the production of steel and electric power.

Second. Take manpower. Western Europe's more than 300,000,000 people, if added to the Soviet bloc's population, would give the latter control of more than half of the world's people.

Third. Take skilled manpower. Europe's skilled manpower pool can be surpassed by no other area but our own. Western Europe's technicians in Soviet hands could be a vital factor in giving the Soviet Union a tremendous technical advantage.

Fourth. Take the problem of strategic position. Loss of Western Europe would mean the loss of land and air bases from which to operate at close range in the event of aggression. Were we to be faced with a global war—with the Soviets in control of Western Europe—we might well have to fight that war on the thresholds of our own homes.

III. Essentials of the Mutual Security Program:

A. The President has asked Congress to appropriate \$7,900,000,000 for the Mutual Security Program during fiscal 1953. Of this total amount, the lion's share—\$5,425,000,000—is for direct military assistance. One billion eight hundred and nineteen million is for defense-support funds. The remaining \$655,800,000 is for economic and technical assistance. These big figures raise two key questions: First, what is the difference between military, defense support, and technical assistance? Second, why is

assistance other than that of a purely military nature so terribly important?

First. The three types of assistance:

(a) Military assistance has to do with helping our friends to develop the weapons of defense and the trained manpower to handle those weapons. It is concerned primarily with military products—with munitions. It is concerned—to cite one highly important example—with equipping the NATO forces with the means of deterring aggression. Most of the funds for military assistance will go into the purchase of guns, planes, tanks, and so forth, in the United States for transshipment overseas. Some of these military assistance funds will be used to purchase military equipment manufactured by our allies.

(b) Defense-support funds are designed to supply our allies with raw materials, commodities, and machinery which they must have if they are to produce the sinews of military defense. Defense-support funds will go for cotton and foodstuffs as well as for mechanical equipment. In this connection, I should like to point out that you cannot separate a nation's economic stability from its ability to defend itself. Looking at it realistically, we cannot offer our friends guns unless we also help them to develop the productive plant with which to produce their own guns.

(c) Technical assistance is better known as point 4. To my way of thinking, the point 4 program is one of the most important, both for this Nation's security and for world peace. Under the point 4 program, America is seeking to help the people of the underdeveloped areas of the world to help themselves. We are seeking to help the people of the Near East, southeast Asia, and of parts of Latin America to develop their own technologies.

Why are we doing this? In the first place, it must be pointed out that communism breeds on hunger, disease, and illiteracy. In the areas I have just noted, these conditions are almost universal. In many parts of the Near East, an income of fifty or sixty dollars a year is a reasonable average. In many parts of Asia, the average life span is 30 years or even less. In some parts of Africa and the Near East, 1 out of 10 babies never gets beyond the first year of life.

The point 4 program is a humanitarian program. It is the true Christian doctrine in practice. But equally important, it is contributing much to America's security. By fighting the conditions upon which communism thrives, it creates strong friends even while showing millions of people the road to a decent standard of living.

It is well for us to remember that our interests abroad do not begin and end in Europe, important though Europe is. The peoples of the Near East, Africa, southeast Asia, and Latin America—these people are also part of the free world. These people are also essential partners in building a strong defense against Communist aggression.

IV. Are our allies doing their share?

A. The charge has been made that our friends in Western Europe are not holding up their end of the Mutual Security Program. I should like to answer this

charge by citing a few pertinent facts—facts that our more violent critics are likely to overlook.

First. Western Europe, unlike the United States, was devastated by the Second World War. With our help, it has made a remarkable recovery. To impose such defense demands upon our European friends as would cripple their still-shaky economies would be to court disaster for them and for ourselves.

Second. It is well to bear in mind that any major war fought on the land is likely to be fought first on the territory of our allies rather than upon our own. It is the western Europeans who are living under the shadow of Soviet guns.

Third. The overwhelming bulk of the European defense force is made up of European troops. Such will continue to be the case when the target for 1954, as set up at the Lisbon NATO conference, is achieved.

Fourth. In the face of economic ruin—World War II result—and domestic demands for a better standard of living, the Western European nations have reached a productivity level which is some 40 percent above the prewar figure.

Fifth. Much has been made of the statement that the Europeans are not taxing themselves as steeply as we are. It is true that there are tax inequities in parts of western Europe. It is not true that the European man in the street is not carrying his share of the tax burden. Here are just a few of the relevant figures: Tax receipts in the United States for 1951 amounted to 25.8 percent of our gross national product. In the United Kingdom, the comparative percentage was 33.7. In the Netherlands, it was 28.3. In France, it was 30.7. In the Federal Republic of Germany—West Germany—it was 30.3. In some of the western countries, the percentage was somewhat lower than in our own country. But, by and large, western Europe is doing its share in footing the bill for defense and security.

Sixth. It is well worth remembering that France and Britain are actively defending free-world interests in the Near and Far East. It is worth remembering that most of the western European countries are fighting by our side in Korea. It is worth remembering that France—to cite one example—is spending an estimated \$1,000,000,000 a year to stave off communism in Indochina and has lost more than 30,000 of her best soldiers there.

V. Conclusion: The mutual-security program is costing the American public a lot of money. There is no denying that. But in paying for the security and defensibility of our free-world neighbors, we are also paying for our own security. It is far better to pay in dollars today than to pay with millions of lives and all of our freedoms tomorrow.

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

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on the pending amendment close in 15 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. FORAND). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Montana?

Mr. SADLAK. Mr. Chairman, I object.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate on the pending amendment and amendments to the amendment close in 15 minutes.

The motion was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California [Mr. HINSHAW].

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Chairman, in my humble opinion, with all due respect to the gentleman from New York, this amendment can be far more important than has been represented, and it should not be considered in a few minutes on the floor of this House. Its implications are hard to figure. For example, you might say that if we are going to supply such things as copper instead of money to some of these countries—money or credit—they could take that copper, sell it on the world market for perhaps as high as 100 percent profit. There is that possibility, as I understand the amendment, and it is entirely within the realm of possibility.

Mr. Chairman, before we adopt such an amendment it should have the most careful consideration by the committee responsible for this bill. Therefore, I reluctantly oppose the amendment. Foreign countries could take those products which we would furnish them, perhaps at our controlled price, and sell them on the world market for a profit of as much as 100 percent.

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

Mr. HINSHAW. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. MASON. And they can do that today with what we furnish them.

Mr. HINSHAW. That may be very true, but in this case when you are furnishing raw metals it is a lot different than when you are furnishing guns, tanks, and clothing. This is something which is a world commodity. It is not a piece of armament. I think the amendment ought to have more consideration than we can give it in Committee in the next few minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MEADER].

Mr. MEADER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment to the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. MEADER to the amendment offered by Mr. GWINN: At the end of line 4, strike out "shall" and insert "may."

Mr. MEADER. Mr. Chairman, this amendment will improve the Gwinn amendment, in my opinion. It makes the authority of the General Services Administration to supply the scarce commodity in lieu of the money grant permissive rather than mandatory.

I fear the amendment as drafted by the gentleman from New York would compel the General Services Administration to buy copper, perhaps out of our available domestic copper supply, and thereby limit still further the amounts available for the automobile industry and other industries which are now retarded because of the scarcity of

copper. I would not want that to happen.

I do not know that the Gwinn amendment should be adopted at all, but if it is adopted it should give leeway to the General Services Administration. I do not want to harm our domestic economy by an amendment hastily adopted.

The International Materials Conference, about which many of you have heard a good deal, purports to allocate the amount of these scarce materials as between this country and other countries of the world. We have enforceable controls in this country. But many of the other countries who are also members of the International Materials Conference, either do not have any controls at all or do not have as effective and as enforceable controls as we have.

This whole question of the International Materials Conference which has no statutory authority should be very carefully and thoroughly explored by the Congress. Under present circumstances I think it is restricting our own production in this country while it leaves other countries free to engage in speculation in these controlled materials and step up their production of products requiring scarce materials. It is an international cartel set up by the executive branch of our Government. Its allocations are enforceable in the United States but not equally enforceable elsewhere. The question is an important one. It should be gone into thoroughly by the Congress.

I think my amendment will improve the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. GWINN]. I, therefore, urge its adoption.

(Mr. SEELY-BROWN and Mr. FULTON asked and were given permission to yield the time allotted them to Mr. SADLAK.)

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. SADLAK].

Mr. SADLAK. Mr. Chairman, I am very grateful to my colleagues for yielding me their time.

Mr. Chairman, when I came to the floor this morning I had been entertaining the thought that something along the same line as put forth here by the gentleman from New York [Mr. GWINN] might be a good thing to do in this particular bill.

When we have in the neighborhood of a billion dollars set aside for these countries to buy copper and zinc, and then we pay the bill with our American taxpayers' money, why could not we take and purchase the copper from these countries and thereby give them the United States dollars which they are seeking?

I join wholeheartedly in the proposal offered by the gentleman from New York. I objected, Mr. Chairman, because of the shortness of time which would be allotted here, but I am sure that my colleague, the gentleman from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD], as he goes into this proposal offered by the gentleman from New York, will find that it has a great deal of importance to the State of Montana. He will find, as has been touched upon by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MEADER], the great ramifications that are involved here with the Interna-

tional Materials Conference, about which I am preparing to make an appearance before the Committee on Banking and Currency on Wednesday, May 28, in connection with the Defense Production Act, because I believe that the International Materials Conference, which has been set up without any statutory authority, is, in my estimation, and in the estimation of a committee of eight which has been appointed by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN], the minority leader, a supercartel operating in the United States. It is keeping from the automobile industry, as the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MEADER] has mentioned, from the electrical and brass companies in Connecticut, causing layoffs and unemployment, and from the other industries involved throughout the United States, the copper and related minerals of which they ought to have the use.

There is so much involved in this proposition, Mr. Chairman, which I would like to remark upon in this short time, but which obviously is an impossibility, as I said, because of the many ramifications. But, as the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. DURHAM] has mentioned, I am very much interested to know how much we have in the line of copper and zinc, presuming he may know, because from my observation of the House he has been one of those who has been most meticulous about keeping up the stockpile, as has been the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. MARTIN].

As to the International Materials Conference, which is restricting the amount of copper and zinc which our people should have, the amounts that are given on allocations, termed "entitlement of consumption," to all of our industries and for the employers of our country are the same allocations given by the International Materials Conference which are used by the National Production Administration, and so we cannot get it because we cannot buy it. Price is not the deterrent.

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

Mr. SADLAK. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. DURHAM. I thank the gentleman for his kind remarks, and I think it is an important thing to talk about at the present time. Of course, the stockpile, on the over-all basis of copper, has not been filled by any means and probably will not be, under world conditions, for some time. But the other important point to think about at the present time is in connection with the two and one-half million, lying down here, or approximately, at the present time, in dollars, with authority to purchase, the materials today are not available. This would further aggravate that condition, in my opinion.

Mr. SADLAK. The gentleman knows, because we do not go into the world market for copper, that we have been restricted because the allocations are made by the International Materials Conference which again, I say, has been set up without any statutory authority, and time does not permit my going into that. Our stockpiling is, also, thereby

seriously affected and the program impeded, in my opinion.

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

Mr. SADLAK. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. MEADER. I wonder if the gentleman has been able to get any information out of our agencies on whether or not the other nations who are members of this International Materials Conference have enforceability laws which govern the allocations of scarce materials which they receive. I have not been able to get it in 3 months' effort out of the departments downtown. Has the gentleman gotten any information?

Mr. SADLAK. I do not have such information from downtown, but the gentleman well knows that the Defense Production Act, the Price Control Act, is only effective in the United States.

Mr. MEADER. Yes; but the other nations in this International Materials Conference do not enforce their allocations, so they are free, but the United States is very rigidly controlled.

Mr. SADLAK. The gentleman is so fully well acquainted with the set-up of the International Materials Conference, knows the serious effect its entitlement decrees have on his constituency and on mine, and he and I could go on for a half hour or an hour today to talk about this program. The time being limited on this amendment, I hope I will have the opportunity before the Committee on Banking and Currency on next Wednesday to discuss the IMC and, more specifically, its relation to the Defense Production Act in my bill H. R. 7157.

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

Mr. SADLAK. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. McDONOUGH. Just recently we were informed that Canadian newsprint was going up \$10 a ton. The International Materials Conference has been the agency that has decided where newspaper produced in the United States shall be allocated to foreign countries. In one instance they allocated some 350,000 tons of newsprint to India, which has reduced the amount of newsprint available to the people of the United States and has had a decided influence on the increase in cost of newsprint from Canadian sources.

There are other materials besides copper that are affected by the International Materials Conference. I certainly agree with the gentleman's statement that it is without statutory authority. It seems to be without any authority at all. It should be thoroughly investigated and the facts revealed.

Mr. SADLAK. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Chairman, I am wholeheartedly in favor of this amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. MORTON].

Mr. MORTON. Mr. Chairman, let us get off this international cartel business and talk about the Gwinn amendment for a minute.

At the end of next month we are going to sell about a million dollars worth of horses down in Lexington, Ky., at the

Keeneland sales. If a guy wants to sell a horse there and get anything for it, he wants to get about eight people bidding on it. The guy who has only one person bidding on his horse goes home pretty sick.

This Gwinn amendment does this, it stops the bidding on copper. If the copper goes to England, France, Switzerland, or wherever it goes, it means that we buy it. We will then have a greater control over the price than if we give them the money and have them bidding up these critical raw materials that we cannot get.

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

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

Mr. VORYS. Each of these countries has other dollars outside of those it gets from us. We cannot by this amendment prevent their bidding.

Mr. MORTON. As I understand this amendment, it requires us to purchase the critical materials, those that are under control and allocation. It requires us to purchase them with the dollars. They get just as much, but it merely means that there are not 15 or 20 people bidding on this poor old nag that cannot outrun an ape, anyhow.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York [Mr. JAVITS].

(Mr. JAVITS asked and was given permission to yield the time allotted to him to Mr. MANSFIELD.)

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I think these two amendments are too far reaching to be given the consideration which they should have in this short period of time.

I can well understand the position of my good friend the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. SADLAK] because he comes from a copper-fabricating State. I can well understand and agree more with my friend the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MEADER] because he recognizes the value of copper, as long as we are using that as an illustration, in the manufacture of automobiles and allied products.

I think we ought to keep in mind the fact that this country is facing an annual deficit of 500,000 tons of copper. We are not spending something like \$1,000,000,000 in this bill for metals, as stated by the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. SADLAK]. There is not that kind of money allocated for this particular purpose. As far as our strategic mineral stockpile is concerned, it is a very, very small one. You cannot tell when we will need such things as copper, manganese, chrome, and so forth, which we have in low supply at the present time.

I wonder if you realize that we import 40 percent of our copper. A good deal of it comes from Chile. At the present time there is a strike on down there which has been in existence for some weeks. I do not know whether or when it is going to be settled. Further, the government down there has withdrawn its agreement insofar as the export supply of copper is concerned. It wants a higher price than it is getting now. That means, of course, that if this matter is not settled very shortly the pinch in our

own country will be that much more severe.

We import 90 percent of our manganese. In my State of Montana we mine 90 percent of the entire supply of manganese in this country. We import 95 percent of the chrome, and we have to depend for 5 percent on our own resources.

I think we ought to consider this matter very, very carefully, because, first, of the impact it will have on American industry, especially in the Detroit area, and, secondly, and perhaps more important, the effect it will have on our strategic stockpile.

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

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield to the gentleman from Connecticut.

Mr. SADLAK. The gentleman knows of the mines which have been recently opened in his State and in the State of Michigan. In upper Michigan, where we are now subsidizing those higher-cost mines, even though they mine copper, we do not get the benefit of it. It goes into the pot for distribution by the IMC.

Mr. MANSFIELD. May I make a correction there? They recently opened mines in the State of Michigan, that is true, but as far as the mines in Montana are concerned, they are down below 5,000 feet, and the deeper they go the richer they are.

Mr. SADLAK. Let me refer to an excerpt from the New York Times of May 22, that the United States is lifting the ceilings on copper imports and will now permit a larger price to be paid on copper from Chile. It also says that the price of domestically produced copper has been fixed for some time at 24.5 cents, and officials said today it will remain at that level.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I believe the price is still too low, because we are faced with a terrible situation insofar as our copper supply is concerned. Twenty-five years from now there will not be a copper camp in the United States and 100 years from now Butte will still be producing. But on a world-wide scale the stuff is not there, and it is going to become more and more valuable as time goes on.

Mr. Chairman, I hope both these amendments are defeated.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Montana has expired. All time has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MEADER] to the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. GWINN].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. MEADER), there were—ayes 39, noes 59.

So the amendment to the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. GWINN].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. SADLAK), there were—ayes 30, noes 74.

So the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. If there are no further amendments to section 3, the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 4. Title II of the Mutual Security Act of 1951 is amended as follows:

(a) At the end of section 201 add the following new sentence: "There is hereby authorized to be appropriated to the President for the fiscal year 1953 not to exceed \$606,370,000, to carry out the purposes and provisions of this section; and in addition balances of any appropriations heretofore made pursuant to this section unobligated as of June 30, 1952, or subsequently released from obligation, are authorized to be continued available for obligation for their original purposes through June 30, 1953, and to be consolidated with the appropriation hereby authorized."

(b) At the end of section 203, which relates to economic and technical assistance for the Near East and Africa, add the following new sentence: "There is hereby authorized to be appropriated to the President for the fiscal year 1953 not to exceed \$55,000,000, to carry out the purposes and provisions of this section; and in addition balances of any appropriations heretofore made pursuant to this section unobligated as of June 30, 1952, or subsequently released from obligation, are authorized to be continued available for obligation for their original purposes through June 30, 1953, and to be consolidated with the appropriation hereby authorized."

(c) After section 205 add the following new section:

"Sec. 206. In addition to the amounts authorized by section 203, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated not to exceed \$65,000,000 for carrying out the purposes and provisions of section 204 of this act, relating to Palestine refugees, during the fiscal year 1953; and not to exceed \$76,000,000 for carrying out the purposes and provisions of section 205 of this act, relating to refugees in Israel, during the fiscal year 1953: *Provided*, That amounts appropriated pursuant to this section which the President finds cannot be effectively expended to carry out the purposes and provisions of sections 204 and 205 may be transferred to and merged with the appropriations authorized by section 203."

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, I offer three amendments.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendments offered by Mr. VORYS:

On page 16, line 13, amend subsection (b) to read as follows:

"(b) Amend section 203 to read as follows: 'In order to further the purpose of this act in Africa and the Near East there is hereby authorized to be appropriated to the President for the fiscal year 1953 not to exceed \$55,000,000 to carry out the purposes and provisions of this section; and in addition balances of any appropriations heretofore made pursuant to this section unobligated as of June 30, 1952, or subsequently released from obligation, are authorized to be continued available for obligation for their original purposes through June 30, 1953, and to be consolidated with the appropriation hereby authorized. Funds appropriated pursuant to this section shall be available under section 503 of this act and the Act for International Development (22 U. S. C. 1557).'"

On page 18, line 4, strike out "(b) at the end of subsection 302 (a)" and insert the following:

"(b) In the second sentence of subsection 302 (a) strike out the words 'the applicable provisions of the Economic Cooperation Act of 1948, as amended (22 U. S. C. 1501-1522), and' and insert in lieu thereof 'section 503 of this act and the applicable provisions' and at the end of such subsection."

On page 20, after line 22, insert the following:

"(c) Amend section 503 by inserting '(a)' after (503) by redesignating paragraphs (a), (b), and (c) as (1), (2), and (3), respec-

tively, and by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(b) (1) Except as provided in paragraph (2), the Economic Cooperation Act of 1948, as amended, is repealed.

"(2) Of the powers, functions, and responsibilities transferred to the Director for Mutual Security by section 502 (b) (2) of this act, only those which are exercised pursuant to the provisions of the Economic Cooperation Act of 1948, as amended, enumerated in paragraph (3) of this subsection and are not in conflict with the other provisions of this act, as amended, may be exercised after June 30, 1952. Of the powers, functions, and responsibilities conferred on the President or the Secretary of State by the Economic Cooperation Act of 1948, as amended, only those conferred by the provisions of that act, as amended, which are referred to in paragraph (3) of this subsection may be exercised after June 30, 1952.

"(3) The provisions of the Economic Cooperation Act of 1948, as amended, referred to above are the following: Sections 104 (e) and (f); 107; subsections (c) and (d) of section 109; 110 (a) and (b); 111; 112; 113; subsections (d), (h), and (i) of section 114; 115 (a); paragraphs (1), (2), (3), (4), (5), (6), (7), (8), (9), and (10) of section 115 (b); subsections (d), (h), and (j) of section 115; section 117 (c); section 119; and section 120. Where any of the above provisions refer to the purposes of the Economic Cooperation Act of 1948, as amended, such reference shall be deemed to be the purpose of this act, as amended."

"(d) In subsection (a) of section 504, strike out all after 'Senate' and insert in lieu thereof a period and the following sentences: 'The Deputy Director shall receive compensation of \$17,500 per annum. The special representative in Europe shall receive the same compensation and allowances as a chief of mission, class 1, within the meaning of the act of August 13, 1946 (60 Stat. 999) and have the rank of Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary. The deputy special representative in Europe shall be entitled to receive the same compensation and allowance as a chief of mission, class 3, within the meaning of the act of August 13, 1946 (60 Stat. 999), and have the rank of Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary.'"

Renumber subsequent subsections accordingly.

On page 26, lines 12 and 13, strike out the words "the Economic Cooperation Act" and insert in lieu thereof "section 503 of this act."

Mr. VORYS (interrupting the reading of the amendments). Mr. Chairman, if I may have the attention of my chairman, in view of the fact that this amendment was read at some length yesterday evening, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the amendment be dispensed with, and also that the various sections of the amendment be considered together at this time.

Mr. RICHARDS. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, as I understand it, this is an identical amendment to be put into this section, which was passed in the other section last night, and also that you have identical amendments to go in titles III and IV; is that correct?

Mr. VORYS. They are similar technical changes, and there is an amendment to go in title V, which I discussed at some length yesterday evening.

Mr. RICHARDS. In substance, the amendments are the same? In other words, they are cut to apply to the particular section involved?

Mr. VORYS. That is correct.

Mr. RICHARDS. Mr. Chairman, in view of that I see no objection to considering all three amendments, as read, and neither do I see any objection to considering all three amendments at this time.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, I shall not detain the committee for 5 minutes. This is a somewhat elaborate series of amendments but has only one purpose, and that is to do away with the possibility of legislation by letter writing, and have Congress legislate, so as to make definitely clear in law what has been stated to be the fact, and that is that the ECA, as such, and the Marshall plan, as such, and the European recovery plan, as such wind up as per schedule on June 30, 1952.

These elaborate sections are necessary to get the program under three acts instead of four. If this amendment is adopted we will then have a single director for the Mutual Defense Assistance Act; the Mutual Security Act; and phases of the act for international development, but we will no longer have four laws, and have him still operating ECA. The appropriate necessary provisions are retained. In view of the fact that the House has already adopted this principle and part of the amendment, I would hope the House would adopt the rest of the amendment.

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

Mr. VORYS. I yield.

Mr. JAVITS. If the gentleman will permit me, I would like to say to the gentleman that having the natural disquiet of a lawyer I would doubt very much that the President's letter writing could take the place of enacted law. I feel this amendment is designed to tighten up, not to weaken the law. May I say further, to remove any disquiet the chairman may feel, that in conference a very thorough review will undoubtedly be made to be sure that every power that is really needed is actually in the bill.

Mr. VORYS. I thank the gentleman. He had a somewhat similar amendment. Let me say this, that once the House decides that this is what we are going to do and the way we are going to do it, you may be sure that the Government lawyers, the committee staff, and the lawyers of the committee will "nit-pick" this thing to make sure we have made no mistakes.

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

Mr. Chairman, last night when a similar amendment came up as to title I of the bill I objected as strenuously as I could and fought the amendment as strongly as I could. I did not think the amendment should be in the bill. But in view of the fact that it was placed by the Committee of the Whole in title I, I agree with the position taken by the gentleman from Ohio that it should also be in titles II, III, and IV; and therefore I will not oppose it.

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

Mr. RICHARDS. I yield.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Will there be a roll call vote on all these amendments en bloc? Does the gentleman contemplate that? I think it is a very serious move that we have taken here; I think it is a mistake.

Mr. RICHARDS. It is. There could be a roll call, although I am not saying that we will demand a roll call; and I do not want anybody in the House to get the impression that I favor these four amendments, but in view of the fact that one has been placed in title I, if that is to be retained I think all four should be retained.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Messrs. Gross and CRAWFORD) there were—ayes 54, noes 76.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chairman appointed as tellers Mr. RICHARDS and Mr. VORYS.

The Committee again divided; and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 101, noes 99.

So the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin: On page 16, line 24, strike out the period and insert the following: "Provided, That the dollar costs of the United States under the act for international development for the program in any country in any fiscal year for supplies and equipment shall not exceed three times the dollar costs of the United States for United States technicians and the training of local personnel."

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, my amendment seeks to limit the dollar costs for supplies and equipment under the act for international development.

There is evidence that those who are administering the program have inaugurated, as I see it, a great WPA program, on a global scale. It is up to this Congress to determine just how far we are going to permit the planners in MSA to establish a program of technical assistance which is not based on common sense, unless we apply the brakes today there is no telling just how fantastic it will be in the future.

Now, I have here, and I want to put in the RECORD, some evidence which shows how foolishly some of this money is being spent.

I am wondering if you know that during 1951 there were 505 teams from 15 European countries and 33 teams from 6 Far East countries who participated in the ECA and the MSA program.

I have before me a statement prepared by MSA for me as to the number of teams that were here on various projects. I will place that statement in the RECORD, so that all Members may read it. I do not have the time to read it now, but it is fantastic. One might draw the conclusion that what we are trying to do under this program is to make Europe and Asia over in our own image. But here is, page after page, a list of projects involving people from all over the world who have come to this country at the ex-

pense of the American taxpayers. This is the most extensive and expensive excursion party ever conducted for free to those who come to this country. Here are 92 teams, for instance, from France, and this is only one instance, and so it goes on and on. I will not take the time to read this exhibit, but it will be in the RECORD so all Members may take their time to read. It will be very revealing, I assure you.

EUROPEANS AND ASIANS VISIT THIS COUNTRY ON VARIOUS PROJECTS AT EXPENSE OF AMERICAN TAXPAYERS

Five hundred and five teams from 15 European countries and 33 teams from 6 far eastern countries were sponsored by ECA-MSA during calendar year 1951. A total of \$6,694,353 was obligated to cover the dollar expenses of the European team members, and \$699,000 was obligated for the far eastern team members while in the United States.

The cost of the program in 1951 was \$7,393,353, and it is anticipated that for 1952 the cost will exceed that of last year.

PART A. FROM EUROPE
PROJECT TEAMS ACTIVE IN THE UNITED STATES DURING 1951

Austria: 16 teams

Trade-union journalists.
Agricultural extension services.
Agricultural organization study.
Chemical wood study.
Agricultural electrification study.
Agriculture extension techniques.
Plant protection study.
Artificial insemination techniques.
In-plant training for engineers.
Young farmers.
MIT foreign student summer project.
Young Women Farmer Trainees.
4-H directors.
Large farmers.
Harvard trade-union program.
Farm management institute.

Belgium and Luxemburg: 25 teams

Chemical research.
Plastics research.
Foundry team.
Forging and stamping team.
Soil study techniques (Congo).
Agricultural prices, marketing, and distribution.
Statistical services (Congo).
Youth leader.
Agriculture economics study.
MIT foreign student summer project.
National income statistics study.
Dairy study.
Grassland study.
Agricultural economics extension.
Agricultural engineering study.
Potato root eelworm control and eradication.
Horticulture production improvement.
Livestock diseases due to mineral deficiencies.

Vitamin deficiencies in poultry.
Livestock feeding.
Wood technology.
Farm machinery.
Soil improvement methods.
Climatology and microbiology (Congo).
Crop forecasting techniques (Congo).

Denmark: 61 teams

Home economics study.
Drainage engineering.
Air traffic control.
Farm machinery study.
Young farmers.
Plant breeding.
Youth leaders.
Artificial insemination methods.

Improvement in seed and seed grain production.
Cattle breeding.
Pig breeding.
Agricultural information.
Quarantine and control measures in agriculture.
Methods in plant breeding.
Insulation and ventilation of agricultural buildings.
Servo-technique.
Paint and varnish study.
Developments in use of concrete.
Hosiery team.
Foundry team.
Storing and canning of fish.
Mastitis in cattle.
Animal diseases.
Power station maintenance.
Chemical analysis of metals.
Foundry machinery study.
Forage crops and hybrid corn.
Agricultural films.
Plant breeding.
Veterinary hygiene.
Quality standards for dairy products.
Synthetic materials in textile industry.
Soil fertility and chemical testing of soil.
Agricultural bookkeeping.
Farm mechanization study.
Meat industry productivity team.
Fractional distillation mission.
Building construction productivity team.
Herbicide, insecticide, and fungicide study.
Dairy research study.
Welding techniques.
Home economics extension.
Cheese-making techniques.
Dairy industry study.
Forestry research.
Poultry study.
MIT foreign student summer project.
Agricultural building design.
Harvard advanced management course.
Mining of nonferrous metals.
Vegetable and fruit canning.
Farm management research.
Ensilage research and experimental work.
Potato breeding.
Lightweight concrete industry.
Harvard advanced management program.
Lime and tile industry productivity team.
Phosphate fertilizer production.
Shipbuilding study.
Civil aviation operational methods.
Manufacture of 50-caliber ammunition.

France: 92 teams

Young productivity trainees.
Secondary nonferrous metals productivity team.
Citrus fruit genetics and production.
Citrus fruit marketing.
Soils study group.
Building construction productivity team.
Export accountant study.
Nonferrous metal mining group (Africa).
Iron and steel productivity team.
Sulfuric acid, phosphate and mixed fertilizers productivity team.
Metal mining productivity team.
Commercial poultry husbandry study.
Industrial training methods study group.
Petroleum engineering trainees group.
Miscellaneous industries market study group.
Plastics manufacturing productivity team.
Handling and stevedoring in ports productivity team.
Insurance productivity team.
Simplification, standardization, and specialization study group.
Railroad equipment productivity team.
Farm work simplification.
Overseas territories farm machinery study.
Wage systems study team.
Plywood, veneer, and wood crates.
Paper and paperboard productivity team.
Optical and precision instruments distribution study.
Glass industry productivity team.
Highway transportation study group.

Plant insect and disease control study group.
 Cotton weaving productivity team.
 Steel drawing and rolling productivity team.
 Rehabilitation of disabled persons.
 Rice culture study group (metropole and overseas territories).
 Insulated wire and cable industries productivity team.
 Rural youth leaders.
 French publishers' and editors' productivity study.
 Emergency controls and Federal agencies.
 Lime and cement productivity team.
 Forestry research.
 Root diseases study in cereals.
 Soil study.
 Management-labor relations within industry.
 Agricultural cooperatives study.
 Corn breeding and selection.
 Pastures and forage.
 Graphic industries productivity team.
 Paint and varnish productivity team.
 Fruits and vegetables production and marketing.
 Architects, engineers, contractors productivity team.
 Motors and turbines productivity team.
 Machine tool accessories and power hand tools productivity team.
 Alloying, rolling, and drawing of nonferrous metals productivity team.
 Plumbing, heating, air-conditioning productivity team.
 Foundations, main walls, material lifting equipment study group.
 New materials, prefabrication productivity team.
 Carpentry productivity team (building construction group).
 Metal construction productivity team (building construction group).
 Chlorine and chlorine derivatives industry productivity team.
 Town planning, legislation, and financing.
 MIT foreign student summer project.
 Young farmers.
 Tile and brick productivity team.
 Fruit canning and jam manufacturing productivity team.
 Lead and zinc ore smelting productivity team.
 Textile dyeing and finishing productivity team.
 Glove industry market study group.
 Vegetable canning productivity team.
 Young farm women trainees.
 Silk and artificial fibers throwing and weaving.
 Provincial press study group.
 Productivity and full employment study.
 Government road construction engineers.
 Fruit juice processing.
 Work accidents and occupational diseases prevention.
 Corn improvement study group.
 Gas industry technical study group.
 Management engineers study group II.
 Laundry and dry-cleaning productivity team.
 Techniques of collective bargaining.
 Meat packing and canning industry productivity team.
 Welding industry technical study group.
 Men's ready-made clothing study.
 Farm management institute.
 Woolen industry productivity team.
 Union organization and functioning.
 Electric power production and distribution study.
 Land-tenure conference.
 Agricultural economics services.
 Integration of the worker within the enterprise study.
 Techniques of collective bargaining, group B.
 Techniques of collective bargaining, group C.
 Business legislation study.

Germany: 29 teams

Techniques of cellulose production.
 Telecommunications study.
 Telecommunications technology.
 Coal mining productivity team.
 Farm machinery study.
 Bread making.
 Control of X-disease in livestock.
 Artificial insemination of dairy cattle.
 Poultry production.
 Agricultural information.
 Animal husbandry and livestock feeding.
 Irrigation equipment methods and management.
 Dairy production management and distribution.
 Marketing agricultural products.
 Soil conservation.
 Agricultural statistics.
 Farm machinery extension methods.
 Farm credit.
 Plant breeding.
 Forest tree nurseries.
 Retail food distribution.
 Manufacture of artificial limbs.
 MIT foreign student summer project.
 German productivity center team.
 Manufacture of fireproofing products.
 Harvard advanced management and trade-union program.
 Development of agricultural program and legislation.
 Land tenure conference and training program.
 Chemists study tour.

Greece: 18 teams

Public health training program.
 Ground water irrigation techniques.
 Union administration program.
 Civil aviation training.
 Surface water research and irrigation practices.
 Nutrition study and training.
 Agricultural home economics extension.
 Irrigation management and land preparation techniques.
 Range management.
 Extension study and training.
 MIT foreign student summer project.
 Agricultural credit specialist.
 Cereal and oilseed processing.
 Electric power system trainees.
 Extension training methods.
 Open house for rural youth leaders.
 Medical and public health training.
 Land tenure conference and training course.

Iceland: 8 teams

Geophysical prospecting study.
 Canning and freezing of fish.
 Utilization of fishery byproducts.
 Soil survey study.
 Young farmers.
 MIT foreign student summer project.
 Labor leaders.
 Paint factory in-plant training.

Ireland: 28 teams

Farm management.
 Tourist industry development.
 Airlines operations.
 Air traffic control.
 Aeronautical telecommunications.
 Weather forecasting.
 Poultry production technology and extension.
 Port and docks study.
 Phosphate fertilizer manufacture.
 Higher agricultural education and research.
 Farm mechanization study.
 Farm management study.
 Agricultural credit facilities.
 Sugar-beet industry—genetics.
 Sugar-beet industry—chemical engineering.
 Oatmeal processing study.
 Restrictive trade practices.
 Animal nutrition.
 Young farmers.
 Youth leaders.
 MIT foreign student summer project.

Airlines study II.
 Soil research.
 Paper industry productivity team.
 Plant nutrition.
 Trade union and productivity project I.
 Harvard trade union course.
 Chemists study tour.

Italy: 18 teams

Civil aviation team.
 Livestock genetics and breeding.
 Forage crop production study.
 Extension techniques in fruit production.
 Plant quarantine study.
 Nonferrous metals team.
 Solid, liquid and gaseous fuels testing.
 Telephone team.
 Port study.
 Industrial organization and management.
 Training steam power operators.
 Story of budget and fiscal techniques.
 Young farmers.
 MIT foreign student summer project.
 Reclamation and land improvement.
 Farm management institute.
 Conciliation and arbitration procedures study.
 Land tenure conference.

Netherlands: 49 teams

Knitwear team.
 Methods of artificial insemination of animals.
 Surinam citrus processing.
 Organizational efficiency study.
 Letterpress productivity team.
 Lithography productivity team.
 Poultry farming.
 Home economics study.
 In-plant training—textile industry.
 Trade-union productivity team.
 Dairy research.
 Young farmers study III.
 Cotton spinning and weaving productivity team.
 Tuberculosis of cattle.
 Poultry disease study.
 Swine disease study.
 Sterility in cattle.
 Brucellosis and mastitis study.
 Paper and board packing specialist team.
 Heavy clothing industry productivity team.
 Agricultural productivity study.
 Leather research.
 Enamelware study.
 Grey iron foundry productivity team.
 Small fruits production.
 Fruits and vegetables processing.
 Soil research.
 Horticultural engineering study.
 Land improvement study.
 Taxation and tax administration.
 Oak, elm, and birch disease study.
 Industrial electrical equipment team.
 Farm women trainees.
 MIT foreign student summer project.
 Seed treatment and testing.
 Alfalfa production.
 Soil and land classification.
 Improvement of production and processing pulses.
 Industrial relations study.
 Pests and diseases of agricultural crops.
 Research on tension and vibrations.
 Farm management institute study.
 Vegetable seed production and marketing.
 Harvard advanced management course.
 Cattle feeding.
 Electrical appliances and telecommunications.
 Equipment industries study.
 Land tenure conference and training program.
 Gas industry study.
 Electroplating productivity team.

Norway: 46 teams

Milk production and processing.
 Textile productivity group.
 Agricultural engineering.
 Management engineering.
 Organization of telegraph and telephone service.

Extraction, refining and use of mica and nepheline.
 Pulp and paper team.
 Agricultural extension service.
 Soil conservation and utilization.
 Farm youth organization survey program.
 Dairy industry.
 Animal husbandry extension study.
 Seed testing techniques.
 Methods of combatting and diagnosing metabolic diseases.
 Methods of silage production.
 Horticultural extension study.
 Agricultural engineering and architecture.
 Administration of farm managerial services.
 Potato breeding.
 Soil surveying and testing.
 Labor-management techniques on scientific management.
 In-plant training-management.
 Industrial management study.
 House building industry productivity team.
 Rubber reclaiming study.
 Propagation of trees and bushes and nursery management.
 Young farmers.
 Agricultural films study.
 Regional planning for industrial improvement.
 Highway transportation study.
 Mining industry productivity team.
 Forestry statistics.
 Industrial and public management study.
 MIT foreign student summer project.
 Farm management study.
 Agricultural radio programs.
 Young women farmer trainee program.
 Agricultural productivity study.
 Farm building team.
 Harvard advanced management program.
 Forest research.
 Government regulations in dairy industry.
 Harvard trade-union program.
 Telecommunication equipment study.
 Forestry productivity team.
 Chemists study tour.

Portugal: 6 teams

Financial statistical studies.
 Foreign Trade Zone study.
 MIT foreign student summer project.
 Harvard advanced management program.
 Agricultural extension.
 Soil conservation.

Sweden: 15 teams

Modern woodworking practices.
 Management-labor cooperation study.
 Iron ore beneficiation.
 Agricultural machinery testing and selection.
 Young farmers.
 Modern woodworking practices.
 Soy bean breeding.
 Youth leader.
 Agricultural film study.
 Electric power study.
 Statistical methods.
 MIT foreign student summer project.
 Industrial and business management study.
 Farm women trainees.
 Harvard advanced management course.

Turkey: 22 teams

Training in meteorology forecasting.
 Statistical study.
 Irrigation and water development training.
 Agricultural technicians.
 Agricultural study.
 Civil aviation training program.
 Methods of reforestation.
 Livestock production and meat industry.
 Animal nutrition.
 Training in telephone administration.
 Soils and soil management.
 Public roads study.
 Sumerbank executives training program.
 Ministry of finance trainees.
 Maintenance of steam locomotives.
 Advanced public administration training.

Meat packing industry study.
 MIT foreign student summer project.
 Meteorological executive trainees.
 Military chemical arsenal study.
 Land tenure conference.
 Farm management institute.

United Kingdom: 50 teams

Underground gasification of coal.
 Soil fertility study.
 Scientific and technological training.
 Grassland management.
 Grassland study.
 Cotton classification and selection.
 Technical managers team.
 Agricultural economics study.
 Agricultural extension study.
 Tropical housing survey.
 Youth leader.
 Telecommunication officers training.
 Training in management techniques.
 Training in technology and management.
 Electrical engineers to study power installation (Maltese Government).
 Hotel and catering study.
 Agricultural statistics.
 Machine tool industry study.
 MIT foreign student summer project.
 Fruit and vegetable grade assessment.
 Agricultural economics research.
 Tobacco production and breeding.
 Spectrographic quantumometers construction.
 Virus research (Tanganyika).
 Harvard advanced management and trade-union course.
 Grain storage and drying.
 Farm management training program.
 Training for industry team I (operatives).
 Productivity team No. 26 (lithography).
 Training for industry team II.
 Productivity team No. 29 (iron and steel).
 Productivity team No. 27 (coal mining).
 Dry grocery industry productivity team.
 Training for industry team III (universities and industries).
 Productivity team No. 30 (furniture manufacturers).
 Specialist team No. 11 (education for management).
 Productivity team No. 30 (zinc and aluminum die-casting).
 Fruit and vegetable canning industry.
 Conservation and substitution of raw and scarce materials.
 Processing of fruits and vegetables.
 Cake and biscuit manufacturing productivity team.
 Provincial newspaper productivity team.
 Constructional steelwork industry productivity team.
 Short-term storage of fruits and vegetables.
 Woodworking machinery productivity team.
 Inspection methods in mass-production industries.
 Production control methods.
 Land tenure conference.
 Metalworking machine tool team.
 Bristol aircraft technicians.

OEEC: 23 teams

Foreign trade zone study.
 BLS study No. 4.
 Industrial safety.
 Materials handling.
 Water, sewage, and garbage treatment.
 Industrial cost accounting study.
 Nonferrous ore dressing study.
 Production and use of printing machinery.
 Oil equipment.
 Utilization of wood products.
 Paper and board packaging study.
 Young chemists study tour.
 Refining and drilling study.
 Highway improvement and utilization.
 BLS study No. 5—Productivity measurement.
 Forest fire prevention.
 Trade-union course.
 Industrial census.
 Galvanizing techniques.
 Heavy metal fabrication.

World Metallurgical Congress.
 Nonferrous smelting and refining.
 Technical assistance study.

*PART B. FROM SOUTHEAST ASIA**Burma: 7 teams*

Youth leaders.
 Rangoon port rehabilitation.
 Inland water transport.
 Postgraduate student training.
 Land tenure conference and training program.
 Agriculture—Training foreign students.
 Chemists study tour.

China: 3 teams

Postgraduate students and trainees.
 Chemists study tour.
 World Metallurgical Congress.

Indochina: 3 teams

Chemists study tour.
 Medical training.
 Land tenure conference.

Indonesia: 8 teams

Youth leaders.
 Public health training.
 Animal feeding and breeding.
 Cooperative associations.
 Chemists study tour.
 Wisconsin land tenure training program.
 Industrial training.
 Improvement of indigenous industries.

Philippines: 3 teams

Land tenure conference and training program.
 Agricultural training and information.
 Chemists study tour.

Thailand: 9 teams

MIT foreign student summer project.
 In-service training of irrigation engineers.
 Public health training.
 Chemists study tour.
 Telecommunications training.
 Hydrographic training.
 Cartographic training.
 Civil aviation training.
 Land tenure conference and training program.

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

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. BYRNES. Can the gentleman advise us at all to what extent these people who come over here with these teams and with their cameras and everything else are screened, as far as their relationship with any Communist areas are concerned, or their responsibility as people representing the democracies?

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. They are presumed to be screened. I would not offer any statement to satisfy the gentleman from Wisconsin as to just how extensive that screening is. Anyhow, it is a fantastic program that is being set up, and I think that we should put an end to it.

Now then, when this program was started it was not designed to be a great WPA project; it was designed merely to bring technical knowledge and assistance to those countries where we felt that such assistance would help them to help themselves.

One of the first witnesses we had in support of the program was Assistant Secretary of State Thorp, and he testified that this meant providing surplus, plus whatever materials are needed, for demonstration purposes. Now then, they have gone far beyond that proposition. It is not only a matter of furnishing a few men but an endless number of projects never contemplated when

the point 4 program was considered. I will enumerate a few, and I am reading from a staff memorandum prepared by the staff of our committee:

The program for each country is divided into six major fields of activity plus one for program direction. These are agriculture; forestry and fisheries; health and sanitation; natural resources, public works, and transportation; industry, handicraft, and housing; and public administration and Government services.

That is the extent to which this technical assistance effort is going. I repeat, it is way out of proportion to anything that this Congress ever intended.

Let me continue. Here, for instance, is a water project, one phase of which includes the construction of a diversion dam, tunnel, and power dam. I will not take the time to go into that matter, but it further illustrates how far the MSA people have gone.

In Pakistan, for instance, 10,000 tons of fertilizer, to include ammonium sulfate, is included in the program. They are building a fertilizer plant in Pakistan. So you see how this is going.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin has expired. (By unanimous consent, Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin was allowed to proceed for three additional minutes.)

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. We have an educational project in Libya. Of course, the first need was for buildings and equipment, which the Libyan Government is unable to provide because of a deficit situation so far as the budget is concerned. The program for the first year, therefore, is concerned largely with repair and new construction costs in the amount of \$475,000.

In Ethiopia there is an agricultural project, which is built around an agricultural college in which the Emperor is greatly interested. Who would not be interested in it? Also there is a rural-development project to serve as a demonstration area. The program in this field calls for 16 United States technicians, costing \$64,000, and supplies and equipment costing \$478,150.

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

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. CLEVINGER. Is it not true that the aggregate in this bill is greater than the total requested for the State Department, some \$300 million before the House cut it 33 percent in the regular appropriation bill?

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. That is my understanding.

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

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. PHILLIPS. The gentleman is aware of the fact that the men most interested and active in the point 4 program are concerned about the substitution of large amounts of money for the personal service upon which it was originally based.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Yes, that is correct, as I have personally talked with some of these men. They are vitally interested, and their hearts are in the program.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to insert at this point in my remarks the report from the Board of Consultants to the Food, Agriculture and Resources Development staff, Technical Cooperation Administration, Department of State. It is a letter to Mr. Whipple, the director of that staff, in which they point out very clearly that there is no need for the supplies and equipment that have been going into this program. This group is anxious to see that that program is geared to technical assistance, with a minimum of extras, such as special projects, power projects, fertilizer plants, etc.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Those are the men who are responsible for the success of the program.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Absolutely. There is no doubt about it.

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

There was no objection.

(The letter referred to follows:)

MAY 2, 1952.

To: Clayton E. Whipple, Director, Food, Agriculture, and Resources Development Staff, Technical Cooperation Administration, Department of State.

From: Board of Consultants to the Food, Agriculture, and Resources Development Staff, Technical Cooperation Administration, Department of State.

Subject: Recommendations.

The chief purpose of the TCA program is to help people help themselves, in a simple, direct way, rather than to be utilized as an expedient to attain political and/or military policy objectives. TCA should not be required to administer funds not contributing directly to its fundamental aims.

TCA programs can only succeed if governments and people have confidence in the sincerity with which such help is offered.

In carrying out the projects it is necessary that TCA adopt a "grass roots-village" approach. Such an approach will give maximum results with minimum expenditure of appropriated funds. This will require a staff possessing imagination and determination inspired by a spirit of service.

The desire for assistance should arise from a need recognized by a community as important for the achievement of better living.

The full participation of the community should be sought through the utilization of locally available human and natural resources, local institutions and organizations, local leaders, and local labor supply, toward the end of developing local initiative and competence to continue and expand programs.

In the field of agriculture, TCA should emphasize a few key projects that are quickly, economically, and widely reproducible.

In many of these countries there exists a rich fund of proven knowledge and proven practical application of that knowledge which desperately needs to be disseminated to all of the people.

The accomplishment of only a few projects which are simple and already proven will solve the immediate food problem in the underdeveloped countries.

Typical projects are:

Proven varieties for high-yielding crops and improved livestock.

Small farm tools for use with hand and locally available animal power.

Savings of food from loss through proper methods of rodent and insect control and through efficient methods of storage.

Immediate implementation of plans to eradicate rinderpest, hoof-and-mouth disease, and desert locusts.

We believe attention should be given to sound evaluation of water resources and planning for proper control and use of this vital resource through simple methods of application and/or drainage.

In order to provide incentive to farmers and secure to them a greater proportion of the results of their labors, we believe that better methods of marketing and distribution should be instituted everywhere. As an example, in the East this has been amply demonstrated at Hong Kong.

We believe that emphasis on these types of projects represents the basic philosophy and concept of TCA, and, furthermore, that the American people will wholeheartedly support a program of this nature.

In the development of this program we urge the closest possible collaboration with the food and agriculture organization of the United Nations.

Harold B. Allen, Director of Education, Near East Foundation, New York, N. Y.; L. G. Ligutti, Executive Director, National Catholic Rural Life Conference, Des Moines, Iowa; Wm. A. Schoenfeld, Dean Emeritus and Organization Consultant, Corvallis, Ore.; E. B. Evans, President, Prairie View Agricultural and Mechanical College, Prairie View, Tex.; Abner Bowen, Farmer and Businessman, Delphi, Ind.; John H. Reisner, Executive Secretary, Agricultural Missions, Inc., New York, N. Y.; Raymond W. Miller, Consultant, Food and Agriculture Organization, United Nations, and Lecturer, Harvard Graduate School of Business Administration, Linden, Calif.; C. Leigh Stevens, Agricultural Engineer and Management Consultant, Yemassee, S. C.

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

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Do I correctly understand that the gentleman's amendment prohibits us from spending in any country on the point 4 program more than three times the dollars that we pay for United States technicians and personnel under their direction?

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. That is exactly right.

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

I hope the House will get first things first in regard to this amendment. This amendment does not add any money to this bill for the so-called technical assistance program. It does not deduct any money from the bill. It says that the individual programs, when it comes to scientific help and supplies, must be operated with a certain ratio as to supplies and technical help. It does not even imply, if you vote for this amendment or vote against it, whether or not you favor the point 4 program. It has nothing to do with that. You will have an opportunity later on to vote your individual conscience on that. Right here, if this amendment is adopted in regard to this program, we would be making a serious mistake, not only on account of disrupting programs that have already begun, but laying down a pattern which will cost the taxpayers of the United States more money if any program is authorized to continue at all.

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

If the gentleman will look at page 53 of the committee report, the title here of contributions by the host governments, it says in the first sentence of

the second paragraph, "The amount which the host governments contribute," and so on and so forth. What do you mean by host government?

Mr. RICHARDS. Mr. Chairman, I want to speak to the point involved here. The point involved has nothing to do with host governments at all. The point has to do with the contribution of the United States Government in these programs, and how these programs will be operated. It has nothing in the world to do with the point that the gentleman just raised.

Mr. GROSS. This deals with the technical assistance program, and here you speak euphoniously of the host government.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment to the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment to the amendment offered by Mr. VORYS: Strike out the amendment and insert "Provided further, That not more than 50 percent of any funds authorized under this act for international development may be expended for the procurement of materials, supplies, equipment, or commodities."

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, I am thoroughly in accord with what my colleague, the gentleman from Wisconsin, proposes, only I do not think he goes far enough. He is saying we should limit supplies 3 to 1, and I think we ought to make supplies 50-50, in a program that is advertised as merely exporting know-how. For many years, we have had programs for giving technical assistance to various countries. There have been necessary small amounts of materials and equipment for demonstration purposes. But, this year we have a vast program, proposed where the general average is 4½ to 1 for supplies and equipment compared to personnel costs, and in some instances the ratio goes over 10 to 1. It seems to me that is a mistake. There is danger that the technical assistance, point 4 program, will simply become a new form of world-wide economic aid. Of course, these countries will accept supplies. Of course, they will permit us to dig wells and build flood-control projects, and furnish all kinds of equipment. But, it seems to me that we do not have the wealth to do this justly and equitably all over the world, and that we had better not get into that sort of thing.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. VORYS. I yield.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Under your amendment, what portion of \$115,000,000 for India could be used for materials, supplies, and so forth?

Mr. VORYS. I shall have an amendment to deal with the amounts later on.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. I mean assuming that the figure was \$115,000,000.

Mr. VORYS. They could use half of it for supplies, and I think over nine-tenths of it is for supplies under the program provided.

Mr. Chairman, this year, during our hearings, we were told we had abroad 698 technicians under point 4. The proposal for next year was that we send out 2,674. We have technical assistance

in MSA, and we have economic aid under point 4, and it is a little bit difficult to unscramble them. But let us look at the two together. The proposal under the bill, as it came to our committee, would send United States technicians and experts over the world for this coming year to the number of 4,070, and that we bring foreigners here to learn different things in the number of 8,470, and the cost of all these experts and trainees would be as follows: First, the experts would cost \$48,684,000, and the cost for the trainees would be \$28,360,000, and the cost for supplies and equipment will be \$283,661,000. It seems to me it might be well if we told them not to spend any more for supplies and equipment than they do for people.

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

Mr. VORYS. I yield.

Mr. RICHARDS. Is it not a fact that the gentleman's amendment to title II could apply to only one country, Iran?

Mr. VORYS. No. The gentleman from Wisconsin modified his amendment so that it applied to all countries and all funds under the act for international development, I believe; and, therefore, I patterned my amendment to his amendment. I think it applies to all funds for international development.

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

Mr. VORYS. I yield.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. I would like to point out that the amount requested for personnel is \$37,900,000; and the amount for supplies and equipment \$37,908,000.

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

(On request of Mrs. KELLY of New York, and by unanimous consent, Mr. VORYS was allowed to proceed for two additional minutes.)

Mrs. KELLY of New York. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VORYS. I yield.

Mrs. KELLY of New York. Will the gentleman's amendment affect only Near East countries in southeast Asia, Latin America and South America, those countries of the world which we are endeavoring to assist but cannot do it militarily?

Mr. VORYS. The amendment reads:

Provided, That not more than 50 percent of any funds authorized under the act for international development may be expended for the procurement of materials, supplies, equipment, or commodities.

Since this is the first time we have come to point four in the bill it seemed no doubt to the gentleman from Wisconsin and it seems to me that this would be a good time to consider any over-all limitations on point four, and this would cover all funds for the point-four program.

Mrs. KELLY of New York. But it does affect those areas of the world more than any others?

Mr. VORYS. No; the largest amount would be for the Far East. But the language, if adopted here in either the amendment or the amendment to the amendment, would cover all of point four in titles II, III, and IV.

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

Mr. VORYS. I yield.

Mr. RICHARDS. Does not the gentleman think that if any such amendment is passed, it should be passed after we determine what amount of point-four funds will be affected? As a matter of fact, it does not affect the amount in the bill.

Mr. VORYS. It does not affect the amount; but at the same time I think it would be well for the committee to have such a principle in mind if it is adopted before they consider the amounts.

Mr. RIBICOFF. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to both amendments. I think there are some technical objections to the form and place of the amendment, but since the gentleman from Wisconsin and the gentleman from Ohio have talked about the general merits and embrace all these titles I would like to discuss it on that basis and point 4 as it would be affected.

These amendments show the difficulties you get into when you try to place a strait-jacket on any of these funds. I think the chairman of the committee raised an interesting question: Would not this affect Iran? I would like to give the answer.

Under the proportions set up in title II the only country that would be affected by the cut would be Iran, because the proportion of supplies to personnel in Iran is approximately 4 to 1 and in other countries it is roughly 2 to 1.

I call your attention to what is happening as described in recent newspaper accounts. Russia today is warning what country? Iran. She is warning Iran against the United States. To come to the floor here today when we are discussing a critical proposal of mutual security for the United States and the rest of the world and to pass such an amendment what country is punished? The only country that receives punishment under title II by the Smith or the Vorys amendment is the country of Iran. That certainly would indicate that the United States is not interested in backing up Iran.

This House argued at great length about a year ago over the subject of wheat to India, and after a considerable amount of debate we authorized a wheat loan of \$190,000,000 to keep the people of India from starving. As I recall the debates it was the desire of most of the Members of the House to see to it that India became self-sufficient in the production of food.

The amendments offered by the gentleman from Ohio and the gentleman from Wisconsin extended to other titles, as a matter of fact, would give a death blow to the present program to make India self-sufficient economically in food. The present goal in India is with the United States technical assistance to raise substantially her grain production from 50,000,000 to 57,000,000 tons by 1956.

At the present time there are 467 American technicians in India who are cooperating with 17,000 Indian village workers. These workers need supplies, they need tools, they need fertilizers. It is basically, really, a joint enterprise.

Mr. Chairman, if this amendment is adopted it would cut considerably the ultimate goal of India to become self-sufficient. Where will we be then? Instead of 22,000,000 Indian farmers being benefited you would have to cut this down to 6,000,000 Indian farmers.

I have often wondered as I listened to these debates just what we Americans are trying to do with ourselves? Are we only interested in giving a piece of lead to the people of the world or are we interested in giving them some food to put in their stomachs as well? Say what you will, you are never going to stop ideas. You are never going to get American idealism across if all you say to people is, We will put a gun in your hand but under no circumstances will we put a plow in your hand or put a piece of food in your mouth. I think that is something the gentleman from Ohio would not advocate.

Just look at the question, What do ideas do? Those of you who are students of Christianity know that for 300 years the Roman Empire tried to keep the idea of Christianity out. In 313 Constantine finally became a Christian and the Roman Empire adopted Christianity. During the preceding period of time when the ideas of Christianity were pressing against Rome and the Romans, all the Christians had was their faith, their belief in the doctrines of Jesus Christ. Yet when the Roman legions came along and threw these Christians into dungeons and into the Colosseum to the lions, the soldiers of Rome constantly saw day after day these people marching to their death yet not losing their faith. What effect did this have? After 300 years it resulted in the Roman soldiers themselves adopting and advocating Christianity.

Is the United States going to say to the people of the world that all we are going to offer you is a gun, a tank, and a plane? This is what you are going to live on. I say if you do that you are really selling America short. You are saying that what America stands for does not count. You are giving Russia the greatest propaganda weapon for saying all the United States is interested in its death and not in life—"They are interested in war, not in peace."

If we are interested in life and peace, let us give some of these people a piece of bread and not just a gun.

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

(On request of Mr. HORAN, and by unanimous consent, Mr. RIBICOFF was allowed to proceed for one additional minute.)

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

Mr. RIBICOFF. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. HORAN. Does not the gentleman know that when the Roman Government took over Christianity and accepted it something died in the consecration of the Christians who had suffered by persecution for 300 years? We are now moving in the missionary field. You can recall the Millsbaugh mission to Iran in the twenties, its flop in the forties; you cannot overcome the fact that something has to be born in the hearts of the

people that we are trying to reach. American money in itself cannot rebuild the hearts and the inspirations that must be born in the hearts of these people.

Mr. RIBICOFF. That is right. I do not think you can buy anything with American dollars, but I think American idealism as set forth in the Constitution, the Bill of Rights, and the Declaration of Independence is something that we can export, and I believe that a little compassion on the part of the United States for these people in critical areas, to show that we are interested in their future and in their welfare, will do more for the United States of America than sending a few tanks and guns.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Connecticut has again expired.

(On request of Mr. BYRNES, and by unanimous consent, Mr. RIBICOFF was allowed to proceed for two additional minutes.)

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

Mr. RIBICOFF. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. BYRNES. The gentleman spoke of India and the relationships there to what we were doing under the technical assistance program. On page 50 of the committee report is a table showing what is anticipated by way of technical assistance, both in technicians and in supplies, for 1953. If I read this table correctly, in view of what the gentleman has said, I am wondering if I am correct. As I read the table, it states that you contemplate spending approximately \$7,000,000 for technicians in 1953.

Mr. RIBICOFF. That is right.

Mr. BYRNES. And \$106,000,000 for supplies and equipment.

Mr. RIBICOFF. That is correct.

Mr. BYRNES. Is that giving technical assistance or is it giving them supplies? It seems to me that proves the point made by the gentleman from Wisconsin who complains that what we are doing is putting the emphasis on supplies rather than on the know-how.

Mr. RIBICOFF. If we are going to let the Indians be able to produce food, what do we have to do? We have to dam some rivers in order to have water for some of their parched land; we have to give them plows; we have to dig wells; we have to give them fertilizers.

The over-all objective is to raise to 57,000,000 tons the productivity of Indian soil, and we are not going to be able to do it with a handful of American technicians. We have approximately 467 American technicians with 17,000 Indian technicians, and then you are going to have this additional amount of supplies and equipment to make possible the production of 57,000,000 tons of grain production. There is a basic problem in India and that is why the supplies are a disproportionate amount.

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

Mr. RIBICOFF. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Is this not a program based upon the extension services, as we know it in this country?

If you go back and read the testimony of those who sought to justify the program in the first place, you will find that it was based upon the principle of our own extension service. As I understand the gentleman's argument, it is that the extension service is not so important; that we have got to send in supplies and equipment, and there, I say, we are away out of line.

Mr. RIBICOFF. The extension service is very important but I, for one, as the gentleman knows from the entire debate, refuse to get placed into the strait-jacket that our executive department has dug for themselves. I say to the gentleman that you cannot compare an extension service, with an educated American farmer, as the beneficiary with fertile land and with know-how and technical ability, to the backward countries of the world, where they are so primitive. They do not have the know-how and the tools to work with that the American farmer has under the extension service in the United States.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Connecticut has again expired.

(By unanimous consent Mr. RIBICOFF was permitted to proceed for one additional minute.)

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

Mr. RIBICOFF. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. FORD. In the gentleman's initial remarks, he stated that either the Vorys or the Smith amendment would affect only Iran. In the latter part of his remarks he seemed to take a different point of view and said that it would affect India likewise. Can the gentleman explain the inconsistency?

Mr. RIBICOFF. Yes. You will recall that the amendment is addressed to title 2 of the bill. Title 2 covers Africa and the Near East, but the gentleman from Wisconsin discussed all areas, so I was discussing the basic philosophy. Actually, in title 2, Iran is affected. India comes in under Asia, which is under title 3. I was making the over-all point so that we would not have to repeat the same argument when we reached title 3 of the bill. As the amendment stands it would affect only title 2, and I am sure that the gentleman from Wisconsin, if the amendment is adopted to title 2, would also introduce a similar amendment to title 3. That is the explanation to the gentleman from Michigan.

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

Mr. Chairman, I would just like to point out to the committee that this is an excellent example of attempting to legislate hurriedly here in a few minutes to set up steadfast rules of what the divisional expenditures shall be between supplies and technical assistance under the point 4 program. This program, as you all know, is devoted very largely to food production, health, and education. Now, we are expected to choose between whether or not we shall make this ratio 4 to 1 or 1 to 1, and to me that is an excellent example of just how well the amendments have been thought out.

How can we intelligently select between 4 to 1 and 1 to 1? Why not let the program go ahead as it is intended and let the needs of the program decide what the division should be made?

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

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

Mr. VORYS. I had intended to ask my colleague, the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. RIBICOFF] to yield, but everybody else was asking him to. But I want to call the attention of the committee to this fact: That the Ribicoff amendment, which will be found on page 23, line 20, provides \$100,000,000 of funds made available under the Mutual Security Act, of which \$20,000,000 to any country may be supplied without regard to any conditions as to eligibility. I voted for that. The purpose was to put flexibility in here so that emergency or unique situations, such as Iran or other places, could be taken care of. There certainly will not be enough money in there to carry on Chester Bowles' program in India, but there will be enough money in the Ribicoff amendment to take care of items in countries where there are special conditions. I just wanted the committee to know about this important amendment which I supported and which I hope stays in the bill which gives great flexibility in taking care of special situations. Since this is in here, it seems to me we are justified in putting a modest limit on the amount of economic aid that can be sent around the world under point 4.

Mr. RIBICOFF. I would say to the gentleman regarding the Ribicoff amendment, everybody is climbing aboard to get something out or to get something in. If that continues very long there will not be very much left.

Now, we have many countries involved, and with \$100,000,000, with not more than \$20,000,000 to one country, it certainly will not take care of the situation sought to be taken care of, either by the gentleman from Wisconsin or the gentleman from Ohio. There are other special needs that may come within this section of which the gentleman from Ohio is well aware.

Mr. RICHARDS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 10 minutes.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I object, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I honestly feel that the best part of this program is probably the point 4 program if it is properly administered.

The gentleman spoke about the situation in India, to teach the people over there to produce more of their food. As I recollect it, it is not so many days ago that I read an article in the papers that they were reducing their food production and going into the production of more hemp for bagging. It is rather strange that these four-hundred-and-some technicians over there do not carry out the program according to the intent of the drafters of this legislation.

Speaking about the food that the gentleman states we should give the people in India so that they can have something to live on, as a good Christian duty, if they are getting any of the food that we ship over there to the Government and the program is administered in the same way it was in Europe, with the billions of dollars worth of food we sent to Europe, the poor people who do not have any money do not get that food. They have to buy food in order to get it, and they have to buy it from the Government through the regular channels.

I want to make an observation on the technical assistance and supplies program. I had occasion to be a member of the Herter committee, of which the distinguished gentleman from Ohio and other distinguished chairmen of this committee were members. I traveled in all of the countries that were to receive our aid and assistance. I had occasion last year to travel over some of the same countries. I went through the countries to see what they were doing as to food production. I ran into some of our technical experts from the United States. The first place I ran across them was in Western Germany, where I traveled for 2 days with a colleague of mine to see what they were doing to produce their own food. I found the Germans very thrifty and hard working. They were working on their little 5- or 10-acre farms, with one horse, and every member in the family was working. To my amazement I found they were producing about two and one-half or three times as much per acre as we were producing in the United States.

We got down to one of the elegant hotels maintained by the State Department near Bonn, and there I ran into one of our agricultural experts. I said, "What are you doing over here?" He said, "Oh, we are over here trying to tell these people what to produce and how to run their farms." I said, "Don't you know that they are producing two or three times more than we are in the United States, and that we could learn a lot from them?" He said, "Well, I know that." I suppose this man gets \$12,000 or \$15,000 a year and expenses, and lives on the fat of the land. He said, "I know what they are doing." I said, "Well, then, what are you doing over here?" He said, "We are trying to get these people to use tractors."

I said, "Do you mean to tell me you are trying to get these people who operate these 3-, 4-, 5-, or 10-acre farms to use tractors, where they can do it with one horse and with the aid of members of their family?" He said, "Of course, it would not be practical for them to use tractors." So I said, "What in the world are you doing to earn your money?" He said, "We are trying to get some of the big farmers in France, Germany, and in the other parts of Europe to use these tractors."

I do not think we can teach those people very much. They resent our interference. They resent the fact that we have the men come around there telling them what to do, when they are probably doing in Europe twice as well as we are to produce the food that is neces-

sary to maintain themselves and their economy.

I have also been in other parts of the world. I have not been in Iran, but it seems to me last year I heard they were going to ship over scores of self-propelled combines to Iran and Iraq. What would they do with them? They are farming there in the most primitive manner. They have no need for such equipment. If we can get down to earth with this program and give these people probably a little more modern equipment, a scythe or something to work with, rather than to work with a hoe, and a few other things, then we will be doing something for them rather than something to them, and wasting our resources and injuring them in the long run.

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

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I yield.

Mr. HARVEY. I, like the gentleman, am prompted to think that some technical assistance is truly worth while, but I recall the attention of the gentleman with regard to Iran, that the present program calls for \$28,000,000 for technical assistance to Iran, and ironically enough that is exactly the amount we have appropriated in the agriculture appropriation bill for extension services for the whole United States.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. That is not very much for what we are doing here to produce food that some of us are asking to give away to the rest of the world.

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

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I yield.

Mr. MASON. I just wanted to bring out the point that in India the counterpart funds are being used exactly as in Europe so that the wheat that we send there is sold by the Government to anybody who can afford to buy it, and the money put into the counterpart funds, and out of the funds they make improvements or anything else they want to do.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I take it that the hungry people who do not have the money are still hungry.

Mr. MASON. Of course.

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

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I yield.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Is it not a fact also that it is almost impossible at the present time to get technicians to send to all these different parts of the world?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. When I heard that there were over 400 in India, I just wondered where they got hold of all these technicians. Maybe they picked up men who were in the Army, and who could not get much of a job in the United States, and sent them over there as agricultural experts.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, I wonder if our chairman might attempt again to secure limitation of time for debate on the pending amendment?

Mr. CARNAHAN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that debate on this amendment, and all amendments thereto, close in 15 minutes.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Reserving the right to object. That may be all right with some of the Members, but each of us have a responsibility here, and I propose to carry out my responsibility. I want to see first how much time each Member would have to speak.

Mr. CARNAHAN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that debate on this amendment, and all amendments thereto, close in 20 minutes, which, I believe, would leave almost 4 minutes for each Member.

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

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CRAWFORD].

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, I think we have reached the place in the debate where it would be helpful if someone on the House Committee on Foreign Affairs would give a technical definition of what constitutes know-how. If you give me a permit to export know-how, at the moment I do not know what you mean. If you give me a permit to export an automobile or a Ford tractor or a Farmall tractor, I would know what you were talking about. The administration and the proponents of this program have led hundreds of people in my district to believe that this know-how program deals basically with the export of technical information. I have been over in the other fellow's chicken yard looking around a little bit, too. I have talked with some of the staff of our commercial departments of the embassies throughout the world and obtained their reactions, and where I have pinned them down, they have said to me, "Now, listen, Congressman, you have raised the question here about a custom or a practice that has been in operation in this country for 100 or 200 or 300 years, and when you ask why we do not attempt to use our know-how to change that custom, we are simply telling you that we are not sticking our noses into that proposition. We have all the trouble we want." I have replied to that very emphatically, "Well, if that is the attitude of the American staff, then I do not propose to vote for the cost of the exportation of know-how." If it is not to be used, why spend the money?

Mr. Chairman, we are a great people for getting down on our knees and praying a prayer under a certain slogan, and in 20 minutes after somebody starts to answer the prayer, we change the slogan and the program. That is exactly what is occurring here with the point 4 program. I am for either one, or both, of these amendments—not that I think we ought to send two-thirds in the form of material and only one-third in the form of technical knowledge, or that we should send 50 percent in the form of material. You are sending all the material that you can get your hands on, and squeezing all of the tax dollars from our taxpayers to pay for it, irrespective of this program.

I am not too anxious to support everything that comes to me, but if you do want the expert American technical knowledge made available to other peo-

ple and you can get at least the embassies and the ministers and the commercial consulates, and so forth, to go along with you, we might make a little progress with the program. But I will tell you that you are not going to change the situation, for instance, in France, and to where the consumer can get some benefit out of the program. In France, the cartel system, the trust system, combinations in restraint of trade, all continue to economically destroy the poor man. Competitive forces do not operate. You are not going to be able to supply a Ford tractor or a Farm-All tractor to some fellow and make it produce when he is accustomed to using a water buffalo down in Chittagong, India, and train him to use it until you get about 50 years more of civilization and supply bases and gas and other stations for the maintenance of the tractor after it gets there. The tractor fails to perform, and the native pushes it off in the canal or drainage ditch, and returns to his buffalo.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York [Mr. GWINN] is recognized.

Mr. GWINN. Mr. Chairman, what interests me particularly is this effort of point 4 to take money or squeeze money with the help of the sheriff or the tax collector alongside out of an unwilling American taxpayer and assign that money to somebody who says he has the know-how. In the very nature of things that leads to irresponsibility, even to corruption. The thing just cannot and does not start right.

You can get many illustrations from your own office if you are on the mailing list of MSA or ECA. You do not get much mail that is essentially amusing and fantastic. Just ask that your name be placed on the MSA or ECA mailing list, and you will.

Here is an example of how our irresponsible personnel function when they have money given to them that they did not earn. They are not volunteers but paid politicians to go over there to tell them the know-how. Ten of our experts over in Bangkok, in Thailand, were sitting on the bank of a canal enjoying a picnic. The fruit vendors and the officials of Thailand coming along the canal would call out and say: "Hi, Austin, Hi, Austin." So they cabled that information; they wanted to show how good the personal relationship was between our know-how men and their citizens, how it was developing on a friendly basis. You will see the statement at the bottom of this cable: "These despatches have been received by cable from officers of the Mutual Security Agency in western Europe and Asia."

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, would the gentleman care to yield at that particular point?

Mr. GWINN. I yield.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Who is Austin? It is Austin F. Flegel, of Bangkok, Siam.

Mr. GWINN. That is right.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Administrator of ECA, a wonderful personality and a great humanitarian.

Mr. GWINN. With other people's money.

Mr. CRAWFORD. With other people's money, with the taxpayer's money. I know him personally. I have sat there on the canal and talked to him about this program. I said: "Austin, why do you spend this money here?" He said: "Well, Fred, these are our friends; if you are going to give away your money why not give it to your friends." He is very practical about it all.

Mr. GWINN. Here is another one, and there are just dozens of examples of how we are spending this know-how. One of our know-how experts is over in Burma, and here is a cable saying that one of ECA's dilemmas was: Can elephants and water buffalo outwork machinery?

As I get it from this information our know-how men are learning more about water buffalos and elephants that the Burmese know all about than our own foreign bureaucrats know about how tractors should work in Burma.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SHEEHAN] is recognized.

Mr. SHEEHAN. Mr. Chairman, during the course of the last couple of minutes debate we have heard reference about wheat to India. Just 1 year ago this week, on May 24 of last year, the House voted to grant \$192,000,000 for wheat for India; and the plea at that time, like the plea today, was threatened starvation, and to save us from the Russians.

As the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. RIBICOFF] said a while ago, the thought behind this expenditure is to make possible more production. He has also pleaded for these funds because as he says the Indians are so primitive they do not have the know-how. Let me give you a little information for your benefit. I was one of those who voted against wheat for India last year because I thought we were being taken for a ride. I want to undertake in the minutes I have remaining to cover two points; one is the wheat to India, to save them from starvation, and the other, trying to outdistance Russian propaganda.

In the Madras Legislative Assembly, Food Minister J. L. P. Roche-Victoria spoke of the offer of the Russians to supply them with 50,000 tons of rice. We were bludgeoned with the idea that we had to give more than the Russians because we did not want to be pikers. If you will look at that speech, you will note that the Soviet Union made its offer of rice apparently as fuel for Communist propaganda in India without specifying the price. The Indian Government tried to cancel the order when the price charged was found to be almost double the normal value, but it was too late because the food was being consumed and, therefore, they had to pay the Russian overcharge.

Mr. Chairman, I want to quote from a dispatch by George Weller, of the Daily News Foreign Service. Here is what he says about the grain which was so desperately needed last year:

Granaries are bulging with wheat purchased under the \$192,000,000 American loan

and still undistributed. India's food difficulties are due to administrative red tape as well as low production.

He also stated:

There are spot famines in two localized corners of Bengal and Cochin because officials refuse to open granary doors to a public lacking cash. The Government has withdrawn cash and food subsidies to cities to save funds and enable farmers to take advantage of the free market.

The Indians may be rather dumb when it comes to food production and using the tools for raising more farm products, but they are not very dumb when it comes to knowing how to manipulate prices so that somebody can make a dollar.

If the Members will view the record of last year, when we were given the great song and dance about the urgent need, and many Members on the floor spoke about the millions of starving Indians and how badly they needed aid and wheat, they may change their minds. Check with Mr. Weller, check his reputation with any newsmen and you will find he usually knows whereof he speaks.

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

Mr. SHEEHAN. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. DONDERO. India may not be so intelligent but she has at least sense enough to know that even though she is a member of the United Nations and she is a nation of 360,000,000 people, there is not one Indian man standing alongside the boys from the United States in Korea.

Mr. SHEEHAN. That is right. Therefore, in thinking of foreign aid, let us think of the American taxpayers and be realistic for a change.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. JUDD].

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Chairman, I am sorry we are in this difficulty; however, it was foreseen and the people in the Mutual Security Agency and the Technical Cooperation Administration have to take the responsibility. This issue of separating and correctly labeling economic aid and technical assistance was discussed at least 15 times in the committee and we tried our best to get those in charge of the program to help us come down here and be candid and on the level with the Congress.

The so-called point 4 program is the only program we have in many parts of the world that makes sense for the long pull. I am interested in it. Back in the Eightieth Congress we set up its forerunner or prototype when we established the Joint Commission on Rural Reconstruction in China. We tied it down so that it could not do anything beyond training and demonstration, and it succeeded spectacularly. It did not get into the sort of commodity program which would try to solve people's immediate problems with transfusions of American goods and not help them get into a position where they could grow their own food through better irrigation and better agricultural methods, and produce more goods, beginning with their little home and village industries, and so forth.

There are certain countries, for example, Iran, Pakistan, and India, where the need for immediate economic assistance is so great, where their internal difficulties are so urgent that they must also have, in my judgment, certain commodity aid of exactly the same sort we gave to France, Austria, and Italy beginning at the end of 1947 and through the Marshall plan. The fact is that in the Middle East and Far East two types of programs are needed; a long-term, inexpensive training program, so-called technical assistance, consisting of specialists to train local personnel, some pilot plants and demonstration agencies; and a more expensive short-range commodity supply program to help them over the present crisis until they can produce or earn for themselves on a more adequate basis. Instead of the TCA people pointing out the two types of programs and making their case for each, they lumped both under the name of point 4 which has become popular throughout the country. For some of the countries of Asia, what is called point 4 is in reality in this bill 90 percent Marshall plan type of aid. I do not object to the provision of economic aid. I think it is necessary. I object to selling something under false pretenses.

Read the hearings and see how often we urged them to be frank with the Congress. We told them that if they had a good program they could sell it to the Congress and the people, but if they tried to sell commodity aid as point 4, all they would get is amendments which would knock out the commodity aid part of it and in the long run it would discredit and destroy the technical training program, too.

If you will read pages 71 and 72 of the hearings you will find some questions I asked of Mr. Harriman. Mr. Harriman had stated:

If there were no danger of subversion, we could carry out programs of technical cooperation in these countries at a slower pace and not speed them up with considerable quantities of equipment and supplies from the United States to support the work of the experts.

I asked him:

Is that an announcement of a basic change in the point 4 program and its character.

He replied:

No; the character is the same, but it is speeded up in these countries, so that faster results can be obtained in those countries where the need for speed is necessary.

Mr. Chairman, you cannot substantially speed up a training program. You cannot take a youngster in the first grade and say that since he needs to get to the twelfth grade more quickly in order to start supporting his relatives, you will give him more vitamins and faster training and he will get there in 8 instead of 12 years. The people in these countries are underdeveloped all along the line: economically, agriculturally, educationally, politically, socially, and neither we nor anyone else can produce all the needed changes overnight. This can only be a slow long-term program. Yet some of the countries also need certain economic aid at once.

So I do not know what to do with these amendments. I think that of the gentleman from Ohio is too drastic. We do not want to prevent proper aid, but we do need to register our disapproval of the methods used in presenting these programs. Then in the conference there should be worked out amendments that will separate the two forms of aid and let each stand on its own merits; if necessary each being brought back to the House for separate votes. Only so, in my judgment, can we act intelligently and wisely.

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

(By unanimous consent, Mr. JAVITS yielded 1 minute of his time to Mr. JUDD.)

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Chairman, I should like to say a word about the second unjustifiable feature which is not readily apparent. One error, as I have said, is trying to combine the technical training and demonstration program under the same over-all umbrella with a commodity program, and under the same label. I think that is wrong.

The other is the mistaken soft-headedness that provides for our sending commodities to countries with dollar balances. Burma, for illustration, exports oil and rice; Indonesia, oil, spices, and rubber. Thailand does the same. Their exports to dollar countries exceed their imports. They have dollar surpluses. There are some commodities they have to buy abroad with dollars. But why should we provide Burma, for example, with \$1,600,000 worth of chemicals and \$1,500,000 worth of cotton, when she has a favorable dollar trade balance? There is no justification for taking the American taxpayers' money to give them items that they can buy with their earned dollars. This whole thing ought to be worked over. In doing so, we ought to have the cooperation and sympathetic assistance, instead of the opposition of those in the agencies handling these matters. I hope that out of the conference will come something that is workable and that we can conscientiously support.

(Mr. CARNAHAN asked and was given permission to yield the time allotted him to Mr. JAVITS.)

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York [Mr. JAVITS].

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

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

Mr. FLOOD. I just want to observe, Mr. Chairman, that I hope, using Iran as a horrible example today, that it is not a classic example of doing the wrong thing at the wrong time. I have a bulletin that I just took off the ticker tape out here with the dateline "Moscow," just about 5 minutes ago:

Moscow.—The Soviet Union charged formally today that Iran's acceptance of American military aid violates the 1921 Soviet-Iranian Treaty admitting Russian troops to Iran if that country's soil is used by foreign military forces hostile to the Soviets.

The Kremlin made its protest in a note delivered by Foreign Minister Andrei Y. Vishinsky yesterday to the Iranian Ambassa-

dor here. It accused Iran, a Russian neighbor on the south, of "cooperating with the United States Government in the implementation of the latter's aggressive plans against the Soviet Union."

Observers here consider it likely that, because of the Russian protest, Iran will reconsider her acceptance of the United States aid and, if she does not, the Soviets will follow up with another strong protest.

In Washington a United States official said the Russian protest evidently was designed to intimidate the Iranian Government. He said the Tehran Government had been under heavy Soviet pressure before and is not expected to give in this time.

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

Mr. JAVITS. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. I am sure the gentleman from Michigan did not mean to give the wrong impression to the Committee. He said that there is not one boy from India that is fighting alongside our American boys in Korea. I am sure he will remember that General Ridgway, in his address yesterday, included India with other allies fighting communism in Korea.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Chairman, just a comment on what my colleague has said. There is no question about the fact that such units from India as are in Korea are minor; I believe they are noncombat units. There is little question about the fact that the position of Mr. Nehru with respect to his inflexible opposition to the Soviet in India's voting in the United Nations, has not been what we desire—that is giving the other side the best of it, but it does not make any difference in this argument, so we might as well lay that at rest.

The fundamental point in this argument which seems to be overlooked, and which the gentleman from Minnesota Dr. JUDD, I think, has so very admirably pointed out, is that sure, the administration may be bungling, but the importance of it is, whether bungling or not, we are at least at work on what needs to be done.

It might interest the House to know that with respect to the Near East, which is the very section we are considering now, I, myself, introduced an amendment to carry out what the gentleman from Minnesota had in mind, to separate from technical assistance what was really technical assistance, so that you will find in the bill with respect to this particular section the dollar assistance is set up in a unit.

Now, what these amendments will do, unfortunately, is to kill the very important areas in which we are doing the best job of economic and technical assistance in political terms, and these are, as has been pointed out, India and Iran.

May I call the attention of the Committee to the fact, on page 50 of our committee report, that in India we have \$106,517,000 in supplies and equipment as part of the program for India and only \$7,400,000 in terms of the salaries and compensation of technicians and trainees.

So that is the program that is going to be hit right on the head.

What is our situation in India? Somebody talked here about a plea.

Can we not wake up to the fact that we are not doing business on a street where we have all the trade? Can we not wake up to the fact that we are not legislating in a vacuum? Can we not wake up to the fact that military, technical, and economic assistance have occurred because we have the grimmest, the most deadly, the most dangerous competition which any power on earth has ever had, the competition of the Soviet Union?

My colleague from Illinois [Mr. SHEEHAN] may have thought he was pointing out a reason for carrying these amendments when he talked about Russian duplicity, but he was giving a very eloquent argument why these amendments should be defeated, because the only way to show up Russian duplicity is by calling their bluff. Would we ever have shown the people of India that the Russians meant them no good, that they intended to overcharge them and double charge them and triple charge them for their rice, if we had not made the Indian grain loan? I emphasize it was a loan, not a grant.

Another thing that is very important is, suppose you had a bill before you today, suppose this bill was unraveled and the administration was unraveled as it should be—I agree with Dr. JUDD—to provide that the payment of technicians should be \$7,400,000 for India and we should give them \$106,000,000 of supplies. Do you think a majority of this committee would not pass it as such? I deeply believe it would. With 330,000,000 people at stake in India with the knowledge that if the free peoples lose India they are likely to lose Asia, and if they lose Asia they may indeed lose the whole world for freedom.

Who would stop and be a stickler at this amount in view of what we are already appropriating in terms of armed defense?

Let us remember this finally: The only offensive we have in the world, unless we are to fight a preventive war—and it has been repeated again and again that we do not intend to do that, but it cannot be repeated too often—the only offensive we have in the world, in addition to our educational program against communism is these soldiers of peace, these technicians who are going into these areas and doing the job of trying to help people at the grass-roots level. And why? Because we are giving gifts or because we believe that people on the brink of starvation will embrace our competitors, even if they know it will enslave them, if they cannot get some help from us. The best answer is that in a certain area of India where there is starvation, we have had very recently the election of a local Communist-dominated government. If we cannot read that handwriting on the wall, then we are indeed not measuring up to the great job we have to do here for the American people and for the free world.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. VORYS] to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. SMITH].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. VORYS) there were—ayes 82, noes 88.

So the amendment to the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. SMITH].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin) there were—ayes 84, noes 91.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chairman appointed as tellers Mr. RICHARDS and Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin.

The Committee again divided; and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 119, noes 103.

So the amendment was agreed to.

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

Mr. Chairman, for 2 days I have been carrying some remarks that I had spent some time on, hoping that the occasion would arise during general debate where I could make them. I shall not ask the indulgence of the House to listen to all that I have committed to paper, but I will put it in the RECORD. I trust it is a thoughtful speech. It is not a happy one, because I am not happy about our situation in the world nor in the United States of America, nor in the House of Representatives.

I see our guests, our constituents, our young men and young women going through this Capitol daily. They have a right to trust us, and I think they do; but sometimes I wonder if we are doing our best for them now or in the generations that are to come with them and after them. I see us here at a time when I think the world is in the worst condition outside of war that I have ever known it; I think it is in the worst condition so far as hope of peace is concerned that anyone now living has seen when we were not in actual war.

During the 175 years of our existence we have engaged in war for 25 years; that is one-seventh of our national life. We have people in the United States who are always saying "There is no danger." They said it before the Spanish-American War; they said it before World War I, and they said it right up to Pearl Harbor.

I remember sitting here and watching and listening to a vote only a few weeks before Pearl Harbor when the draft law was extended by only one vote; in other words, if the vote had been 202 to 203, the other way, we would have taken down instead of built up our Army, our Navy, and all our elements of defense before we were struck at Pearl Harbor. We have people still explaining why they did not vote a small appropriation to dredge the harbor of Guam. They are still explaining that.

We, in this House of Representatives should not have it upon our heads that we are not ready with money, with materials, and with men. When I read what Gen. J. Lawton Collins, Army Chief of Staff, said a few days ago, I first had a feeling of outrage. He said:

Some of the types of ammunition important to our front-line soldiers have been

rationed in Korea because production still does not equal our normal battle expenditures, and World War II stocks have either been exhausted or have approached exhaustion.

General Collins added to my concern when he said if we were attacked tomorrow in Europe that—

We would have no reserves of some of the most important types of ammunition and our front-line troops would have to limit their ammunition expenditures to what came off the production line.

As I said I reasoned that we are the world's most productive country and asked why we could not adequately supply our soldiers with ammunition.

I felt that if such a situation existed there must be criminal negligence and the responsibility should be fixed promptly.

That was alleviated in my mind to a great extent by the remarks of Gen. Matthew B. Ridgway yesterday when he said, not only in the House but before the committees of Congress, that we had an Army in Korea that could hold the line. I wonder if we are going to hold the line here?

(On request of Mr. McCORMACK, and by unanimous consent, Mr. RAYBURN was allowed to proceed for five additional minutes.)

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Chairman, I notice this house in glee, and it seemed to me without a great deal of reason, cutting the appropriations in this bill. The committee has already cut a billion dollars below what those in charge and who are supposed to know the most about world affairs said was necessary. Now by one amendment yesterday \$600,000,000 more was cut from this bill.

Are we going to be there with too little and yet too late again?

This money, in my opinion, every dollar of it, is being spent for peace, not for war. If we can help our allies and those democracies that are allied with us to get upon their feet so that they can stand to defend themselves and help us defend ourselves and the other democracies of the world, we can cease these appropriations and come back home. But whether or not the amounts we are appropriating here are going to insure that peace that we pray and hope for I do not know.

A little while ago this House reduced the budget estimate for our Armed Forces by \$6,000,000,000. I think that was a dangerous and an unwise thing to do. In that same bill we wrote a provision imposing an arbitrary figure of \$46,000,000,000 for defense expenditures. No one can think Robert Lovett, Secretary of Defense, is a radical or an excitable man, but here is what he says about that action: "For all three services results are so serious as to indicate a possible critical blow to preparedness efforts and the defense of the country," our country.

Then Mr. Lovett said the result of the limitations if "honestly carried out would be to demobilize a substantial part of our Armed Forces."

That is pretty serious right here at home when we are also reducing amounts tremendously to help our allies get upon their feet to defend themselves and to help defend us.

Let me repeat, those who stand with me and believe as I do and think they know something about conditions around this world want to spend whatever is necessary to make ourselves and those who stand with us so strong that no international desperado will ever dare attack us because he knows he will be beaten into the dust if we, with our natural resources, with our capacity for production, can have the money to carry it out.

We expended three hundred and fifty billion in less than 5 years fighting World War II. But there was the greater tragedy. There was expended the lives and the blood of thousands upon thousands of the flower of our young manhood and womanhood. War is waste. We shot away, we burned, we destroyed strategic materials because we were not prepared.

Suppose we have another war. It will cost more than that; it will be more furious than the last one. If we expend \$50,000,000,000 a year for 5 years making ourselves strong, making us feared, that would be only five-tenths of what we expended in World War II, in which we lost all of these lives and all of these properties. Suppose another one comes. It will not only be the soldiers upon the battlefields that will have lost their lives; probably thousands upon thousands of civilians will be bombed out of existence, and billions of dollars worth of private property go to the dust.

Do we want to take those chances? Do we want to hazard these things? We are passing on that question in the House of Representatives in the year 1952 in our defense program and in our mutual-aid programs. Anybody who has a boy, or even a kinsman's son, that boy is more precious to you or to your neighbor than somebody else's millions.

For us peace has become abnormal and war, or preparation for war, normal. And there is little reason to believe that in the next decade or two this situation will change.

Readiness for war is imposed upon us by the stubborn facts of our time. It is the more imperative that we be ready because we are leaders of one great wing of the human race. To be unready now is to jeopardize the survival of this Nation and the whole free world.

When, therefore, we deal with preparedness or with military and economic aids to our allies, we are actually dealing with the life or death of our country and the future of the world for centuries to come.

Someday men will say of us: "They served us well," and bless our names. Or they will say: "They failed us," and bitterly curse us.

We are called, then, to rise superior to ourselves; to stand above pettiness, jealousy, political party preferences, partisanship.

When 176 brave men died recently in the collision between the *Wasp* and the *Hobson*, they died, not as Republicans or Democrats, but as Americans. Their loved ones mourn American dead. And those who survived to serve their country again will do so as Americans. Survival is not a matter of party affiliation. Death knows no party labels.

It behooves us, then, in the grave matters of foreign affairs, to conduct ourselves, not as Republicans or Democrats, but as Americans. I am a Democrat. I am also an American. As both, it gives me great pleasure to say, and makes me the prouder of my country, that many high-hearted, noble-minded Republicans, in and out of Congress, have made invaluable contributions to the foreign policy of our times.

I have been a Member of this House during the two global wars we have fought. Now we are all in a period without parallel in history.

There have been wars before. But never—until the last war—had there been a true world war. There have been revolutions before. But never before has revolution flamed simultaneously from one end of the earth to the other. There have been times when men, here and there, were changing their attitudes toward the world. But never before our day has there been a time when all mankind was engaged at once in changing its attitudes toward the world.

It follows, therefore, that since our times are without parallel, we must act without parallel.

I do not pretend to a full understanding of our times. I do not believe that any man has this understanding. They will be clearer to those who come after us than to us. But some things are clear.

One is that man's technical development is far ahead of his moral development. And scientific man, when not controlled by morality, is the most dangerous thing ever unloosed upon earth.

The other thing is that man has always been engaged in a struggle between good and evil. But now unadulterated evil roams the world. It does credit to the essential goodness of Americans that they disbelieve in such evil. But self-preservation dictates that we recognize it and move to checkmate it in every way possible.

Other things are also clear.

From Waterloo in 1815 until the outbreak of the First World War in 1914, we enjoyed a century of dynamic growth. We devoted all our energies to building this Nation. We could do so because Britain then policed the earth and largely kept the peace. But in 1914 we moved into a new and dark era.

The first global war then began. It ended in 1918. Thereafter we had an uneasy armistice for 20 years. In 1939 the Second World War began. Technically it ended in 1945. Actually, it has never ended at all. And now, 7 years after, we face the threat of a third world war.

There are two factors to be considered here.

The first is that men have been almost continuously at war for nearly 40 years.

The second is that the time lag between wars grows shorter and shorter, while the wars increase in dimensions and destructiveness.

The convulsions of our times are universal and titanic. It would be foolish to believe that they will quickly subside.

In all our wars, we have been unprepared. In the last war we were taken by surprise although there had been ample warning. We can no longer afford

the dangerous and dubious luxury of unpreparedness.

In his first inaugural address, Thomas Jefferson could say of the United States that it was "Kindly separated by nature and a wide ocean from one-quarter of the globe." Now the world is physically one. In terms of travel time Moscow today is as close to New York as Philadelphia was in Benjamin Franklin's time. Our potential enemy has intercontinental airplanes and the atomic bomb. The words of the Negro spiritual apply to all men everywhere: "There's no hiding place down there."

Several factors worked for us in the great wars of our times. What were they?

We were saved from destruction, or serious injury at home, by the accidents of geography and space. The wars were fought on the soils of other peoples.

But now geography and space no longer work for us. The air is a two-way ocean.

We came late into both the global wars. We could do so because we had powerful allies. They held the enemy at bay until we could come onto the battlefield.

I have unbounded admiration and the deepest gratitude for the courageous men and women of our fighting forces. They fought and died on many a foreign field during two global wars. Yet the wars could not have been won without the factories of America.

But the factors that formerly favored us, either exist no longer or are sharply weakened.

Hitherto, when the enemy got the jump on us, we knew that we could eventually overtake and destroy him. Our factories, invulnerable to attack, almost guaranteed victory. But now our potential enemy has weapons with which to attack them. He knows principal targets. He knows that much of our industry is highly concentrated.

Our borders, therefore, are no longer on the Rhine, the Elbe, or some other foreign stream. They are on the Missouri, the Hudson, the Mississippi.

Our European allies suffered dreadfully in two global wars. Not yet recovered from the first, they were hurled into the second. Today France fights a costly war in Indochina, and Britain a costly war in Malaya, while both must shoulder the burden of rearmament at the same time. And some of our allies struggle with huge Communist Parties at home.

It may be well for us to recall that while the United States in 1914 was a debtor Nation, France was the world's richest country per capita, and Britain was banker to the world. But now we are the richest people on earth and both of these great nations need aid from us.

What is the upshot of all this? It is that we must be prepared for any eventuality and can no longer rely upon allies single-handedly to hold the enemy at bay until, in our good time, we arrive on the battlefield.

But the alarming thing is this: Many democracies seem for a long time to have been losing their instinct for self-preservation.

In passing, I want to say a word about our potential enemy. Powerful, fanatical, determined, he is bent upon world domination. Hitler told all men that he was out to conquer them. But few of us took him seriously. That was a grave error on our part. Now Soviet leaders tell us the same thing. At their weakest moments they have never deviated from their course. Let us, then, take them at their word.

As I see it, we must do the following things:

First. We must adopt a long-run view of world affairs. The race is not always to the swift.

Second. We must accept struggle and peril as part of our daily portion.

Third. We must use our power and intelligence to prevent a third world war, is possible.

Fourth. We must possess ourselves in patience.

In 1936 Winston Churchill, addressing the House of Commons, gave his countrymen sound advice that we might well heed today. He said: "Let us never accept the theory of inevitable war; neither let us blind our eyes to the remorseless march of events."

All this may require a substantial transformation in our temperament; something that is not easy to do. We are impatient. But our potential enemy is endlessly patient. He thinks in terms of decades and centuries. Many of his ambitions of today were his ambitions 400 years ago.

Bearing these general considerations in mind, I come now to considerations of specific acts.

During recent months we have conferred with the Joint Chiefs of Staff, the Secretary of Defense, the Secretaries of the Army, Navy, Air Force, and others.

When we deal with them we are in somewhat of a quandry. We are not expert in their field. We cannot pass expert judgment upon their requests. But they also are in a quandry. The military security of the Nation is their grave responsibility. Yet they cannot know precisely what they may need for this would be to know what they cannot know; namely, what is in the mind of the potential enemy. Nonetheless they must be prepared for all sorts of contingencies that may or may not arise.

Thus the Korean conflict came up over night. If it could not have been anticipated, neither could we anticipate that it would be as long and as costly as it has proved to be.

Yet I ask you: Is any Member of this House prepared to stake the security of the Nation upon the assumption that there will not be another Korea tomorrow somewhere else? Or another Pearl Harbor?

We cannot achieve complete military security. We are bound to run risks. But I am in favor of the highest degree of security attainable. We are the enemy's principal target. I would like to see our risks reduced to the smallest margin. Let us remember the old maxim of prudence: "For want of a shoe the kingdom was lost."

Of course the price is high. The price of freedom has always been high. It was high at Valley Forge and Lexington. It

was high at the Marne in 1914. It was high in France in 1944. But the price of defeat is death and slavery.

If the price of freedom is eating hoe-cake and molasses, I am for that.

If its price is hoe-cake and branch water, I am for that.

I have tried as hard as any man to raise the American standard of living for all the people.

But this Nation will go down in the dust—and deservedly—if it ever lowers its standard of life.

We talk about spending. I advocate the spending for peace and making ourselves so strong that international desperadoes will fear to attack us.

If we curtail appropriations in this bill deliveries of arms to our allies—already delayed—would be further delayed. The gulf between American promises and American performance would be widened. Our allies would be disheartened trying to follow a leader who marches backward, not forward.

Thus an announcement that Greece is about to reduce her military expenditures by 10 percent follows our announcement that we are reducing appropriations under the Military Security Pact.

France finds it increasingly difficult to fight in Indochina and honor her pledges to NATO. Britain has been obliged to cut down to avoid a financial crisis. Nonetheless we propose to reduce the aid to NATO members upon which they counted when they went as far as they could go in making their appropriations.

The Lisbon conference of 1952 was based upon two things. The first was an estimate of the ultimate amount the partners could spend on defense without courting bankruptcy. The second was an estimate of the least they could afford to meet the dangers of 1952. The conference was held in February. But now in May the dangers are more apparent than they were then. For example, the German situation may require a greater show of strength than the West has had to make since the war.

If we and other NATO members reduce carefully calculated quotas, western defense will be imperiled. Every time we reduce the defense program of our allies, by so much we reduce our security. A billion now in so-called savings may cost us many billions in the future.

General Eisenhower believes that if we drag out the defense program we shall get only half the result at twice the cost, and might even fail completely.

What we are actually doing is this:

We are tearing down a program before it has been built up.

We are postponing far into the future the day when Western Europe will be able to defend itself.

Under the circumstances I question the wisdom of slashing our appropriations without more soul searching and cold calculation than we seem to have given the matter.

Before going on, let me say this:

Nineteen hundred and fifty-two is election year in the United States.

But it is not election year in Soviet Russia.

Let us never forget this. We are confronted with an election of another kind that far transcends the choice of a President.

We must elect to be wise or foolish; to vacillate or persevere; to survive or perish.

As party members, we may be deeply concerned with the coming election. But the enemy will not hesitate, nor will destiny pause, if we play with the Nation's security for partisan advantage.

Speaking for myself alone, as one man and one Democrat, I would rather see my party go down in defeat and never arise if it should attempt to deceive the American people by holding out to them false promises of a reduction of their burdens based upon the false premises that this Government has done, and is doing, all that it can do to assure the security of the Nation.

I believe that I can illuminate this opinion by two things:

The margin of our atomic superiority over the enemy is daily disappearing.

We have lost air superiority to him.

We have already permitted our Air Force to fall below the minimum necessary for security. And even 2 years hence—according to present plans—it will still be below that minimum. Indeed we shall not reach it until 1956.

This, according to the Secretary of Defense, and the Secretary of the Air Force, is to put the country in grave danger.

But 1956—if we should still be alive then—will also be an election year. That will give another chance for us to ask destiny to stand still.

Here let me again quote Winston Churchill. He has said repeatedly it is only our stock of atomic bombs, and our ability to deliver them, that has deterred the Soviets from attempting to overrun Western Europe and start a third world war.

If this be true—and I believe it to be true—then the Air Force has paid for itself a thousand times.

The fact of Soviet air superiority is a galling, and an appalling, fact. Not long ago we could reasonably believe that our strategic air command could hurt the enemy more than he could hurt us. It is not safe to believe this in 1952. By 1954 such an assumption might lead to our destruction.

Once the enemy concentrated upon fighter planes for home defense. Now he is tripling his production of intercontinental bombers. He is increasing his air strength offensively as well as defensively.

Presently we believe we have more atomic bombs than he has. But this is small comfort. For if our industrial potential could be destroyed by x number of bombs, it is of no importance that the enemy does not have x plus y number of bombs.

If force without diplomacy is empty, equally empty is diplomacy without force. A vital part of that strength is the Air Force. It should be adequate to do three jobs:

First. To deter the enemy.

Second. To defend this Nation in war.

Third. To deliver instantaneous hammer blows upon the enemy.

It has still another task; one tied up with our basic strategy of world alliances. Hence the Air Force must be ready not only for global war but wherever the strategy of our enemy and our strategy collide, as in Korea.

What has he done there?

He has raised the Chinese Air Force to the fourth ranking air force of the world. It is composed of about 1,700 planes. One thousand of these are modern jets.

There are certain things to remember about an air force.

No plane is a good plane if a better one can be made. The minute your enemy produces, or is preparing to produce a better plane than yours, your planes become obsolete. In warfare the second best is worth nothing.

Numbers of airplanes are destroyed even if they never see combat. Operational accidents take them. If you begin the year with, say, 100 fighter planes, you will end it with 80. And you will lose a large fraction of bombers and other types.

These things inescapably make an air force expensive in lives and money.

The Army, Navy, and Marines, have parallel duties to perform, and if I have chosen to mention the Air Force at some length it is not special pleading but only by way of illustrating my thesis that we may be cutting our throats trying to save our necks.

We put economic aid to others next to military aid and preparedness at home. Can we afford to be complacent in this field? If anyone is complacent, I call his attention to a New York Times dispatch by Michael L. Hoffman, dated Geneva, May 18, 1952. He says:

Western leaders who concern themselves with world economic trends are worried about the lack of any clear signs of improvement in production and in the availability of what are commonly thought of as the necessities of life in the non-Communist underdeveloped areas.

I call your attention to this passage:

What makes it politically perilous is that the Communist countries have done much better with their underdeveloped regions than the non-Communist regimes of the Middle East and Asia have done with similar regions.

Studies made by the United Nations Economic and Social Council show that good progress is being made in western Europe. But, we are told:

The economic systems of most of the Middle East, southern and eastern Asia, and even parts of Europe such as southern Italy have not shared in the increases in production.

Asians want technical knowledge and it apparently does not matter to them whether they get it from democracies or Communists since in their eyes the two groups are merely different forms of one civilization.

What is to be done?

This is the Council's answer:

Western leaders believe that since the West cannot achieve its results as communism does, it must devote very much more of its greatly superior per capita wealth than has even yet been considered—much less al-

located—to the instigation of economic progress in the vast poverty-stricken regions of the non-Communist world.

Let me sum up.

We have assumed a dominant position in the world through the workings of destiny.

Never seeking power, we have achieved power.

There rests upon us such a responsibility for the world's freedom that the free world will stand or fall largely by what we do or fail to do.

Inclined to isolationism, we have been thrust into internationalism.

Emerging from the war with our home strength intact, we chose to help those less fortunate than ourselves in a series of acts that for magnitude and generosity are without parallel in man's history.

The only great democratic power able to resist imperialism parading under the guise of communism, we have committed ourselves to that vast task.

With little in our history, philosophy, or temperament, to prepare us for the task of world leadership, we have learned fast. If we have had our defeats, we have also had our triumphs.

Today we stand at the topmost pinnacle of our power.

Standing there, we say to the Communist world and the democratic world that, in our opinion, peace can be had and differences reconciled by good will on both sides. We seek to enslave no one. We are indeed unique in history in this respect: we are the only great nation that ever fought a war to free slaves.

To the underdeveloped countries we say: "Come and take what you will of our technical knowledge. You don't have to take the donor with the gift. We attach only one condition to our aid. It is that you use it efficiently so that you may the sooner help yourselves."

Man, for the first time, can now conquer nature, reduce poverty, banish disease, bring light to those in darkness. We Americans know how to do it. We are willing—even anxious—to do it. But just when man is within sight of the promised land of happiness and prosperity, we must devote our energies—through no fault of our own—to war and preparations for war.

Destiny has a rendezvous, and it is with us. We are the most prosperous people upon the fact of the earth. We must lead this world or it is leaderless. We must bring it back to sanity and to peace if there is to be sanity and peace in this world.

If in this democracy, Republicans and Democrats alike, all Americans loving our country as we do, stand together, freedom will be ours and democracy will go on to bless the human race for years to come, and the future will say about us that in these crises we did not fail.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. CHATHAM:

On page 17, line 4, strike out "\$65,000,000" and insert "\$50,000,000."

On page 17, line 7, strike out "\$76,000,000" and insert "\$50,000,000."

Mr. CHATHAM. Mr. Chairman, I feel that this is a very picayunish time for me to stand up and talk about a small amount of money after the speech we have just heard. I cannot quite believe what I have seen today, that one political party would vote together for things that I am sure a lot of them do not believe in. I have voted many times with the gentlemen on the left, but when the security and the peace of the world is at stake, as the distinguished Speaker has just said, I want to go on record as saying that I cannot believe my eyes have been true. We have cut this bill very heavily. My amendment is a further cut. Last year we gave Israel \$50,000,000 and we gave the Arab refugees \$50,000,000. The facts are reported on page 53. The Arab refugees have gone down from 875,000 to 850,000. The Jewish refugees have gone down from 669,000 to 273,000. I can only say that I think it is a matter of common sense that we give these people what they had last year, and I would guess that the Arabs are getting the worst of the deal.

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

Mr. CHATHAM. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. BURLESON. Does the gentleman know whether or not the report is true that already the Israelis are using the funds they now have under the economic program to retire some of their public debt?

Mr. CHATHAM. Yes; I think that is good business. They are.

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

Mr. CHATHAM. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. DINGELL. Did the gentleman stop to consider that the people of Israel, courageous as they are, constitute the keystone of our defenses in that area of the world?

Mr. CHATHAM. I think that when I offer this amendment I am working for the people of Israel, because some day the Arab world is going to say we are unfair, that we should take no sides. Vote this amendment up or down, but I think when you have 875,000 refugees whose homes have been taken away from them and who are living in poverty, some consideration should be given to them.

Mr. DINGELL. My friend is just dead wrong in his concept of what Israel means to the United States, and, more than that, that is indicative of a philosophy in this House, particularly on the other side of the aisle, that we can afford to squander our sons just so we can save the dollars. I say, forget the dollars. I am for saving the sons of this Nation and preserving peace.

Mr. CHATHAM. I appreciate the gentleman's viewpoint, but I think I am doing a good deed toward Israel by offering this amendment.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CHATHAM. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I think the gentleman probably has a good amendment. I have visited some of these Arab refugee camps, and I can

tell the gentleman from my observation that they are living out on the desert in tents that are not fit to live in. They have been there for 3 years, and they have no technical aid or assistance that we can observe.

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

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

Mr. VORYS. I think it is of interest that, as the bill was submitted to us, for the seven Arab states nonmilitary assistance amounts to 57 cents per capita, and for Israel the nonmilitary assistance amounts to \$50.84 per capita. I therefore feel that to do just what we did last year, as the gentleman suggests, while it would not change that ratio much, would be a little more in order than what is proposed.

Mr. CHATHAM. I thank the gentleman from Ohio, because I think that as unpopular as it may seem we are doing something for the Jewish people by putting these people on an equal level. The per-capita cost will still be 10 times what the Arabs are getting.

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

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

Mr. CELLER. Would the gentleman say that a democracy is on a level with an autocracy or totalitarian regime? The Arab States are not democratic states. They are autocracies or absolute kingly dynasties. You cannot consider them on the same parity with the democracy that exists in Israel. Would not the gentleman say that where democracy flourishes we must give every degree of aid and comfort to keeping that light of democracy burning, as in Israel? Seventy-six millions is little enough for this.

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

(By unanimous consent, Mr. CHATHAM was allowed to proceed for two additional minutes.)

Mr. CHATHAM. May I say to the gentleman from New York that if you are run out of your lands and homes it does not matter whether you believe in democracy or anything else. The Soviet world today has in the Arabs a true opportunity. These people were run out of their lands and homes. They were promised compensation or that they would get their lands back. They have not had either. I would further say that the \$15,000,000 of Arab funds impounded in Israel have not been turned loose. They say, "When we get our German funds we will release them." I do not believe in that kind of business.

Mr. CELLER. There are Israeli funds in other parts of the world which are also impounded, and the Israelis are unable to avail themselves of those funds.

With reference to the homes, I think history will tell you that the Jews did not oust the Arabs. They were perfectly willing to keep the Arabs in Israel. It was the exhortations of the effendi and the Arab emirs an rabble-rousing leaders that exhorted the Arabs to leave their homelands and go into the surrounding Arab countries. The Jews did not force

them out. They were perfectly welcome to remain there.

Mr. CHATHAM. I refer my distinguished friend from New York to the United Nations report on that. I take it the gentleman believes in the United Nations?

Mr. CELLER. I have read it, and I read it differently than the gentleman does. There was no ousting whatsoever.

I have been in Israel several times. There are thousands and thousands of Arabs still in Israel. There are probably over 200,000 Arabs presently in Israel, living in comfort and decency, holding their heads high, and happy to live in that democracy.

Mr. CHATHAM. I think we are for the same thing. I think Israel is a strong bastion of democracy. I think the Arab world is also important, and I think we have to be fair. That is all I have in mind to do.

Mr. CELLER. I would not want to reduce the Arab allotment. I would just leave it where it is. The reasons for cutting that you indicate are not substantiated. You should not, for light and transient reasons, reduce the amount that the Committee on Foreign Affairs, after mature deliberation, figures to be the proper amount.

Keep the amount set for Arabs.

Keep the amount set for Israelis.

Mr. CHATHAM. Because our report says that the Jewish immigrants not assimilated are down 273,000 people.

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

Mr. RICHARDS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on the pending amendment, and all amendments thereto, close in 20 minutes, exclusive of the time of the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROOSEVELT], who now has the floor.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. ROOSEVELT. I yield.

Mr. McCORMACK. I just want to make a brief observation. Both the Democratic and Republican platforms of 1948 came out strongly in favor of an independent Jewish commonwealth, the Democratic platform for "a free and independent Jewish nation." I might also say that the Middle East is a part of the world that is under great tension today, and requires a great deal of delicacy. I want to say we should appreciate the significance of a free and independent democratic nation such as Israel is in the Middle East. Furthermore, this is the first time that I have ever heard the argument advanced in support of an amendment to reduce an appropriation that you are helping somebody by reducing the appropriation.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. I thank my eminent majority leader, and concur in what he says.

Mr. Chairman, this is a completely unthought-out amendment. The committee has arrived at its two figures after considerable deliberation. Let me urge

the House to consider these two authorizations not as a bloc, but as separate authorizations to separate sections of the bill, and for different purposes. So far as the Arab refugees are concerned, the one authorization would be inadequate if we were to cut it to what it was last year for the simple reason that between last year and today, the United Nations has at last brought forth a plan of rescue and ultimate integration, resettlement, and rehabilitation, for these 850,000 Arab refugees into the Arab communities in the Middle East. Last year we were appropriating for relief, and this year we are appropriating for an integration and resettlement program which will be a 3-year program.

The second part of this amendment, and I regret that this amendment was put in as a single package, is to cut the \$76,000,000 authorized for resettlement of Israel refugees to \$50,000,000, again on the theory that what we did last year was adequate. It is not adequate because a year has gone by and the circumstances have changed. As you will read in the committee report, the economy of Israel today is a very precarious one. Although the immigration has tapered off, there are still some 396,000 refugees unassimilated in Israel today, and more are coming in every day. If we cut this appropriation today, we are saying in effect to Israel, "Your problem has not changed, and our interest in your welfare has not changed."

Mr. Chairman, we cannot afford to say that, because Israel is the outpost of democracy, in the most delicate and most dangerous hot spot in the Middle East, in the world today.

Israel's democracy will succeed only if we encourage her economy and her agriculture to get on a stable basis so that the refugees who have gone to this little country will be self-supporting, self-respecting.

Just one thought for a moment: Many of these 700,000 refugees who have gone into Israel in the last 4 years and who have been welcomed into this little community are people whom we were taking care of in the DP camps of Western Europe, and if they had not gone to Israel this Congress would still be appropriating for their care in the DP camps of Western Europe. We must be grateful to the people of Israel for having received them and taken them off our necks.

It is to our interest that both these special problems be solved in the next 3 or 4 years in accordance with the United Nations program of integrating the Arabs into the Arab countries, a plan which has been accepted and is supported by the Arab League, a plan which will end the relief that we have had to carry on for the last 4 years, and that the other program making Israel the great example to that whole part of the world what free human beings can do for themselves in a democracy.

I urge the defeat of this amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. JONAS] is recognized.

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Chairman, I submit that in the instant case this amendment should not be adopted.

I have no special interest in the particular section of this bill except to see

that fair play is done. When we had the issue up here some time ago relative to Spain and all the other countries that were involved in this bill it was decided by a majority vote of the Members present that the record stand as written in the bill. I do not believe we ought to let prejudice or bias or individual feeling enter into this bill until all of the various and respective sections of the bill have been disposed of.

To single out this specific appropriation for so drastic a reduction as the amendment calls for in my opinion is unfair and unjust in the light of what has been the attitude of the House relative to all preceding amendments that have been acted upon in connection with this bill. I believe this amendment should not prevail, and I propose to vote against it.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER] is recognized.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Chairman, I have been to Israel, and I can say this advisedly: There are many nations that are stronger, but no nation that is braver. Remember, a few people, the Israelis, worsted 6 Arab nations, over 30,000,000 strong, but with the courage of the Maccabees and with the fortitude of the prophets they worsted them, and these with a dearth of arms, almost with their bare knuckles. This is the type of people we are asked to help.

I know nations that are richer in worldly goods, but none exceed Israel in hope. I know nations which are stronger in arms, but none have a greater faith than the people of Israel, faith in themselves and faith in God. They do not wear their faith as one would the fashion of a hat, they realize with Browning that faith can move mountains. Those people have performed wonders. They can do anything but fail. For that reason I do hope that this amendment will not carry. Think of what they have done; they have well nigh doubled their population in a period of 3 years. Imagine what chaos and economic confusion would happen in this country if we were almost to double our population in that length of time; yet they smoothly and in a most efficient manner brought in all these refugees from Iraq, Iran, Yemen, North Africa, and from behind the iron curtain; they gave these helpless, hopeless, and homeless persons surcease from their sorrows and their trouble. When they were persecuted and pillaged in all these lands the Israelis said: "We will receive you." Israel would quickly be able to balance her budget if she were to close her doors and bar the refugees, but how can a mother deny her children entrance? It is in that spirit that Israel receives the refugees, but she cannot do that unless we give her help. For that reason, vote down this amendment.

The amazing accomplishment of the state of Israel in its short years of existence has earned the admiration of the world. This is not an economy, as is so often the case, that has lost its stability through lack of self-development, through disinterest in production, and in agricultural progress. The strides in production and agriculture have been so tremendous that the mind looking at it

today cannot fully comprehend it. Production increases in just a year average some 24 percent to 50 percent in certain industries. Agricultural output has increased, in some instances, to an extent of 60 percent. New industries are daily being developed.

"Then, why," it may be asked, "is it necessary to include Israel in an aid bill?" It is necessary because Israel is the only country in the world that, despite its hardship, despite its infancy, despite its lack of natural resources, has taken in hundreds of thousands of people and responded to the cry of humanity. Without these hundreds of thousands of immigrants, Israel today, with its original population of 600,000, could have been a thriving, bustling nation, with an economy stabilized and expanding. But with the influx of immigration, the new and little and brave Republic of Israel could not meet the demands placed upon it—the demands, remember, which she herself gladly undertook to answer of hungry, helpless, sick people. Remember, they came at the rate of 30,000 a month.

If we have an interest in democracy anywhere, we must have it everywhere. Here is a little land which is the first democracy, mind you, the very first, in the Middle East area. Here is a democracy which carries forward the basic concept of our civilization—the dignity of the individual. The people of Israel understand the word. It is a practicing democracy. And it is to our ultimate self-interest that this first and only practicing democracy in the Middle East not only survive the hardships it has taken unto itself but expand.

The objections of the Arab leaders to Israel lie in the very fact that the tenets of democracy will spill over the border and teach people that they, too, are individuals entitled to live, as such, under guaranties of liberty and freedom.

There are countries to whom we are giving aid—and I do not say they are less deserving—to whom the light of democracy has yet to be turned on, who are struggling through to democracy. Here are a people who brought democracy with them and built a government on it. I have been to Israel and I know whereof I speak. It is often accused of Communist tendencies. The fact remains that nowhere else—and I have been through Europe—have the Communists less of a grip on its people. They are a variable people, given to free and differing discussions. They are a people who have submitted to austerity, a voluntary austerity, unknown in any other democracy, but they do not, and cannot, and will not submit to tyranny. The people who have gone in the main into Israel are people who, through their very bitter experience, have learned what it actually means to live under totalitarianism. They know its terror and its tragic consequences. They do not have to be sold on freedom. Can we, therefore, afford to disregard the sturdy fruit of democracy planted by Israel in the Middle East?

Today the United States would still be carrying the staggering burden of maintaining the displaced-persons camps were it not for Israel's willingness to receive the DP's. In our own DP pro-

gram, we placed restrictions upon the entrance of these people—restrictions on health, restrictions on skills, and so forth. But Israel placed no such restrictions. She took the hard core of the halt and the lame and the blind, as well as the able-bodied. She did not stop to count the cost, because she placed the human life above the dollar.

The cut in funds here proposed has a thousandfold been returned to the United States. In hard cash it has been returned to us in the money that was saved by Israel's generously emptying the DP camps. It has been returned to us by the growth of democracy in the Middle East. It has been returned to us by Israel's voting in the United Nations against aggression and for peace and on the side of the United States. It has been returned to us by the more than proportionate share of medicines Israel has been contributing to the soldiers in Korea.

Now we propose to cut aid to Israel. Why? Because she has done too much? Because she is a little land? Because she is a democracy? It does not make sense. The needs are desperate in Greece and Turkey. The needs are desperate in Israel, too. Israel has not placed herself before us as a suppliant, with no effort on her own to grow into a self-sufficient economy. She has inaugurated an austerity program which, in its severity, is matched by no other country. She has made and is making a superhuman effort to close the dollar gap by raising and producing as much as she can for export. She has not been afraid to raise her own taxes and so impose these burdens upon her people first. She has launched a \$500,000,000 bond drive, sold to the people of the United States at a 3½-percent interest-bearing rate, thus taking a debt into herself which she must herself pay within the next 12 to 15 years. She fought her own battle against aggression with no aid from any country, with no arms. In fact, we ourselves had imposed an arms embargo against her. She has watered her own deserts and made huge technological strides in the direction of synthetic productions. And, in addition to all that, she has taken the hundreds of thousands of the homeless, so that they may regain their dignity, learn again the lesson of freedom, and become once again productive members of a free society.

Toward such endeavor, toward such industry, toward such evidence of democracy, toward such humanity, we cannot remain indifferent.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York [Mr. MULTER] is recognized.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Chairman, in the short time allotted to me it is impossible for me to tell you the many things I would like to tell you about the reasons why this amendment should not prevail. I have been in Israel several times. I have been through some of the Arab states, and I tell you that conditions in both countries, as far as persons who are compelled to live in tents is concerned, is deplorable. In Israel you have more than 200,000 people living in tents awaiting the construction of homes for them. In the Arab states you have a similar situation.

I am not asking you to cut the part that is allocated to the Arabs as against that which is allocated to the State of Israel. I say you should not cut anything that is allocated to either of these areas. They both need every dollar this bill provides, and more. As a matter of fact, the recommendations that were sent in called for much more. The committee recommended, not as much as was needed, but as much as, and no more than, we should be called upon to spend in this area under all the surrounding circumstances. The job we are trying to do in that area of the world is one of saving and rebuilding human lives.

It is not a matter of saving dollars, it is not a matter of building up trade or industry or even war matériel; it is a matter of trying to give these people an opportunity to rebuild their lives, to build homes for themselves, to build for themselves and their children the wherewithal to make themselves useful citizens. Let us give them a taste of the freedom by which they can acquire a decent standard of living by dint of their own labor. If we do we can then be sure they will be people who will stand by us when the time comes to fight the enemy, who would enslave us all.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. EBERHARTER].

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Chairman, this amendment, if adopted, would in effect say that because the people of Israel have helped themselves we are going to cut down on the amount of money we will allot to them. The reduction in the number of refugees in Israel has come about not only because they themselves energetically attacked the problem but also because they have received hundreds of millions of dollars in charity from people in the United States. The Jewish people had a problem, and they tackled it with wisdom and faith and zeal, and with charity in their hearts.

I visited Israel; I also visited Camp Gaza of the Arabs, and in contradiction to what the gentleman from Minnesota said, there is technical assistance there in Gaza. There is a hospital, and there is a staff there from the United Nations trying to help the Arab refugees. If it were up to me I would probably increase the allowance for the refugees of both the Israelis and the Arabs. I certainly would not decrease it. For a long time the Arab States had no plan for the resettlement of Arab refugees. Now that a plan has been adopted perhaps we could increase their allotment.

However, the simple fact remains that the people of Israel welcomed and still continue to welcome the people of Jewish faith from all over the world; they even welcome those people who cannot even speak the Israelic language. In the refugee camps in Israel are learned interpreters who find it almost impossible to understand the language of some of the people coming in from southern Asia and from parts of Africa; yet they welcome these people there, many of whom are old men who could not possibly contribute to the economy, simply because the people of Israel want to do a charitable deed for the unfortunate and persecuted brethren of theirs.

Mr. Chairman, we would be going against a sound program if we adopted this amendment. It seems to me there should be no question but that the amendment should be defeated.

Mr. BENNETT of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. BENNETT of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I am vigorously opposed to the pending amendment which is designed to make a substantial cut in our aid to the new State of Israel.

This nation is a sister democracy of ours and has the same objectives as our own country in its efforts to promote harmony and preserve world peace. The House Foreign Affairs Committee has carefully considered all phases of the provision in this bill for Israel and I think we must rely upon its judgment as to the amount of assistance which should be extended. If Israel remains strong and free it can well be of great assistance to the rest of the world in preventing the spread of communism in the Near East.

While I am opposed to our gigantic over-all program of foreign-aid spending and intend to vote against this bill in its entirety, I do strongly feel that Israel should be treated on the same basis of fairness and equality as is accorded to the other nations seeking our assistance and hence I shall vote against the proposal to reduce the amount of Israel's aid, and I hope the amendment is defeated.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York [Mr. KLEIN].

(By unanimous consent, the time allotted to Mr. KLEIN was yielded to Mr. JAVITS.)

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. CHUDOFF].

(By unanimous consent, the time allotted to Mr. CHUDOFF was yielded to Mrs. KELLY of New York.)

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FLOOD].

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Chairman, I am not going to discuss the philosophy of the amendment, as it has been so well handled previously. I join in approval of what the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER] has said.

I have spent a great deal of time in the Arab world. As a matter of fact, 1 year ago, together with my colleague from New Hampshire [Mr. MERROW], I spent several weeks in all of these Arab states.

I have this very practical thing to tell you practical people. If you want a stationary air base on the North African coast, in case you are going to, God forbid, find it necessary to send bombers back of the Ural Mountains, you better have it where you know you will have it, in Israel and not in the chaotic, turbulent Arab world.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, will the distinguished gentleman yield?

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

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, since the Committee of the Whole has limited debate on this amendment, I have not been able to secure time to fully discuss my opposition to it. Mr. Chairman, I am vigorously opposed to it, and heartily commend my three colleagues from New York and the gentleman from Pennsylvania, for the splendid remarks and convincing statements they have made in opposition to the pending amendment. I trust the Chatham amendment will be voted down.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Chairman, I oppose the pending amendment.

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, the State of Israel has proven by its acts that it intends to defend its rights with the maximum military force that it can raise and that this military force will be used in defense of the free world.

In the struggle against Soviet atheistic communism the State of Israel is in the camp of the free world that must be based on the civilization we know as Judeo-Christianity. In this civilization each human being is precious because he is made in the image and likeness of God. I am against cutting aid to the brave little State of Israel.

Mr. AUCHINCLOSS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. AUCHINCLOSS. Mr. Chairman, about 4 years ago I went on public record that our country should do everything it could to encourage the development and strength and the economic stability of the new Republic of Israel. My judgment at that time has been proved over and over again to have been sound.

This new Republic of Israel is a true democracy, antagonistic to communism and all that godless ideology stands for. Israel today requires its youth to serve in its ever-growing army in the defense of freedom and in opposition to all the enemies of liberty. Indeed, Israel is the greatest hope our country has in our protection against the encroachments of communism in the Near East, that most sensitive spot in the world.

The amendments submitted by the distinguished gentleman from North Carolina, who I am proud to add is a friend of mine whom I highly respect, would cancel to a certain extent the aid which the United States would extend to Israel in helping to establish itself and solve the perplexing problems that confront it. Rather than reduce this aid, it should be increased and this thought is not prompted by any emotional feeling on my part but because it is just sound, good common sense to aid those and help those who in turn will aid in the protection of the liberty and freedom

which we cherish in our Nation. I will vote against these amendments and I feel sure that the House itself will not approve of them.

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Chairman, I am opposed to the Chatham amendment to eliminate the funds for the aid of refugees in Israel. In view of the vast increase in population in the State of Israel and the enormous number of refugees who have migrated to Israel, and now are in need of shelter and other necessities of life, this fund for the aid of these refugees is urgently needed.

One of the outstanding attempts to create a democratic way of life has been the struggle of the Jewish people to create anew the nation of Israel—Israel which now offers peace and dignity to a people who were perhaps the foremost victims of the holocaust of World War II.

In my opinion this authorization of funds for the aid of refugees in Israel will aid the future development of the State of Israel and will develop its strength as a nation. Israel is in a very strategic position in the Near East, and it is of mutual interest to the United States and Israel that she be kept strong.

Since the State of Israel was established in 1948, 684,275 immigrants came into the country in a space of 44 months. The Jewish population of Israel has more than doubled. For the first 3 years this great migration was made possible by the contributions of Jewish communities all over the world and, to an even greater extent, by the sacrifices of the Jewish people of Israel who shared their slender resources and went deeply into debt.

Many immigrants came to Israel from the displaced-persons camps of Europe where they had been maintained by the United States Government and international agencies. Upon their arrival in Israel they became the responsibility of the new State of Israel, which assumed the burden.

However, early in 1951 it became evident that Israel needed additional help. The aid voted by Congress to Israel in 1951 is now being made available for food, fuel, power, irrigation, agricultural, industrial, and communications equipment, and this is helping to put the new immigrants to work and helping to care for them.

In 1951, however, because of the mass exodus of the Jews from Iraq, 174,169 additional immigrants came to Israel. In view of a severe drought, shortages of essential capital goods, and the rise in world prices, the economic problems facing Israel have again become critical.

Housing is urgently needed to care for these refugees. Almost 250,000 people in the State of Israel today live in villages of tents, canvas-wall huts, wooden cabins, and tin shacks. Clothing is strictly rationed. Food is scarce.

Work must be found for the new immigrants, but they are unable to achieve maximum production because there is a

shortage of raw materials, tools, and equipment.

Most of the immigrants come to Israel without assets; many are sick or disabled.

I cannot too strongly urge the defeat of the Chatham amendment which would eliminate the funds for the relief of these unfortunate and suffering refugees in Israel.

The State of Israel is a democracy, and a strong Israel promotes the security of our own Nation and of the free world. Because of its strategic position in the Near East, it is my belief that the United States should render this financial aid to refugees in Israel because such aid will strengthen the economic independence of Israel and will develop its natural resources and industries.

Mr. YORTY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. YORTY. Mr. Chairman, the amendments would reduce appropriations already inadequate. The refugee problem being handled by Israel would tax the patience, strength, and ingenuity of a much larger and older nation. It is a problem which we must help solve. Failure to do so would be an act of selfishness and blind folly unworthy of a great Nation; unworthy of the great people of the United States whom we are here to represent. I think the people of the Nation want and expect us to help this friendly democracy, which is struggling to integrate hundreds of thousands of unfortunate refugees into its economy and social and political system. When in history has such a new Nation ever achieved so much in the face of such obstacles? When have any people ever demonstrated more fortitude, generosity, or determination? Do the American people want to show their appreciation and admiration by cutting this appropriation? No, of course, they do not. We would fail to accurately express the will of the American people if we voted to cut this appropriation.

We all know Israel is our friend. We can rely upon the people of Israel. Then, too, in helping them to solve their problems and grow strong, we are helping ourselves, helping ourselves in the awful struggle for world peace in which we are engaged.

This appropriation involves several millions of dollars, a large sum, yes, but comparatively small when one considers the importance of its purpose and the magnitude of the job that has to be done by the State of Israel. Let me emphasize that the refugee problem cannot be considered to be only the concern of Israel. It has much larger implications. It is our problem, too. Every humane consideration compels us to do our part to aid the nation which is doing so much to take in and assist the hundreds of thousands of unfortunate families who knock on its gates and ask admission.

Mr. Chairman, we must help keep those gates open. This appropriation does not really involve dollars. It is families. It is little children looking to

us for a home and a chance in life. We must not turn our backs upon them.

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Chairman, I am vigorously and unalterably opposed to the reductions in the amount recommended for Israel provided by the terms of the two pending amendments.

It should be manifest to anyone who has had an opportunity to observe conditions in the Near East during the past few years that that area is in great distress and suffering marked unrest.

I am anxious that the Congress should do everything possible to promote friendly relations between the Jews and the Arabs in that area.

However, I cannot see any logic or reason in the proposed reduction of the funds which the new-born Jewish homeland of Israel so urgently requires in order to carry out its gigantic, humane program of resettling and caring for thousands upon thousands of displaced and persecuted persons from virtually every section of the troubled world, including a considerable number from behind the iron curtain.

Instead of seeking to penalize these most commendable efforts, which have been carried out with an unusual degree of efficiency and humane feeling, I humbly believe that we should do everything we can to support and further these efforts because they are contributing to the alleviation of human misery and the relief of oppressed, persecuted peoples and the succor of the weak, helpless, and persecuted of many nations.

In my opinion, the least we can do here is to display in concrete form our feelings of approval and commendation and our willingness to support the valiant work which the new State of Israel has so manfully undertaken and is carrying forward with such zealous and unflinching purpose.

I hope that the House will reject these stultifying amendments and thus extend not only a helping hand but that moral encouragement and inspiration for a great human cause which is implicit in the original provisions of the pending bill.

Mr. ANFUSO. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. ANFUSO. Mr. Chairman, I am opposed to any cut in the appropriation recommended for the State of Israel.

We have here two amendments—one to cut the appropriation from \$76,000,000 to \$50,000,000 and another to cut the recommendation of the Foreign Affairs Committee from \$76,000,000 to \$65,000,000.

Thus one amendment attempts to cut the recommended appropriation by \$26,000,000 and the other by \$11,000,000.

To me, both of these proposals appear to be ridiculous. Here we are today appropriating more than \$7,000,000,000 to

try to win over friends in the world at a time when our own security is in danger. Now with respect to Israel we don't have to win this country over. She already is on our side and presents one of the strongest bastions for peace in that part of the world.

It would have taken us more than the entire \$7,000,000,000 appropriation, plus thousands of American lives to establish such a bastion for peace had we been compelled to do so.

Recognizing this fact, does not it appear ridiculous that we should try to cut from the appropriation to this noble young nation what by comparison is a very, very insignificant amount?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. JUDD].

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. JUDD as a substitute for the amendment offered by Mr. CHATHAM: Page 17, line 7, strike out the figure "\$76,000,000" and insert the figure "\$65,000,000."

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

Mr. JUDD. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. WIER. I just want to express my opposition to the Chatham amendment with its cut, and expect to vote against it.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Chairman, what my amendment does is to provide the same amount, \$65,000,000, for each of these groups—the Arab refugees and the Israel refugees.

Last year I urged that the House maintain equality of treatment in this area. There is no place in the world where the forces are more explosive today and where more damage could happen to ourselves and our security in 24 hours' notice than in this area. Conditions with respect to relations between the Arabs and Israelis are better today than they were a year ago. At last they appear to be on the road to gradual solution of their problems, and I think it is in part due to the fact that in last year's bill we maintained equality in granting aid to the two groups.

I do not doubt for a moment that the sum of \$76,000,000 asked for Israeli this year is justified, but under the circumstances and in view of the larger issue of the security of the United States, which requires peace in the Middle East, I think it may be wise to maintain the same amount for both of these groups of refugees, but that it would be most unwise to reduce the amount of \$65,000,000 to \$50,000,000 for each one of them.

The hour of show-down with the Soviet Union in this area is approaching; it could blow up at any time in the next day or month or year. I do not believe that the amount to be saved by the amendment of the gentleman from North Carolina justifies the additional risk we would be taking if we were to say, by adopting his amendment, at the very moment when a solution of this difficult problem begins to appear possible, that we are reducing our support. I hope that my substitute will prevail rather than that of the gentleman from North Carolina.

(Mr. RICHARDS asked and was given permission to yield the time allotted him to Mrs. KELLY of New York.)

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from New York [Mrs. KELLY].

Mrs. KELLY of New York. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to both of these amendments.

First, I want to comment on the amendment just proposed by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. JUDD]. Out of this authorization, you propose a cut for Israel from \$76,000,000 now in the bill to \$65,000,000. But you propose no cut for the Arab refugees. Also, we must remember that the Arab refugees will be getting more contributions from the U. N. fund besides our own, so that the gentleman from Minnesota is to that degree making an inequitable proposal.

Now, to answer the argument of the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. CHATHAM], regarding the point he made about the impounding of the funds in Israel: Humbly I state at this time that I have been working with the State of Israel toward a solution of this problem, and I am very happy to say that as of yesterday there is a solution and an agreement in being to unfreeze these funds, which will take place very shortly. To cut the authorization to Israel is destructive. It will not bring peace to this area nor will it bring peace between the Arab States and Israel. The Committee on Foreign Affairs, on which I have the privilege of serving, carefully considered the needs of the Arab refugees and the needs of Israel and the ability of this great new democracy to contribute to the free world as our allies. The important problems in the Near East are well known to all of us. I firmly believe we would take a very constructive approach to this area by approving the full amount of assistance to Israel.

As my colleague the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROOSEVELT] explained, we are primarily interested at this time in the resettlement of the refugees in this area and to make them self-sufficient. As far as Israel is concerned, we must encourage and strengthen this friendly, democratic state and we must assist in solving her economic problems. Aside from the fact that Israel is a great fortress of democracy in the Near East, she has the largest and the strongest military force in this area, next to Turkey. I am sure we all agree that this army, if ever needed, will be on the side of the free world and the United States.

In this program 70 percent is for the resettlement program, which includes housing, farm building, and the importation of necessary commodities to strengthen their production. Thirty percent will permit continuation of assistance in expanding and increasing the efficiency of industry and agriculture in this area.

I compliment my colleagues who have risen in opposition to these crippling amendments which would cut down on aid to Israel and I hope this committee will weigh carefully its decision, because I firmly believe you should take the advice of the Foreign Affairs Committee, who considered carefully the arguments

pro and con in bringing forth a plan in this bill. I do hope both of these amendments will be defeated.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. KELLY of New York. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. The gentlewoman speaks of the fighting forces they have in Israel today. Can the gentlewoman tell me how many there are in Korea, how many troops Israel has sent there?

Mrs. KELLY of New York. Despite her own economic difficulties and her security needs, Israel has contributed ambulances and medical personnel to the United Nations forces in Korea which are sorely needed there.

Mr. GROSS. More troops from Israel in Korea?

Mrs. KELLY of New York. I am speaking of Israel's contribution in ambulances and medical personnel—doctors, nurses, and the like.

Mr. GROSS. Is Israel a member of the United Nations?

Mrs. KELLY of New York. Yes. And a very strong supporter of U. N. principles.

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. KELLY of New York. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. CANFIELD. Supporting the statement just made by the gentlewoman from New York, the Reverend Dan Poling, editor of the Christian Herald and father of one of the famed four chaplains lost in World War II, has written a letter to every Member of the House of Representatives describing Israel as the most reliable bastion in the Near East.

Mrs. KELLY of New York. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. KELLY of New York. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. CELLER. Israel has made contributions to the forces in Korea. She has a medical unit in Korea with a considerable number of doctors and nurses and other manpower.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. KELLY of New York. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. I wish to commend the gentlewoman from New York, and desire to say that I oppose both the pending amendments.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to both of the pending amendments which would cut down on the amount of aid to Israel and Arab refugees.

The young State of Israel is a very effective, well-organized, and well-ordered democracy. She is a tower of strength, vigor, and hope in a sensitive area of the world—the Near East.

We need strength and democratic forces in that area just as we do in all the other areas of the world.

The bill before us is a mutual-security bill, in the mutual interest of the United States and the countries we are assisting. Israel stands ready to stand by the side of the United States and other free countries. Let us stand by her side and not cut this aid at a time when our young ally needs our helping hand.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. KENNEDY) may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. Chairman, I want to take this opportunity to speak in support of the \$76,000,000 appropriation in this mutual security bill for the Israel refugee program.

The record of accomplishment of the free State of Israel stands as a beacon of inspiration to all free men everywhere.

My personal observations of the epic struggle for freedom which the Jewish people of Israel have made are set forth in the following speech which I delivered last Friday night to a group of Jewish war veterans in Boston:

The importance of the individual, his dignity, his rights and privileges in a democratic society, has already been recognized in Israel.

There, all citizens, regardless of their religion, color, or national origin, enjoy the same fundamental rights. Although Israelis come from all the continents of the world, all share equally in their status as citizens of the State of Israel. And whether one is a Jew, a Christian, or a Moslem, the right to practice one's own religion according to the belief of his fathers, is guaranteed by fundamental law.

Twelve years ago, I had an opportunity to spend nearly a month in what was the British Mandate of Palestine. The country was torn in that fateful summer of 1939 by violence and strife; it was a prime example of the British policy of divided rule.

I came away with a feeling of hopelessness for the future. But the interest in the establishment of a national homeland for the Jewish people in this promised land that I had derived from my visit was rekindled at the end of World War II. The tragic plight of the Jewish people in Europe and the daring fight that was being made to build a new home in Israel under the guns of the British and Arabs stirred me deeply. I was, therefore, proud to tell the convention of the New England Zionist region on the same platform with Dr. Silver in 1947 exactly how I felt in these words:

"Today the United Nations has before it the solution of the Palestine problem. It is my conviction that a just solution requires the establishment of a free and democratic Jewish commonwealth in Palestine, the opening of the doors of Palestine to Jewish immigration, and the removal of land restrictions so that those members of the people of Israel who desire to work out their destiny under their chosen leaders may do so."

With this long background of my deep interest in the fight for nationhood, it was a tremendous experience to visit Israel last fall with Congressman FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT, Jr. What a tremendous change had taken place in the country from my visit of 12 years before, both in appearance and in spirit. Swamps had been filled, deserts had become productive, and the air rang with vitality and energy.

Nothing in my opinion has been more admirable than the tenacity with which the Israelis have maintained their policy of unlimited immigration. Their willingness to increase their population from 600,000 to over 1,200,000 in the past 3 years and to plan to bring in another 600,000 in the next 3 years is testimony to their invincible faith in their future. And the Israelis have been willing to take the hard-core cases of old men and women, the sick and the infirm, whom

the rest of the populace would have to support. We can get some idea of the sacrifice that this policy entails on the population by imagining the tremendous burden we in this large country would have to carry if we increased in a 3-year time our population of 150,000,000 to 300,000,000 and then undertook to increase our population to 450,000,000 in the next 3 years.

Keeping the doors open as a place of refuge to Jews who want to come to Israel from iron-curtain countries or Arab lands has put a strain upon the economy of the country. While private philanthropy and private investment can help make Israel economically self-sufficient, the United Nations and our own country also have a role to play. I was glad to see the American Congress recognize last summer that this Israeli policy deserved American support and I was happy to support the appropriation of \$50,000,000 for this purpose. In addition, I will vigorously support the passage of an appropriation of \$76,000,000 for the Israel refugee program when the House of Representatives considers the mutual security bill next week.

In addition to economic help so that Israel can become self-sufficient, I look upon the development of a free and democratic State of Israel in an area free from threats of aggression, as a goal to which all Americans must commit themselves and the responsibility of the United Nations to fulfill. For the peace of the world it is important that the Arab States recognize the reality of the existence of Israel. Israel is here to stay. The sooner the Arab League is ready to see what the rest of the world has seen for a long time—that a war has been ended, that boundaries have been fixed, and that peace must be established, the sooner this troubled spot of the Near East can be strengthened as an outpost of democracy. Then with free relations between Israel and the Arab States and with the support of our country and the rest of the United Nations, hope can be given to people who live marginal existences in underdeveloped areas for the raising of their standard of living.

This hope can be realized, as Prime Minister Ben-Gurion told Congressman ROOSEVELT and me in Jerusalem last November: "By the emergence of positions of leadership in the Arab States, of liberal, progressive elements, elements genuinely interested in the well-being of all of their people by building mutual confidences and fears of motive will disappear."

When Mr. Ben-Gurion in the same conversation was asked whether or not certain Arab States might not fear aggression by Israel, he asked us: "How could a country like Egypt with a population of 20,000,000 fear invasion by a small nation of less than 2,000,000. Besides, we were once in Egypt and have no desire to return," he added.

This reference by the Prime Minister of the State of Israel to the liberation of the people of Israel in ancient times from slavery to freedom is historic proof of the ability of a people with the will to be free to achieve freedom. What Israel was able to accomplish in ancient times and what the State of Israel has been able to achieve in recent years should serve as a symbol to all men of the invincibility of the human spirit.

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Chairman, I concur in the position taken by Mr. ROOSEVELT, Mrs. KELLY, Mr. JAVITS, and the others who have expressed their opposition to these two amendments because I believe they will seriously interfere with a well-ordered plan to give assistance to Jew-

ish refugees in Israel and thereby help that new nation to strengthen itself among the family of free nations. Israel's strength is a definite asset to the security of the free world.

I believe the proposals in the mutual security bill providing for the relief and resettlement of refugees in Israel, and for technical assistance in Israel are sound and I hope the House will follow the recommendations of the Committee on Foreign Affairs. We should reject these two amendments cutting the program and I urge my colleagues to do so.

I believe the program as approved by the committee is justified by the urgent needs of the people themselves, the results that can be achieved and the strategic importance of Israel in the area. Within recent months, tension has mounted in this critical region. We must help its peoples strengthen themselves. We must encourage them and equip them to join us in the defense of the free world from Communist aggression.

The House Committee on Foreign Affairs says in its report:

It would be difficult to exaggerate the importance of this area to the whole free world. It contains vital resources and is the strategic land bridge between Europe and Asia.

With that statement, I wholeheartedly agree. For this reason I must oppose any effort to cut this program and I hope the majority in this House will agree with me.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York [Mr. JAVITS] to close debate on the pending amendment.

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

Mr. JAVITS. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. YATES. Is it not true that one of the purposes of the Mutual Security Program is to encourage business firms in the United States to participate in building up the economic wealth of the countries participating in this program? Is it not true that many large United States corporations, such as Philco, Kaiser-Frazer, Ford, General Motors, Reicholt Chemicals, and a number of other firms have made substantial investments and built large plants in Israel? Is there not a strong industrial bond growing between the United States and Israel?

Mr. JAVITS. It is. There is a good deal of American investment in Israel. The fact that large American companies and other American investors have invested there is an added tie with our country and an expression of their confidence in Israel.

Mr. Chairman, I think the members of the Committee on Foreign Affairs will bear witness to the fact I have been as devoted a friend of the solution of the Palestine Arab refugee problem as there is on the committee. I am opposed with equal strength to both parts of the pending amendments.

In the first place, with respect to the Arab refugees, they seek to cut the only promising program for their permanent resettlement, the United Nations program for \$250,000,000, of which we contribute only a part.

Let me emphasize before we make a mistake on this question of equalization that I appreciate both of these amendments are not unfriendly and I want to emphasize that I feel the people of Israel have not a more devoted friend in the House than the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. JUDD].

In the technical assistance part of this section, in the \$55,000,000, there is \$23,500,000 for the Arab States and only \$3,000,000 for Israel. If you add \$23,500,000 to either sixty-five or fifty million the equalization figures offered to us, the Arab part of the bill is still receiving very much more than Israel and this average is emphasized by both these amendments over what it is already in the bill. So you do not get equal amounts even with these amendments.

As to the situation of Israel, I have always argued this question on the floor, and I did it last year, purely as an American legislator. The reason you have a right to aid Israel is the reason just expressed by my colleague from New Jersey, because of Israel's strength in terms of free world security. The reason we give the 396,000 unabsorbed refugees in Israel a somewhat higher amount than we give the 600,000 to 800,000 Arab refugees is that the Israeli refugees are building strength and it costs more to do that, yes even in military terms. Almost the first thing that is done with a young refugee in Israel is that he goes into the army. When I was in Israel I spent a day with the army, and that is exactly what I saw.

Israeli is the one fighting, dependable force in that whole area of the world in terms of the struggle we are fighting. If you need any proof as to the orientation of Israel toward the United States, I point out to you that it is my information that about 160 of Israel's Army, Navy, and Air Force officers have already studied in our military schools. Now, do you think our military people would let them do that if they had any doubt as to where Israel would stand in the event of a show down? This is a strong reason why we should vote for the authorization as it is contained in the bill.

Furthermore, this is not a program that developed in the committee as it did last year. This is the program of the Department of State. They have gone through this thing with a fine-tooth comb. People have said they were at one time unfriendly to Israel. So much the more important when we come to the program this year, which they have brought in, which they have supported, and which they are enthusiastic about, and with reference to which they say Israel has done a fine job with the last appropriation given.

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

Mr. JAVITS. I yield.

Mr. JUDD. Does not the gentleman agree that the worst thing that could happen in this area, second only to aggression by the Soviet Union, would be for these two groups to be further set against each other with greater friction and bitterness? That is the thing that would make impossible any solution; would it not?

Mr. JAVITS. I do not think we can dedicate ourselves more effectively to

achieving peace in that area than by helping these two groups of refugees.

Mr. JUDD. That is why I want the two groups to be drawn together as rapidly as possible so that they will not be working against each other but standing together against the common enemy of both and of our own country—the efforts of the Soviet Union to destroy and enslave them and us.

Mr. SEELY-BROWN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JAVITS. I yield.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. SEELY-BROWN. I congratulate the gentleman from New York for his statement. Certainly the situation in the Middle East is particularly critical. Our efforts to bring some order out of the chaos there have been remarkably successful. I do not want to jeopardize the progress that is being made in this area. Therefore, I shall oppose the amendment offered by the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. SIEMINSKI. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks at this point in the Record.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. SIEMINSKI. Mr. Chairman, I am in accord with the committee on this issue and oppose both amendments because they would destroy what they would demolish effective aid to needy Israel.

I appreciate the forthrightness of the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. CHATHAM] and that of the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. JUDD]. Their stated position is greater aid to the Arab League to equalize aid now given to Israel. But, in cutting aid to Israel to help the Arab League, I think fairness is injured.

As I understand it, Israel has tried time and again, and is still trying, to make peace with the Arab States. This, in spite of the ugly rumor that when the Arab League feels strong enough, it will wipe out the State of Israel. Peace with Israel, in the fullest meaning of that word would bring, I am sure, the fullest measure of assistance to the Arab States. And I am told several intelligent and brave Arab leaders are anxious to make peace but two fears bar them.

The first fear, I am informed, arises from an outside source, the second from an inside one.

Will Transjordan or the Hashemite Kingdom be cut off from economic aid if it makes peace with Israel? I am sure the British would not be so crude. Great Britain is dedicated to peace is it not?

Even if the Hashemites hesitate, Lebanon and Egypt could extend their hands in friendship, could they not?

Iran and Syria have some sticky problems to solve, granted.

Iraq? I am advised that the Aramco Oil Co. has done a magnificent on-the-ground public-relations job.

What is the inside fear of some Arab leaders? Just this: If the ugly rumor of revenge and the future destruction of Israel subsided, people would clamor for

economic benefits and a better life which would entail losses to the wealthy.

The choice in the problem is not up to Israel, is it? Then, why hurt her by these two amendments?

The issue is this, it seems to me, the world around: In their 60 to 70 to 80 or more years on earth, men and women are striving more than ever to live in dignity and peace.

Governments and rulers, through the ages, have feared an innocent and kindly triumvirate—a man, his wife, and child, feared them because they seek opportunities in peace, which cement-headed rulers thought could be obtained for a select few only in tyranny or war.

This Mutual Security Act is no fool's paradise. It is showing the cement-heads up.

I side with the committee. Israel needs the aid. The amendments should be defeated. I look forward to greater aid for the Arab League, when a step in the above direction is taken.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, the amendment offered by the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. CHATHAM] to reduce the appropriation to Israel by one-half and also the substitution amendment submitted by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. JUDD] to reduce the appropriation by eleven million should be defeated.

The new nation of Israel is an important beachhead for the democratic and free nations in their struggle to curtail the spread of communism in the Middle East. Statements have been made on the floor to compare the appropriation of Israel with that of Arabia. I do not believe these comparisons should apply as far as these two nations are concerned in the battle against the spread of communism. Israel has already created a substantial army to defend its borders against the encroachment of outside tyranny. The foundation of this young nation has already been constructed on a firm, solid, and permanent base and every aid should be extended by this Congress to aid in its fight, both economically and militarily, in its struggle for self-government and freedom from outside aggression.

Jews in America have been generously contributing their private funds toward the aid and welfare of the Israel nation ever since its inception. The millions of Jews in America have not only been extending an outstanding and patriotic service to their blood brethren in Israel, but their sacrifice in times of crisis and war to America has been an illuminating demonstration of American patriotism.

During World War II, the Jewish representation in the armed services was far above its pro rata allotment. A large concentration of Jewish people live in metropolitan centers. Agricultural, mining, and metal industries, and so forth, which were favored by draft exemptions did not apply to metropolitan centers. Besides the relatively large

proportion of Jewish boys taken in the draft, there were approximately 35,000 Jewish volunteers. Statistics show that honors conferred on Jewish soldiers for valor in action included no less than 1,100 citations. These included the Congressional Medal of Honor, Distinguished Service Cross, Croix de Guerre, and other decorations. The records also reveal that more than 10,000 Jewish commissioned officers were in several branches of the service. The total of Jewish casualties was from 13,000 to 14,000 including 2,800 who made the supreme sacrifice. The figures tell of a sacrificial devotion and patriotism to their country which is in line with their age-long battle for freedom.

Both the Chatham and Judd amendments should be rejected.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the pending amendments be reread by the Clerk for the information of the Committee.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. JUDD as a substitute to the amendment offered by Mr. CHATHAM: On page 17, line 7, strike out the figures "\$76,000,000" and insert the figures "\$65,000,000."

Amendment offered by Mr. CHATHAM: On page 17, line 4, strike out "\$65,000,000" and insert "\$50,000,000." One page 17, line 7, strike "\$76,000,000" and insert "\$50,000,000."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the substitute amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. JUDD] and the amendment offered by the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. CHATHAM].

The substitute amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. CHATHAM].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. CHATHAM) there were—ayes 66, noes 103.

So the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

Sec. 5. Title III of the Mutual Security Act of 1951 is amended as follows:

(a) At the end of section 301 add the following new sentence: "There is hereby authorized to be appropriated to the President for the fiscal year 1953 not to exceed \$611,230,000, to carry out the purposes and provisions of this section; and in addition balances of any appropriations heretofore made pursuant to this section unobligated as of June 30, 1952, or subsequently released from obligation, are hereby authorized to be continued available for obligation for their original purposes through June 30, 1953, and to be consolidated with the appropriation hereby authorized."

(b) At the end of subsection 302 (a) add the following new sentence: "There is hereby authorized to be appropriated to the President for the fiscal year 1953 not to exceed \$408,000,000, to carry out the purposes and provisions of this subsection; and in addition balances of any appropriations, heretofore made pursuant to this subsection unobligated as of June 30, 1952, or subsequently released from obligation, are hereby authorized to be continued available for obligation for their original purposes through June 30, 1953, and to be consolidated with the appropriation hereby authorized."

(c) Add the following sentence to subsection 302 (b): "Unexpended balances of allocations heretofore made to the Secretary of State pursuant to that proviso shall be continued available until expended."

(d) In the first sentence of subsection 303 (a) after the words "to be appropriated to the President" insert the words "for the fiscal year 1953."

(e) In the second sentence of subsection 303 (a) substitute for the words "1952" the words "1953".

(f) Immediately before the last sentence of subsection 303 (a) add the following: "In addition, the United States Department of the Army is hereby authorized to make available to the United Nations Korean Reconstruction Agency, at the time when that Agency assumes full responsibility for relief and rehabilitation in Korea, goods and services of a value not to exceed \$67,500,000 which the Department of the Army then has on hand or on order for civilian relief in Korea and which the President determines should be contributed by the United States to the United Nations Korean Reconstruction Agency for use in its relief and rehabilitation operations in Korea. The value of goods and services made available pursuant to the preceding sentence shall be credited toward the contribution to be made by the United States to the United Nations Korean Reconstruction Agency."

(g) The last sentence of subsection 303 (b) is hereby repealed.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. VORYS:

On page 18, line 7, strike out "\$408,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$208,800,000."

On page 18, line 8, after the word "subsection", insert "In accordance with the provisions of section 503 of this act and not to exceed \$88,000,000 to carry out the purposes of the provisions of this subsection in accordance with the applicable provisions of the act for international development."

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, this amendment does two things: It divides Mutual Security from point 4 in title III, just as we have divided point 4 so you can identify it in title II which has just been passed. Thus, you have a chance to consider Mutual Security and defense support as a separate item from the point 4 authorizations in title III.

The committee provided that Burma and Indonesia would no longer come under Mutual Security, because there were no military activities going on there. You see MSA, or Mutual Security, carries on technical assistance; and point 4 carries on economic aid, and they are pretty badly mixed up. This sorts them out a little bit and proposes that for Formosa, Indochina, Thailand, and the Philippines where military assistance is going and, of course, in Indochina there is fighting going on, that the defense support for those countries be cut 10 percent, cut from \$232,000,000 down to \$208,800,000. That would leave \$176,000,000 for point 4 under title III for India, Burma, Indochina, Pakistan, and some other countries; and the amendment proposes to just cut in two the point 4 money for title III.

These amounts are the ones that seem to me to be the wise amounts. It may be the committee will modify them. But we make a 10-percent cut in the defense-support money and we make a 50-percent cut in the point 4 money. That is what the amendment proposes. We have had considerable discussion earlier in

the bill about point 4. The Smith amendment covered the waterfront, the whole world, in that respect. This amendment applies only to title III.

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

Mr. VORYS. I yield to the gentleman from Connecticut.

Mr. RIBICOFF. Will the gentleman please tell us actually in dollars how much is cut out over all by virtue of these changes?

Mr. VORYS. The cut would amount to \$111,200,000; but that would be a 10-percent cut on defense support and a 50-percent cut on point 4. By doing it this way, identifying the authorizations for point 4 separate from authorizations for mutual assistance, there will be no danger that those who administer the act will slip defense-support money over under point 4. I think the Congress has a duty to authorize separately for point 4. This type of amendment gives the House the opportunity to do that.

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

Mr. VORYS. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, I ask for this time only to make a suggestion. We have been debating and considering this matter all week. I know it is hoped that we can conclude consideration at a reasonable hour this evening. May I make the suggestion that possibly on some of these amendments debate might be limited to 5 minutes for and 5 minutes against. We want to make as much progress as possible, having due regard to the desirability of adequate consideration.

Mr. VORYS. I join in that request, Mr. Chairman, and may I call the attention of the Committee to the fact that although I have made a number of speeches I have not asked for any extension of time.

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

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

Mr. RICHARDS. We on this side want to cooperate and get through with this matter. However, we have been speaking on a lot of amendments that in no way dealt with an amount of money involved. Now we come along with another meat-ax cut and they talk about limiting debate to 10 or 15 minutes. I want to be reasonable but we have several speeches on this side of the House in opposition to the proposition made by the gentleman from Ohio.

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

Mr. RICHARDS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 30 minutes and that I may have 5 minutes at the end of the debate.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Chairman, a number of years ago when this program for economic aid to Europe was started, I was inclined to follow along with the program. At that time Europe was still feeling the severe shock resulting from the greatest war in history. Its people were crushed, without morale, and impoverished. I had occasion to see much of the distress in Europe during and immediately following the Second World War and I was greatly disturbed over the terrible sights of destruction which greeted the eye of even the most casual passer-by. During the interim, this country has done a great deal to help the distressed people of Europe—has encouraged leadership and given financial aid to these people. In my judgment, they themselves have gone to work and have accomplished a great deal. It is certain that some of these people have done an outstanding job of bringing back their own economy, rebuilding their own government, and rebuilding their own country out of the ravage of war. They are to be commended for the part they have done for themselves.

My observations of Europe lead me to the conclusion that economically, Europe is rapidly returning to a normal condition. In fact, in my judgment, many countries of Europe are already in a normal condition financially, the people are aggressive and vigorous, industry is noted for its full smokestacks, throbbing machines, and commerce has again returned to a high level of activity. In these countries, it is my judgment, that no more economic help is needed and the time for cutting down has arrived.

Last year, Mr. Chairman, I voted for many cuts in this bill and I worked to reduce the total over-all amount of the bill. Since then, conditions in Europe have improved further and we no longer need to support further economic aid to Europe unless conditions change very much in the future. At the present time, there are amendments to reduce the provision on page 15 of the bill from \$1,637,300,000 to \$1,337,800,000; another amendment to reduce the amount to \$1,000,000,000 even; and a third amendment to reduce this amount to \$637,300,000. In addition to this, the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS] has offered an amendment to cut this provision entirely out of the bill. I favor the last-named proposal, as it will once and for all close this bill of economic assistance and will provide some degree of consideration for our own people.

Many projects throughout the country need financial help from the United States Government. At the same time, the people are heavily burdened by taxes, and I think we must consider our own people in these matters. We must vote to reduce spending. We should reduce the amount authorized in this bill and when the provision for appropriating the money comes up we should see that our people get some relief from the heavy burden of expenditures which rests upon them. If the foreign situa-

tion should change in the future, of course, Congress will be in session and we can always appropriate money. Once the money is appropriated, however, it is gone forever from our economy and the burden of taxation rests even more heavily upon people who already most generously have borne the brunt of war expenses.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I rise to support the amendment of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. VORYS] to reduce the figures \$408,000,000, to \$208,000,000.

This so-called point 4 program started out to be a program of technical assistance to the underprivileged areas and peoples of the world. It has long ago grown into a world-wide WPA program. In its first year, according to my information, it had an appropriation for only \$35,000,000. The general public believe now that this is a program simply to extend technical aid to underprivileged peoples. As a matter of fact, the technical aid which this bill is intended to provide is insignificant when compared with the supplies and equipment which are intended to be provided.

The effort to provide these supplies and equipment under this so-called technical-aid program is merely an underhanded and back-door method of continuing the Marshall plan and the ECA program, although the sponsors of both of them assured the Congress and the American people that the Marshall plan program and the ECA program would end June 30, 1952.

To illustrate what I mean, it is proposed in this bill to give to India \$115,000,000. Of that amount, \$6,779,000 would pay the salaries and expenses of 467 technicians, and \$1,705,000 the cost of training 341 trainees. The total of the two items would be approximately \$8,500,000. One hundred six million five hundred and sixteen thousand dollars of the amount allotted for India is intended to be spent for supplies and equipment. The opposition to the amendment now under consideration have stated, in their arguments against the amendment to cut this point 4 money, that we must continue to give food and the necessities of life to the Indian people.

I voted against giving the \$190,000,000 worth of grain to India last year. The information we now have about that grain is that the granaries in India are bursting with grain we have furnished them because of the poor methods of distribution provided by the Government of India. Another bad feature about that grain legislation is that the hungry people, the poor and destitute people, do not benefit from the program. The grain goes to the Government of India, which in turn sells it to the individuals. Thus, the person who needs charity, and who would appreciate our charity, if anyone in fact appreciated it, which I doubt, is the person who does not get the benefit of the grain.

Under this so-called technical-assistance program, or point 4 program, we are doing such things as, and I cite these instances from the contract entered into between our Government and the Government of the Hashemite Kingdom of the Jordan, which is printed on pages 26 and the following of the first report to Congress on the Mutual Security Program:

Appropriations to Water Resources Department.

Appropriations to Department of Agriculture.

Appropriations to Department of Health.

Appropriations to Department of Education.

Appropriations for mineral development.

Appropriations for transportation.

Appropriations for census organization.

Appropriations for industrial development.

Of the sum of \$2,780,000 appropriated under a contract between our Government and the Government of the Hashemite Kingdom of the Jordan, made on February 27, 1951, and amended in January 1952, only \$100,000 was allotted for the training of specialists, technicians, and other technical aid, while \$2,680,000 was allotted to other purposes, which, in plain language, amount to nothing more nor less than a world-wide WPA.

Similar contracts have been entered into between our Government and 32 governments of the world.

Our taxpayers cannot stand this program. We cannot carry all the world on our backs. This program should not only be cut in half—about nine-tenths of it should be cut out.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD].

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Ohio is having a field day cutting figures off here and there. It should be brought to the attention of the Committee that up to now all cuts have been in the European area.

As I understand the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. VORYS] he wants to cut the sum of \$408,000,000 in title III down to something like \$208,000,000, roughly a cut of 50 percent. He states in his remarks that 10 percent of the cut will apply to defense funds for the Far East and 50 percent of the cut will apply to the point 4 program.

Mr. Chairman, I wish to state that the point 4 program is the only long-range program authorized in this legislation. It is one way of reaching the lesser developed areas of the world, teaching those countries, not American democracy, but how to better their standard of living so that they can live 35 to 40 years instead of the normal 27 years, teaching them to till their soil through better methods so that they can eat two meals a day instead of one, help them to get a better and a more rainproof roof over their heads, and help them to raise their own standards in their own way.

I think it is perhaps the most important long-range program which we have ever had, and if you want to find

its genesis you have to go far beyond what the gentleman from Minnesota, Dr. Judd, has mentioned about the joint reconstruction program in China, which has been a success, and go to the joint Inter-American program which has been in effect 15 years, and which has been the cornerstone of American foreign policy.

Then, this matter of a 10 percent cut in defense funds brings into sharp focus places like Formosa, in which we are all interested; and Indochina, which is of paramount interest at this particular time. I wonder how many Members of this House know that the French have been spending more money each year in Indochina for the past 5 years than they have received each year under the Marshall plan or the Mutual Security program and have suffered tremendous casualties there. I wonder if this House realizes that the French are in that area protecting a vital flank in our common fight against Communist aggression. Think what would happen to southeast Asia if Indochina were to fall or, for that matter, what would happen to all of Asia including Japan, the Philippines and Korea.

It should be stated for the RECORD that France is spending this year, in Indochina, more than one-third of its entire defense budget. This amounts to approximately \$1,400,000,000. In addition, France has in excess of 200,000 soldiers in Indochina, comprising its entire regular army, most of its regular noncommissioned officers, and practically all of its younger commissioned officers. If it were not for Indochina, France today could place between 10 and 15 more divisions in Western Europe.

These are things to think about because we are engaged in a world-wide struggle for survival and we should remember that what happens in this part of the world affects the rest of the globe. I hope this amendment is defeated.

(Mr. MILLER of Nebraska asked and was given permission to yield the time allotted him to Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin.)

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KERSTEN].

REPUBLICAN LEADERS URGE POSITIVE FOREIGN POLICY OF LIBERATION TO REPLACE OUTWORN CONTAINMENT

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, the several billions authorized by this bill and the fifty-odd billions appropriated this year for the United States military will be a tragic pyramid of waste if it is used to implement the bankrupt foreign policy of mere containment of communism developed by the Department of State.

Republican leadership should forge the new and affirmative foreign policy of liberation. Such a new policy of liberation is based on the Declaration of Independence. It gives meaning to the dollars spent in the fight against communism. The object of such a policy is victory over communism and not the empty stalemate of a half-free, half-slave world.

"CONTAINERS" ENVISAGE 20-YEAR PROGRAM

The Secretary of State and other advocates of the "containment" policy tell

us that it is a long-range policy and that we should be prepared to continue it for 10, 20, or 30 years, with the hope that, maybe, the tyrants of the Kremlin would, after that time, become reasonable and civilized.

I quote from a speech of the Secretary of State entitled "The Peace the World Wants," made before the United Nations in September of 1950.

He stated:

We need this defensive strength against further aggression in order to pass through this time of tension without catastrophe and to reach a period when genuine negotiation may take its place as the normal means of settling disputes.

This perspective is reflected in the proposals of the Secretary-General for a 20-year program a perspective from which we can derive the steadiness and patience required of us.

This perspective takes into account the possibility that the Soviet Government may not be inherently and unalterably committed to standing in the way of peace and that it may some day accept a live-and-let-live philosophy.

The Soviet leaders are realists, in some respects at least. As we succeed in building the necessary economic and defensive military strength, it will become clear to them that the non-Soviet world will neither collapse nor be dismembered piecemeal. Some modification in their aggressive policies may follow if they then recognize that the best interests of the Soviet Union require a co-operative relationship with the outside world.

CAN WE PAY FOR 20 YEARS OF CONTAINMENT?

Mr. Chairman, let us apply this thinking of the Secretary to the actual economy of the United States—to our actual ability to pay for this kind of a program over a period of 20 years.

Such a 20-year program would not cost us less than \$60,000,000,000 a year for the full 20 years. The cost of such a program would probably increase during this period because weapons do not remain the same. We could not rely on the weapons of 1952 to defend us, under the Secretary's program, in the year 1962. The scientists who develop military weapons on the land, in the sea, and in the air, have a way of increasing costs by the square. One very good example of such increase in costs is the comparative price we now pay for jet planes as compared with the planes of World War II.

CONTAINMENT WILL COST EACH AMERICAN FAMILY \$32,000

But let us be very conservative and say it would cost us only \$60,000,000,000 each year of these 20 years. What does that mean? It would mean that the minimum conservative total cost of such a program would be \$1,200,000,000,000. What does that mean? It means that every family of four in the United States would pay \$32,000 during this period to uphold the Secretary's Maginot wall of containment. Such a defensive policy that turns the whole world into an armed camp for a period of 20 years or more would almost guarantee the all-out third world war that everyone wants to avoid.

Unless the billions we are authorizing today are used for an affirmative constructive foreign policy, the greater part of the natural resources of the United States will be consumed for nothing.

This purely defensive type policy promises for the American people either bankruptcy or war, or both.

LIBERATION AND SELF-DETERMINATION A POSITIVE ALTERNATIVE TO NEGATIVE CONTAINMENT

But what are the alternatives? The defenders of this bankrupt program say there are none. But the Republican Members of Congress have already shown that there is an alternative. Recently, my colleague, Congressman ALBERT P. MORANO, the gentleman from Connecticut, took a poll of the Republican Members of the House. One of the two questions submitted by Congressman MORANO to his Republican colleagues was: "Do you support the inclusion of the principles of national liberation and self-determination for all the Communist-enslaved peoples as planks in our party platform of 1952?"

REPUBLICAN CONGRESSMEN SUPPORT LIBERATION 82 TO 7

On this question 82 Republican Congressmen declared themselves in favor of such a plank in the party platform and 7 declared themselves not in favor of such a platform. These principles of liberation and self-determination are a positive and effective alternative to the administration policy of perpetual defense. If we embark on this positive policy of rendering assistance to the peoples now enslaved by communism to enable them to eventually free themselves from the Communist tyranny, we can end this threat to our civilization at its very source.

The gentleman from Connecticut also asked his Republican colleagues how they regarded the resolutions—House Concurrent Resolutions 89, 94, 119, 120, 121, 123, 138, 139, and 168—which I introduced last year. Eighty-four Republican Congressmen declared their support of the resolutions, and five declared that they did not support the resolutions.

These resolutions reaffirm the historic friendship of the American people with the oppressed peoples in the Communist-dominated countries. These resolutions express the conviction of the American people that these suppressed peoples have the right of liberation and unqualified self-determination, and to the exercise of their basic inalienable rights and freedoms. Each of these resolutions refers to a different nation now enslaved by communism, namely, the Russian and non-Russian peoples of the Soviet Union, Poles, Czechs and Slovaks, Hungarians, Bulgarians, Rumanians, Albanians, and Chinese. They call upon the President to formulate a new and stronger foreign policy which would exclude all further agreements, commitments and recognition of the Communist regimes, and to explore methods whereby the American people may offer aid and moral support to active fighters now struggling for the liberation of their native lands.

The resolutions also call upon the President of the United States to direct our representatives in the United Nations to charge the Soviet Communist regime with aggression in the various satellite countries which it has overrun and to demand the withdrawal of the Soviet Communists from these countries and the establishment of free elections

under the supervision of the United Nations. Our U. N. representatives are further requested to urge the United Nations to assist the various peoples within the Soviet sphere to obtain liberation from their present enslavement.

BASE OUR POLICY ON DECLARATION OF INDEPENDENCE

If we continue a policy of fear, appeasement, and containment, we shall have the all-out war that everyone wants to avoid, and possibly lose our freedom.

If we base our policy on the principles of the Declaration of Independence given us by our forefathers, if we have the courage to rely on the magic power of human freedom under God, if we adopt a foreign policy of liberation, we will be true to the America our fathers loved, and more important, we can transmit that America to our children.

MUTUAL SECURITY AMENDMENT CAN BE USED TO IMPLEMENT POLICY OF LIBERATION

Such a foreign policy can be embarked upon under the provisions of the amendment to the Mutual Security Act of 1951 which I sponsored last year. This amendment provides \$100,000,000 to be used for persons who are residing in or escapees from the Soviet Union and the other Communist dominated countries. This amendment has as its purpose:

First. To assist those people who escape from the Communist tyranny, primarily by forming those who are willing into national army elements which can fight along with the NATO forces; and

Second. To afford practical assistance to people behind the iron curtain who are working to eventually gain their freedom from the Communist regimes.

I am pleased to see that the bill to extend the Mutual Security Act of 1951, H. R. 7005, now being considered provides for the continuation of the program authorized in my amendment to the 1951 act by reappropriating any unexpended balances. I believe that the wording of the bill as it was presented to this committee in H. R. 7005 takes care of the continuation of the program contained in my amendment for the next fiscal year.

PRESIDENT ALLOCATED \$4,300,000 FOR ESCAPEES

The importance of this amendment to section 101 (a) (1) of the Mutual Security Act, with respect to one area of activity contemplated by the amendment, was expressed in a letter from Mr. Averell Harriman to President Truman on March 20, 1952. In this letter Mr. Harriman asked the President to approve the allocation of \$4,300,000 of the fund in order to improve the reception and treatment and secure the resettlement of qualified people who escape from the iron curtain countries. Said Harriman:

It is the unanimous opinion of the departments concerned that this program is of immediate and utmost importance. I concur in this opinion and recommend that you determine the assistance planned will contribute to the defense of the North Atlantic area and to the security of the United States.

Mr. Truman thereupon acted in accordance with Mr. Harriman's request and did determine that such assistance was in the interest of the defense of the North Atlantic area and to the security

of the United States and allocated the \$4,300,000 requested.

NONE OF \$100,000,000 HAS BEEN SPENT FOR MAIN PURPOSE

This action of the Mutual Security Director and the President in implementing a phase of activity contemplated under my amendment is a start. But there are apparently some roadblocks in the administration which have prevented any substantial part of the program contemplated under my amendment from getting under way for Secretary Acheson testified on March 29, 1952, before the House Foreign Affairs Committee that not a single dollar of this \$100,000,000 had been spent to that date.

Perhaps the State Department has failed to use these funds because it still clings to its outmoded Maginot-line containment policy and regards this program as incompatible with its vested interest in this containment policy.

Or perhaps the State Department just does not know what to do with these funds and lacks the imagination to devise practical methods of implementation.

IMAGINATIVE LEADERSHIP IN NEW AGENCY NEEDED

But in either case it is obvious that the program to be undertaken is of a very flexible character. In no case should it be permitted to remain static. Dynamic, imaginative leadership must be the keynote to the success of this program. Therefore, I recommend that this highly important task be placed in the hands of a special commission or agency of the Government which can be held accountable to Congress for the dynamic, imaginative type of leadership the situation demands.

The following are the reasons in support of this recommendation:

First. The Hoover Report on Foreign Affairs—page 32—states:

Recommendation No. 7: The State Department as a general rule should not be given responsibility for the operation of specific programs, whether overseas or at home.

In discussing this recommendation, the report further states that the State Department should not undertake operational programs unless unusual circumstances exist. In this connection it also stated that the circumstances in the occupied areas did not appear to be sufficiently unusual to call for an assumption of occupied areas' responsibility by the Department.

Second. The traditional functions and responsibilities of the State Department are of representation, reporting, and negotiation. A long tradition has been built up along these lines which of necessity carries with it a set frame of mind, and an approach which is not suited to the expeditious handling of operational problems outside the area of representation and negotiation.

Third. A special commission or agency of Government which is held directly accountable to the President and to Congress is more likely to bring new and vigorous thinking to play in turning the problems of escapees from communism into real live assets for the free world. Such a commission or agency

should be required to report to the Congress at least semiannually on the progress being made, any unusual handicaps being encountered, and pointing up new opportunities that are ours in the all-out cold war.

MINIMUM OBJECTIVES OF MSA AMENDMENT

The minimum basic actions which should be carried out in order to properly implement this section of the Mutual Security Act are:

First. The establishment of adequate reception facilities for escapees from communism.

Second. The establishment of machinery which will guarantee that the individual assets of each escapee will be recognized and taken advantage of.

Third. In the classification methods particular attention should be paid to the following:

(a) Individuals who are physically fit and otherwise suited for military service. These individuals must be given the opportunity to be formed into military elements of NATO.

(b) Individuals who demonstrate practical qualities of leadership should be trained for special tasks in the interest of the free world. The special tasks for which they would be trained would be a short range and long range character. This determination should be made by the appropriate agencies of government charged with the various aspects of conduct in the cold war.

(c) Individuals who possess technical scientific or other special knowledge useful to the free world should be placed in a position where this information can be put to our best advantage.

(d) Individuals who are not suited for military service or who do not possess special talents or knowledge should be prepared for migration to one of the countries of the free world prepared to offer them resettlement opportunities.

Fourth. Plans should be laid for rendering practical assistance to persons behind the iron curtain that looks toward their freedom.

Mr. Chairman, I believe that the program I have outlined provides a positive means whereby we can break through the stalemate which promises to continue in the world indefinitely. I believe that any foreign policy which seeks to guarantee our security behind a Maginot Line of mere containment is doomed to lose for us that very security it purports to preserve.

JOHN FOSTER DULLES FAVORS NEW POLICY OF LIBERATION

I would like to refer to an excerpt from an article in Life magazine of May 19, 1952, by John Foster Dulles on a new foreign policy. I believe that Mr. Dulles' position recently stated is to a large extent the same as I have outlined above. Mr. Dulles states, in part, as follows:

Consider the situation of the twenty-odd non-Western nations which are next door to the Soviet world. These exposed nations feel that they have been put in the expendable class, condemned in perpetuity to be the ramparts against which the angry waves of Soviet communism will constantly hurl themselves. They are expected to live precariously, permanently barred from areas with which they normally should have trade, commerce, and cultural relations. They cannot be enthusiastic about policies which

would merely perpetuate so hazardous and uncomfortable a position. Today they live close to despair because the United States, the historic leader of the forces of freedom, seems dedicated to the negative policy of containment and stalemate.

As a matter of fact, some highly competent work is being done, at one place or another, to promote liberation. Obviously, such activities do not lend themselves to public exposition. But liberation from the yoke of Moscow will not occur for a very long time, and courage in neighboring lands will not be sustained unless the United States makes it publicly known that it wants and expects liberation to occur. The mere statement of that wish and expectation would change, in an electrifying way, the mood of the captive peoples. It would put heavy new burdens on the jailers and create new opportunities for liberation.

Here are some specific acts which we could take:

1. We could make it clear, on the highest authority of the President and the Congress, that United States policy seeks as one of its peaceful goals the eventual restoration of genuine independence in the nations of Europe and Asia now dominated by Moscow, and that we will not be a party to any deal confirming the rule of Soviet despotism over the alien peoples which it now dominates.

2. We could welcome the creation in the free world of political task forces to develop a freedom program for each of the captive nations. Each group would be made up of those who are proved patriots, who have practical resourcefulness, and who command confidence and respect at home and abroad.

3. We could stimulate the escape from behind the iron curtain of those who can help to develop these programs.

4. The activities of the Voice of America and such private committees as those for Free Europe and Free Asia could be coordinated with these freedom programs. The agencies would be far more effective if given concrete jobs to do.

5. We could coordinate our economic, commercial, and cultural relations with the freedom programs, cutting off or licensing intercourse as seemed most effective from time to time.

6. We could end diplomatic relations with present governments which are in fact only puppets of Moscow, if and when that would promote the freedom programs.

7. We could seek to bring other free nations to unite with us in proclaiming, in a great new declaration of independence, our policies toward the captive nations.

As the United States News of January 11, 1952, pointed out about this \$100,000,000 amendment to the Mutual Security Act:

Louder cries of alarm have been sounded by Russians over these dollars than over the \$150,000,000,000 to be spent on United States rearmament.

SOVIET COMPLAINTS AGAINST KERSTEN AMENDMENT

The Soviet Union and its satellites have protested violently to this amendment both to the United States Government and in the United Nations. The gist of their complaints is that passage of the Mutual Security Act with this amendment in it constituted an aggressive act and an intervention in the internal affairs of other countries.

Passage of this amendment is by no means an aggressive act against the peoples of these countries. On the contrary this amendment signals our friendship with the suppressed peoples of the Communist countries. It is a formal clasp of friendship through the barbed wire which separates the op-

pressed victims of communism from the people of the United States. Only the tyrants in the Kremlin need fear it.

AMENDMENT CONFORMS WITH DECLARATION OF INDEPENDENCE

My amendment is in complete harmony with the expression of the basic natural law contained in our own Declaration of Independence. In that document, our forefathers set forth the fundamental God-given right of all peoples to alter or abolish their government and to institute a new one whenever any form of government became destructive of the proper ends of life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.

The Declaration of Independence further stated it was not only the peoples' right but their duty "to throw over such government and to provide new guards for their future security." Clearly, then, since these unfortunate peoples have the right and duty to overthrow their masters in the Kremlin, the American people have a right in every practical way to assist them in such an undertaking.

A VINDICATION OF PRINCIPLE OF NONINTERVENTION

The principle of nonintervention in the internal affairs of other countries is an excellent time-tested principle which should govern the activities of all countries. If the excellence of the principle of nonintervention is to be properly acknowledged and adhered to, it is incumbent upon those devoted to this principle to come to its defense when it is violated and to take positive measures to oppose and end the intervention of outsiders upon the internal affairs of any nation. And it is precisely in defense of this principle, which has been so rudely violated by the Communist gangsters in the Kremlin, that the action taken by the United States in adopting this amendment was so justly warranted.

The Communist outlaws have continuously intervened in the internal affairs of the United States. But more particularly and more disastrously they have intervened in the internal affairs of Lithuania, Estonia, Latvia, Poland, Czechoslovakia, East Germany, Hungary, Bulgaria, Rumania, Albania, China, and Korea, and the Soviet Union itself. They improperly seized power in Russia and have since continued to deny all the peoples of the Soviet Union the exercise of their sovereign right to determine their own affairs. Thus, our declaration of intent to render aid to the peoples enslaved by communism is not a violation, but rather a vindication of this principle of nonintervention, and the right of these peoples to govern their own affairs without outside interference.

AMENDMENT HITS AT VITAL WEAKNESS OF COMMUNIST TYRANNY

This new program set forth in the Mutual Security Act provides a new approach to our foreign policy. If we courageously carry out our plan to help the people of the Communist countries to liberate themselves, we can secure world peace by ending the threat of war at its very source.

The anguished complaint of the Soviets about the Kersten amendment indicates that this program of liberation hits at the vital weakness of the Communist tyranny.

The extent of the Kremlin's cries about this amendment to the Mutual Security Act is quite understandable if the nature of the present world conflict is properly understood. In most of the conflicts of the past nations have been pitted against nations but each of them has had the general support of its own people. But the Communists today are trying to re-define the nature of man and make him an animal. Acting thus contrary to human nature the Soviet Communist regime has not even the support of the Russian people, much less the other peoples it has subjugated. It must maintain itself only through force and fear. Consequently today in contrast to past conflicts in world history, in which defections on either side were rare, we can expect and encourage wholesale defections from the enemy camp, if we take proper measures. It is the purpose of my amendment to provide our Government with an opportunity to take further effective measures which take into account this unusual but very important factor of potential wholesale defection which thus far has been largely ignored or abandoned. Thousands of refugees have escaped from the countries under the heel of the Kremlin and are now residing in Western Europe. Official estimates as to the number of refugees who have escaped from the Communist tyranny in the past 2 years indicate that there are a minimum of 18,000 of such people living in Western Germany, Western Austria, Greece, and Turkey. I am also informed that an absolute minimum of 1,000 a month continue to escape, despite the obstacles placed in their way by the masters of the Kremlin.

ESCAPEES STRONG ALLIES AGAINST COMMUNISM

I believe that any student of this problem will agree that those who have lived under the tyranny of Moscow not only have a strong desire to eliminate this universal threat to freemen everywhere, but have practical knowledge of the workings of communism which would enable them to make substantial contributions in the fight against it.

President Truman expressed his views of the desirability of utilizing escapees from behind the iron curtain in his message to Congress on March 24, 1952. He likewise warned of the great loss if we failed to utilize them. Wrote Mr. Truman:

The miserable conditions in which these fugitives from communism find themselves, and their present inability to emigrate to new homes and start new lives, lead inevitably to despair. Their disillusionment is being effectively exploited by Communist propaganda. These men and women are friends of freedom. They include able and courageous fighters against communism. They ask only an opportunity to play a useful role in the fight for freedom. It is the responsibility of the free world to afford them this opportunity.

Joseph Stalin at the Yalta Conference made a very significant observation with respect to all former Soviet citizens who had been deported to Germany or fled there during World War II. He referred to all these people as "seeds of Soviet disaffection" and demanded that all of them be forcibly repatriated by the Western Allies at the end of the war. Stalin

was quite correct in terming these people "seeds of Soviet disaffection." We have abundant proof of the accuracy of this statement in the thousands of displaced persons who have come to the United States under the Displaced Persons Act. They are telling the true story about communism and its every-day workings in thousands of communities throughout the United States. Their hatred of communism and all that it stands for in addition to their desire to tell everyone else their feelings has had a profound effect in bringing to light the evils of communism and the dangers it presents to freedom-loving people.

ESCAPEES NOW BEING NEGLECTED

Emigre groups from the Soviet Union and her satellites are forming organizations in every part of the free world in an effort to acquaint free people with the dangers of the Kremlin plan for world conquest. In the light of these circumstances, it is unfortunate that we, the leaders of the free world, have failed to take full advantage of the great asset the escapees from Communist tyranny present to us. We have even failed to accord them the ordinary decencies of life after their escape from behind the iron curtain. As a consequence the vast majority of them are put into jails or camps or thrown upon an economy that can neither house or feed them, nor give them any opportunity to participate in the fight for freedom. As a first step, therefore, it is necessary that these elementary facilities of reception and care be set up as border hostels in Western Germany, Western Austria, Italy, Greece, and Turkey. I strongly advocate that the necessary steps to this end be taken immediately and in such manner as will cause each of these countries to continue the work they are already doing so that our contribution will be in the nature of a supplement—but a very badly needed one—to what they are already doing.

It might be helpful to our thinking if we would take another look at this question—from the Soviet point of view. What would they do in a situation where 1,000 people a month "escaped" from the free world to the animal farm of the Soviet Union? We can be sure they would exploit such a situation 24 hours a day. They would use such a situation to convince their own suffering millions that conditions in the West were so bad that "refuge" in the East was a gift from heaven. Look what they have already done with the handful of dupes, fellow travelers, and "dummies" who have sought refuge in the East from the capitalistic warmongers of the West. I say "dummies" because it is no secret that the Kremlin has found it necessary to create characters who have escaped from the West in order to offset the lack of escapees from West to East. Yet, we are failing to take advantage of a situation which is all one-sided to our advantage.

NATIONAL MILITARY UNITS

The principal measure to be taken under my amendment and which is spelled out therein is the creation of national military units of escapees from behind the iron curtain. These military units should have their own national

flags and emblems, their own distinctive uniforms or identifying insignia. The units should be attached to NATO or the American Army for command purposes.

Free battalions of Poles, Czechs, Slovaks, Hungarians, Rumanians, Bulgarians, Albanians, Chinese, Lithuanians, Latvians, Estonians, Byelorussians, Ukrainians, and Russians would be strong magnets of defection from Stalin's satellite armies and his own Soviet forces. They would weaken the will of the Communist forces to fight the West and might well be catalytic agents in the ultimate liberation of their native lands.

CIVILIAN BORDER HOSTELS

As these young men come through the iron curtain they should receive first aid and care at civilian border hostels. From there they should be taken on a voluntary basis, to military processing centers and formed into their respective national units. As these units would grow and strengthen, the necessity for American troops in Europe would be greatly reduced. As one official in the Pentagon remarked to me, "One Pole, Czech, Hungarian, or other battalions of Eastern European nationals is worth a division of American, British, or French troops in opposing Stalin satellite armies." Such units would, according to a high American official just returned from Europe after spending 3½ years with iron-curtain refugees, disintegrate the morale of Red controlled armies.

To put a hypothetical case: If America were taken over by the Reds and our Armed Forces were under the military control of the Soviets, what effect would the setting up of real American units with American uniforms and American battle flags on the Mexican or Canadian border have? What would be the effect on the will to fight for Stalin on the part of the average young American under this control? Would our sons fight for Stalin?

POSSIBILITIES FOR DEFECTION IN SATELLITE ARMIES

The possibilities for defection exist not only among the satellite countries of Eastern Europe but within the Soviet Union itself. But let me assume for the moment that this policy of cutting away and isolating the Communist apparatus from the peoples it has victimized would only be successful in the satellite countries. In the event of war let us examine how this would substantially and radically change the picture in Eastern Europe.

Gen. Alfred M. Gruenther, recently stated that the Soviet armed forces presently consist of 175 Soviet divisions and 60 satellite divisions. The Council of the North Atlantic Treaty in Lisbon recently stated that NATO this year will have approximately 50 divisions in appropriate conditions of combat readiness.

Two hundred and thirty-five Soviet divisions against our hoped-for 50 divisions—more than 4 to 1 against us.

STALIN DISTRUSTS OWN ARMIES

But if we create these free battalions of Hungarians, Poles, Czechs, Slovaks, and the others we let these people behind the iron curtain know in a most practical way that we are willing to assist

them. Then in the event of war, the 60 satellite divisions, which Stalin is now counting on to fight on his side, may well turn their guns around and fight with us instead of against us. These victimized soldiers would come over to join the West singly or in groups, or by mass surrender as they did in the early part of World War II before the Germans mistreated them. Or they may create armed insurrections within their own territory.

Look how this would change the entire picture in Europe: Stalin would lose 60 divisions and we would gain 60 divisions. Thus Stalin would have 175 divisions against our 110. Only a 3 to 2 ratio against us instead of the present 4 to 1. And this does not take into account the excellent possibilities for defection within the 175 Soviet divisions themselves.

EXPERIENCE OF LODGE PLAN

An Associated Press report of April 13, 1952, stated that a report from Heidelberg, Germany, showed that only 220 European DP's had been accepted into the United States Army under the program sponsored by Senator HENRY CABOT LODGE. This program would give American citizenships to European volunteers after 5 years of honorable service in the United States Army. According to the press report, there were more than 5,000 applicants for enlistment in the United States Army under the Lodge plan. Seven hundred and fifty of these were disqualified because they did not fall within the age limit of 17 to 35 years. Another 1,000 did not show up for actual tests, although no information is given as to how long they were kept waiting before they were given actual tests. Still another 1,500 failed to pass the physical, mental, and aptitude tests. Perhaps the reason for this was that the tests were given in English. But even this would leave 1,750 applicants whose applications were not processed, indicating that perhaps the plan is not being properly executed.

LODGE PLAN DIFFICULTIES

Despite the excellent idea of the Lodge plan, it has certain disadvantages, I believe, in comparison to that provided for in my amendment to the Mutual Security Act. Under this amendment there is no promise of American citizenship. Hence any applicant need not be screened to the same extent as would be an immigrant to the United States. Furthermore, the promise of citizenship in the United States is contrary to the very basic psychological urge inherent in my plan. Those most likely to join national units would be those who desire to eventually go back to their own countries when conditions are more favorable, not ones who desire to come to the United States as permanent residents. Such soldiers would be doubly valuable to us in event of war since they would be valiantly fighting for the liberation of their own countries, for the rescue of their loved ones, and the return to their old homes and familiar surroundings.

Under the Lodge plan a European volunteer would be lost in a company of American soldiers, while under the Kersten plan they would be among their own countrymen, with their own friends,

with a much higher esprit de corps. While a potential recruit might be reluctant to join under the Lodge plan, he would be an enthusiastic soldier in his own national unit.

Furthermore, it is evident from enlistment figures that the United States Army is reluctant to take foreigners into American units—probably because it makes their training program more difficult. It disturbs the Army routine. For this reason it would appear that the American Army has not promoted the Lodge plan very enthusiastically. I do not, therefore, believe that the number of persons accepted into the American Army under the Lodge plan is any way a criterion of what could be done under the Mutual Security Act, if properly executed.

None of us can predict the future. But in view of today's precarious world situation it is highly important that we move ahead rapidly in creating these military units of escapees. Unfortunately, however, I do not believe that the Government has moved ahead as rapidly as it could have and should have, despite the enthusiasm of many of the members of the Armed Forces.

GOVERNMENT MOVING TOO SLOW IN FORMING MILITARY UNITS

If war should perchance break out before we have created these units, we would lack this potentially tremendous magnet of defection which could undermine the will to fight of the Soviet and satellite troops.

Some of the escapees may be more useful in the cold war in technical or scientific or other special activities than in the military units. Provision should be made to best utilize such escapees, always, of course, on a voluntary basis, however.

Those escapees not suitable for military service or not possessing special skills should be prepared for migration and resettlement in one of the countries of the free world, under the program now being worked out by the various countries.

With regard to aid to persons behind the iron curtain, I wish only to state here that no action is contemplated or intended under my amendment, nor should it be embarked upon, which would set off any premature, abortive revolts or unnecessarily endanger the lives of fearless patriots.

We should, however, proceed without delay in taking the leadership in devising concrete, practical plans aimed to assist in bringing about the eventual peaceful liberation of all the enslaved peoples.

If the people behind the iron curtain can be assured that plans are being made and are being carried into execution to help liberate them, they are more apt to patiently await the propitious moment for freedom than if nothing is done. But if they feel that they have been abandoned they may revolt prematurely in desperation, rather than in hope.

AIM TO AID PERSONS BEHIND IRON CURTAIN SHOULD BE OPENLY PROCLAIMED

Also, this phase of the program—to aid persons behind the iron curtain—should not be concealed or disguised, but openly

proclaimed to the world. We must restore hope to those hopeless people and this cannot be done secretly. We cannot assure the people behind the iron curtain of the sincerity of any purpose to help them unless they know that we believe in the basic freedoms for everybody and that it is the announced, open and continuing policy of the United States to help them.

MAGINOT LINE THINKING BASED ON UNSUPPORTED HOPES

Some of our Government officials speak in terms of a 20-year defense program behind our Maginot line, and counsel us to have steadiness and patience. They say that the Soviet revolution may change; that these revolutionists will modify their aggressive policies, and may some day accept a live and let live philosophy. But they have advanced no factual data which would support this rosy outlook.

The evidence rather points to just the opposite conclusion. A live and let Communists live policy would only strengthen the Communists' strangle hold on the people and make less likely any modification of their aggressive policies. These Government officials would stake a 20-year foreign policy and the fate of our country on this unsupported, wishful hope.

CONTAINMENT AIMS AT STALEMATE, NOT VICTORY

And even if their program is 100 percent successful in its own terms it would still leave one-half the world in darkness and misery. It would be well to recall the words of Queen Juliana of the Netherlands in her address to Congress on April 3:

Mankind should be one kind. A split humanity is like a split personality; it is inclined to go from bad to worse, unless it recovers its unity of purpose, comes to coordinated thinking, and gains sanity and happiness.

The same part of the mind of humanity must always remember it's responsible for the other part. The sound half is the one which is designated to save the other half.

Under my amendment to the Mutual Security Act it is now possible for our Government to launch a program which will lead the sound half of the world to saving the other half, and thus heal our split humanity.

AN END TO STALEMATE POSSIBLE

Such a program offers our own American people a foreseeable end to the continuous drafting of our people for military service, and for the dissipation of our blood and resources in stalemate Koreas around the world.

It provides something better for our American people than 20 more years of confiscatory taxes, 20 more years of harassing bureaucratic restrictions, and 20 more years of burdensome armaments and the possible loss of our own liberties.

It provides a means of lifting this onerous burden from the backs of the American people by destroying the Communist threat of war at its very source.

WORLD WANTS PEACE OF LIBERTY AND JUSTICE

But far more important than lifting this burden from the American people is lifting the infinitely greater burden of the enslaved peoples and the restoration to them of their God-given right to free-

dom. The peace the world wants is not a negotiated peace with Stalin and his gang of criminals, but a peace of liberty and justice for all.

We will then have, not a world half slave and half free, but as Queen Juliana expressed it:

One human race, under the law and the love of God.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BURLESON].

Mr. BURLESON. Mr. Chairman, the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio embodies a very important principle. Aside from the amount of funds involved, it is an attempt to separate several different types of assistance, a thing that we should have done a long time ago. As to the funds involved: I frankly do not know the amount really needed, and I doubt if anyone else does. In this, and other parts of the bill, there is great doubt concerning the needs, but there is a principle involved here which I think is certainly worthy of the support of this House. The amendment proposes to identify the funds authorized by defining the agency administering the program and the purpose for which they are to be used.

I have been very disappointed in the last several years when we have considered this matter that we have not separated these funds in previous legislation in order to determine who is spending the money. Out in the Far East, and Southeast Asia particularly, there are several different agencies doing about the same thing, starting with the transfer of funds from the area of China. You remember that amendment in 1950, I think it was. They have been using those funds in several different places, and by whom I do not know.

Now, we have the point 4 program, we have the military, and we have some other agencies, and it is very difficult to identify where one's work begins and the other stops, except by country. I understand that these agencies do not work side by side in the same countries, but that there are different programs in one country bordering on the other. I think it is high time that we did identify them.

As to the sums, I pass that over for, as I say, I do not know. But I am supporting the gentleman's amendment because of the principle involved in the separation and the identification of the work and the funds which are to be used in that area.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS].

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, of all the catch words, slogans, and sugar-sweet titles coined by the political hucksters of the past 20 years or so, none is more nauseating and deceptive than "free world." These words are contained in the bill and throughout the report.

Who and what constitutes the free world? Socialistic Britain? Communist-riddled France and Italy? The dictatorships of Spain and Argentina? Is there individual freedom in the American tradition under kings, dictators, and governments which control every facet of life?

To document the complete idiocy of the term "free world," title 6 of the administration-negotiated pact, under which the United States arms Yugoslavia, alleges that deal to be for the benefit of the free world. What is free about Yugoslavia? It is a Communist police state, run by a Russian-trained Communist dictator, Tito, as ruthless as any dictator on the earth today. The fact that Tito purportedly fails to see eye to eye with Stalin on every issue, certainly makes him no less a Communist and no less a dictator. Yet, in administration language, in black and white, this tyrant, Tito, is part of the free world.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. HAYS].

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. Mr. Chairman, it is painful for me to have to discuss an amendment of this importance in such a brief period. Nothing more important, it seems to me, is before us in connection with this legislation than the proposal to take so much money from the point 4 program in Asia.

I want to read to the House two or three short sentences from an address delivered in this Chamber a year ago. In speaking of the people of Asia, our visitor said:

What they seek now in friendly guidance, understanding, and support, not imperious direction; the dignity of equality, not the shame of subjugation. Their prewar standard of life, pitifully low, is infinitely lower now in the devastation left in war's wake. World ideologies play little part in Asian thinking and are little understood. What the peoples strive for is the opportunity for a little more food in their stomachs, a little better clothing on their backs, a little firmer roof over their heads, and the realization of a normal nationalist urge for political freedom.

Those were the words of Gen. Douglas MacArthur.

Mr. Chairman, the point 4 program is the most practical approach to peace and stability that we could have in the Orient. I have been influenced in my thinking by the contributions to our discussions made by friends on the other side of the aisle. I am grateful to them for the light that they have shed on the problem of helping the people of Asia, because in this fashion, sending our technicians to help people to help themselves, to produce from the soil the things that they need to improve standards of living, as General MacArthur suggested, because it is the least expensive way to do that job and to strengthen our defenses in that area, I am enthusiastic for the technical assistance program.

We spend annually on the whole program around the globe only the equivalent of a few hours expense of our armament program, and here is General MacArthur, a military man, speaking eloquently not of military support but of the strengthening of defense in Asia through nonmilitary means. His words should certainly weigh heavily with the House of Representatives.

I have seen from actual observation in some of the countries what a few hundred thousand dollars will do. In Mexico, for example, in the course of a few years under technical assistance in public and private agencies the produc-

tion of corn has been doubled. For the first time in 35 years, largely as a result of a cooperative effort under the guidance of practical men they find it unnecessary in Mexico to import corn for their own population.

I cite Mexico because of its longer experience. Asia will profit by such experience. Mr. Chairman, it would be a terrible mistake for us to cut this appropriation.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York [Mr. JAVITS].

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. JAVITS to the amendment offered by Mr. VORYS: Strike out "\$208,000,000" and insert "\$232,000,000" and strike out "\$88,000,000" and insert "\$176,000,000."

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Chairman, it is just inevitable with the members of the committee making amendments that it takes members of the committee to deal with them. I feel very badly about it. I have taken more than my share of the time, but it is unavoidable because when committee members move the amendments other committee members are supposed to know something about them.

What my amendment seeks to do with the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. VORYS] is to use his formula, which I think is sound but to reject the deep cut in amounts, to separate out the technical assistance from the defense support part, but to restore the original figures, which aggregate \$408,000,000.

The difficulty with the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. VORYS] is this: It goes right to the heart of the proposition, it is not just a question of trimming off fat. In other words, it takes 10 percent off defense support, and if it took another 10 percent off economic and technical aid it could not be argued that the program would die on that kind of reduction, but when it cuts the technical-assistance program, which includes commodities, by 50 percent, then it is really dismembered, for this reason, \$315,000,000 out of the total of \$408,000,000 is going where? It is going to three countries, which are the most critical in the Far East, to us, right now. It is going to Formosa, it is going to Indochina, it is going to India.

In Indochina there is actually a war against communism. Incidentally let us pay a little tribute to the French here. The French are being really bled white in terms of real blood in Indochina. They are spending a billion dollars a year in the Indochinese war. They are losing the flower of their youth—a very large percentage from among the young people who graduate from their Ecole Militaire—are being killed or wounded in Indochina every year.

Then it is going to Formosa, which is very dear to the hearts of many people in this House as the remaining possibility that ultimately freedom may come back to China.

Finally, it is going to India, where the free peoples are probably fighting for all of Asia, fighting for the devotion to the free peoples of 330,000,000 people. If

there was ever short-sighted economy, it would be to adopt this amendment of the gentleman from Ohio on the Far East.

I do not think this is the question of shaving this figure or of saying that the administration is inadequate, and that the figure ought to go down a few percent. This goes right to the heart of the program and cuts it right to its heart in these critical areas—Formosa, Indochina, and India. It is for that reason, which is a fundamental and substantive reason, that I hope very much the House will turn down the amendment of the gentleman from Ohio and adopt the amendment to it I have proposed.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. SHAFER].

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD, and to yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. JUDD).

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

There was no objection.

TUNISIA IS HOT SPOT

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Chairman, I wish to address the House today on the general subject of our relations abroad. I have long had many cross-currents surging within me, and they boiled to a speech.

This is a year of decision for our country, and I have, I think, some comforting thoughts for the Members of this great legislative body as well as for the millions of Americans they have so honorably and continually tried to serve.

The most comforting thought that I have is that American public opinion, which many times in the past has seemed to be buried and seemed to be silent under the continuous barrage of propaganda that avalanches upon it, is neither buried nor is it silent. It is an inspiring thing to report that this same public opinion—and I regard it as the core of the heart of our country—still is able to assert itself and make known, not only its desires, but its anger, when those desires are thwarted by little men in office.

We have a man in the White House who, unfortunately, is a captive President.

He is the creature of two men—one of whom uses the respected black robes of the Supreme Court to mask his role as a political sorcerer. The other is a man who looks to Britain for guidance. Just at this moment he is on the eve of his departure for Britain to receive the honorary degree from Oxford University and to be made a "bencher" at Lincoln's Inn, no relation to our Honest Abe.

Would to Heaven that, using baseball parlance, we could bench him forever. He is the greatest Secretary of State His Majesty ever could have had. His name is Dean Acheson.

And now we see this strange triumvirate—the black-robed sorcerer, the sorcerer's apprentice, and our captive President.

As a great American used to say—and I refer to the late Alfred E. Smith—"Let's look at the record."

The record is terrible. We emerged victorious from a great war. We even saved bolshevism in the form of the U. S. S. R., and in the scant intervening years since the end of that war, we have seen, in what I term "Alger Hiss-tory," the recipient of our bounty—Soviet Russia—emerge as the greatest threat we have ever encountered to everything we hold dear and dear to us in the United States of America.

I used the words "Alger Hiss-tory" because these two chief architects of our misfortune—Felix the Finagler and Acheson the Apprentice—happened to have been the chief protagonists for Alger Hiss, once a seemingly respected figure in the State Department and now a number in the penitentiary.

A captive President termed all this, many times, simply a "red herring."

But, as I said at the outset of my remarks, American public opinion still is true to the traditions of liberty and decency that have characterized it since the birth of our Nation and, thank God, it still can make itself heard.

I wish to call attention to an article in the New York Times of Saturday, May 17. It is a dispatch from Paris by one of the staff correspondents of the New York Times, and it states that we are bringing pressure to bear against the French to speed "implementation"—that horrible government word—"of the program of home rule requirements for Tunisia or face the loss of the United States support." There is a story behind a story in this situation. It is this:

Having lost to the Soviet, the people of China, some 450,000,000 of them, the Frankfurter-Acheson-Truman trio set about promptly to lose our ancient friends, the 400,000,000 persons of the Moslem world. The Tunisians, of course, are members of this second largest segment of human beings.

It is an extraordinary thing that our foreign policy—that is, if we have one—should appear to deliberately alienate what we have long possessed, namely, the respect and the admiration of these peoples. In the first place, the Moslem world always has represented a tremendous bulwark against communism. Like ourselves, Christians, their religion is monotheistic. They believe in one God. Like ourselves, they believe in the right of inheritance and of the maintenance of the dignity of the human being.

These tenets of a basic faith have been abandoned in Russia, but their abolition has not yet been made successful by the men in the Kremlin. Could they but boast of the elimination of God from man's life, and its blind adoption by the 200,000,000 persons under their immediate tyranny, they might indeed feel secure within the walls of that ancient edifice in Moscow.

But they are clever and crafty men and they have used—to their advantage—our mistakes and weaknesses, in dealing not only with the Tunisian question but the entire situation in the Middle East. They know that the peoples in those areas have long resented a decadent colonial imperialism. They know that the peoples in these areas—and largely because of the success and the development of the American Revolu-

tion, have striven for, and quite naturally demanded, liberty, independence, and the freedom to conduct their own affairs.

But what has happened in the past few months? The Frankfurter-Acheson-Truman combination has, by its actions, seemed to deliberately affront and antagonize these peoples. We have sided with Britain in her misconduct in Egypt. We have sided with Britain in her dispute with Iran, and most recently, we have sided with France in her irrational actions in Tunisia.

If we were—as is the custom in Washington—to alphabetize the Frankfurter-Acheson-Truman statecraft, we would call it the FAT agency. I can assure you that the FAT is in the fire so far as the 400,000,000 members of the Moslem world are concerned.

But the saving grace of this frightfully un-American conduct of our international affairs is found in the latest developments and again I wish to call to your attention the story in the New York Times. I shall quote a significant paragraph, as follows:

When the United States abstention from the Tunisian issue drew hostile criticism from the American public, and in Congress, the Secretary of State, Dean Acheson, let it be known that the United States would "re-examine" its position if the Tunisian troubles were not settled and the case were to be raised again before the world today.

What the writer refers to is that, for the first time in our history as a Nation we "took a run-out powder" on decency. There never was a single time before in America's great history when we failed to offer sanctuary, assistance and whatever else we had, in moral backing, financial help or otherwise, to those poor wayfarers from far places of the world who, struggling for liberty in those places, and being rebuffed, finally sought assistance from us.

The black-robed sorcerer and his apprentice changed this. They changed American foreign policy, but they could not corrupt the heart and the soul of the American people. In our book, liberty is not local—it is not a precious gift to be enjoyed by us alone. It is something worth fighting for and assisting wherever it raises its voice. That is why I rejoice in the retreat of the State Department from its previous stand in the United Nations on the Tunisian question.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. JAVITS].

I agree, as I said earlier this afternoon, that these two types of programs ought to be separated. One is for technical training and economic support of the military effort in four countries, Indochina, Formosa, the Philippines, and Thailand under the MSA. The other is a combination of Marshall plan type commodity aid and technical assistance under the TCA in seven countries in Asia which want and receive no military aid.

The adoption of the earlier amendment of the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. SMITH] makes it certain that when the bill goes to conference, there must be a reexamination of the whole question of how the programs in Asia are to be di-

vided between economic aid, and training and demonstration projects. I believe it would be a mistake to adopt the amendment of my friend, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. VORYS] in this case, because he cuts out 50 percent of the aid in one field, technical cooperation, and 10 percent of the aid in the other category, defense support, in that very part of the world where we are taking a licking.

We have not made such drastic cuts in the areas where there is no war, only the possible threat of one. It seems to me that, after listening to General Ridgway yesterday, and knowing the dangerous situation that exists in Asia, this is the last place in the world where we should cut down our support. I am as much in favor as anybody else of separating these items in the bill so that we will be completely forthright in presenting this program to the Congress and to the people of our country and of other countries. But when we have rejected cuts in the Middle East where, to be sure, danger exists, but where actual war has not broken out, it seems unwise for us now to cut as much as 50 percent in the very areas where the United States for the first time in its existence is involved in a major war and not winning it, because we cannot win it now without efforts which are beyond our capacities in view of the enormous Communist buildup in the last few months of fake truce talks and in view of our other responsibilities in the total world situation. Our only hope in most of Asia is to strengthen the areas still free so that, if possible, they can hold the line and keep from being taken over by Communists. It will contribute immeasurably to our own insecurity if they are taken over, and will add immeasurably to our security if they remain free and independent, even though not associated with us in any direct military effort.

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

Mr. JUDD. I yield.

Mr. FULTON. I agree with the gentleman that it has been the Republican policy that we equally appreciate the Orient.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Chairman, I hope the substitute amendment of the gentleman from New York [Mr. JAVITS] will be adopted. Under it we will do what the gentleman from Texas urged—divide these two programs, but without reducing the amounts so drastically.

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

Mr. JUDD. I yield.

Mr. BURLESON. The gentleman is making a comparison between something in one part of the world that is economic and humanitarian with something in other parts of the world that is purely military. You cannot make that type of comparison in a rational way, which will hold water in the argument.

Mr. JUDD. Yes; but the amendment of the gentleman from Ohio cuts even that which is in support of a military effort. I think it goes too far.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RICHARDS].

Mr. RICHARDS. Mr. Chairman, this is a very, very drastic amendment. The gentleman from Ohio is asking to cut out of the bill for the purpose mentioned something around \$111,000,000. Let us take India just as an instance of what is involved. I think there are just \$115,000,000 here for India where there are 330,000,000 people. A great deal of criticism has been directed at Nehru. He says he does not believe in war as a means of settling disputes, and most of us agree that war is not a means of settling disputes. But Prime Minister Nehru, who has been criticized sometimes for being soft with communism, has just scored both the Moscow and Peiping regimes, and particularly communism in India. According to an Associated Press dispatch from New Delhi, he said that India "will never pay the price the Soviet Union and China have paid to achieve progress."

He also said:

I doubt if the leaders of the Russian people would pay the price if they had the chance to do it all over again.

Do you not believe that? I do.

The 330,000,000 people of India are disciplined in the faith of Gandhi, who believed in nonresistance. Compared with all the billions we are authorizing in this bill for defensive armaments we should not refuse to invest \$408,000,000 in this great area of the world for purposes of peace. These funds are to send scientific, medical, and agricultural missionaries there, if you please. I assert here today that if any good will has come to the people of the United States for what we have done for the people of the world in the way of military or economic aid, it has come from the kind of program we are talking about right now. In the years and years gone by the good will that has come to the people of the United States from countries abroad has come from missionaries of various faiths who have gone from us to sacrifice in those lands. All we are asking for is the opportunity to send some men and women of good will, missionaries of agriculture and engineering, and the medical profession, if you will, to cast bread upon the waters. Although it may not come back to us for many days, I have confidence and faith that if we so invest these funds as carried in the bill, the day will come that you will say it is one of the best investments the United States of America ever made.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from South Carolina has expired, all time has expired on this amendment.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. JAVITS] to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. VORYS].

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that my amendment may be read before it is voted on.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. JAVITS to the amendment offered by Mr. VORYS: Strike out

"\$208,000,000" and insert "\$232,000,000"; and strike out "\$88,000,000" and insert "\$176,000,000."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the Javits amendment.

The amendment to the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The question recurs on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. VORYS].

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Chairman, I ask for tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chair appointed as tellers, Mr. VORYS and Mr. RICHARDS.

The Committee divided; and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 122, noes 91.

So the amendment was agreed to. Mr. RICHARDS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the balance of the bill be considered as read and open to amendment at any point.

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

There was no objection.

The balance of the bill follows:

Sec. 6. Title IV of the Mutual Security Act of 1951 is amended (1) by adding at the end of the center heading "and non-self-governing territories of the Western Hemisphere," (2) by inserting after "Republics" in section 402 the words "and non-self-governing territories of the Western Hemisphere," and (3) by adding at the end of such title the following new section:

"Sec. 403. In addition to the amounts heretofore authorized and appropriated, there are hereby authorized to be appropriated to the President for the fiscal year 1953 not to exceed \$62,400,000 to carry out the purposes and provisions of section 401 and not to exceed \$22,000,000 to carry out the purposes and provisions of section 402. In addition, balances of the appropriation heretofore made pursuant to each such section unobligated as of June 30, 1952, or subsequently released from obligation, are authorized to be continued available for obligation for their original purposes through June 30, 1953, and to be consolidated with the applicable appropriation authorized by this section."

Sec. 7. Title V of the Mutual Security Act of 1951 is amended as follows:

(a) Section 522 is hereby repealed.
(b) In paragraph (3) of subsection (a) of section 501, insert before the period at the end thereof the following: "and the supervision, coordination, and evaluation of all reports prepared by agencies of the United States Government in the course of their operations under this act, in order to prevent duplication of effort and to insure a reduction of reporting requirements to the minimum essential for effective operation."

(c) In subsection (c) of section 504, (1) strike out "transferred to or employed by the Mutual Security Agency" and insert in lieu thereof "employed in the United States on programs authorized by this act" and (2) amend the second sentence of such subsection to read as follows: "Such positions shall be in addition to those authorized by law to be filled by Presidential appointment, and in addition to the number authorized by section 505 of the Classification Act of 1949, as amended."

(d) Before the period at the end of subsection (d) of section 504, add the following: "Provided further, That, 90 days after the enactment of the Mutual Security Act of 1952, the number of civilian employees who are United States citizens, receiving compensation or allowances from the administrative expense appropriations authorized

by this act, employed in the United States and overseas by or assigned to the Mutual Security Agency, or employed by or assigned to the Department of State or the Department of Defense for carrying out programs the appropriations for which are authorized by this act, and the military personnel assigned to such programs, shall be in the aggregate at least 10 percent less than the number so employed or assigned on January 1, 1952, except for such personnel of the Department of Defense engaged in the manufacturing, repair, rehabilitation, packing, handling, crating, or delivery of matériel: *Provided further*, That after the Director has determined the reduction to be effected in each agency, the determination as to which individual employees shall be retained shall be made by the head of the agency concerned."

(e) Amend subsection (c) of section 506 to read as follows:

"(c) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, beginning with July 1, 1952, the Secretary of Defense may furnish military assistance out of the materials of war whose production in the United States shall have been authorized for, and appropriated to, the Department of Defense: *Provided, however*, That nothing in this act shall authorize the furnishing of military items under this subsection in excess of \$1,000,000,000 in value. For the purposes of this subsection (1) 'value' shall be determined in accordance with section 403 (c) of the Mutual Defense Assistance Act of 1949, as amended, and (2) the term 'materials of war' means those goods, commonly known as military end items, which are required for the performance of their missions by armed forces of a nation, including weapons, military vehicles, ships of war under 1,500 tons, aircraft, military communications equipment, ammunition, maintenance parts and spares, and military hardware."

(f) Add at the end of section 506 the following new subsection:

"(d) Of the funds made available for military assistance under the amendments made by sections 3 (b), 4 (a), 5 (a), and 6 of the Mutual Security Act of 1952, not less than \$1,000,000,000 shall be expended for procurement of military end items from sources outside the United States."

(g) Section 511 is amended by adding the following new subsection:

"(c) In addition to the provisions of subsections (a) and (b) of this section, the Director, for the purpose of utilizing most effectively the resources of the United States made available by this act to stimulate and accelerate positive accomplishments toward mutual security, shall take whatever steps he may find suitable or appropriate to assure effective use by recipient countries of their resources, including fiscal and budgetary, for mutual security. In granting assistance under this act, the Director shall take into account the progress made by such countries in the use of such resources for mutual security."

(h) In section 513, amend the heading to read "Special Use of Funds", insert "(a)" after "Sec. 513.", and add at the end of such section the following new subsection:

"(b) Not more than \$100,000,000 of the funds made available under the Mutual Security Act of 1952, of which not more than \$20,000,000 may be allocated to any one country, may be supplied without regard to any conditions as to eligibility contained in this act, or any other act for which funds are authorized by this act, when the President determines that supplying such funds is in the interest of the security of the United States. The President shall notify the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate and the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives upon making any such determination."

(i) Amend section 514 to read as follows:

"STRATEGIC MATERIALS

"Sec. 514. In order to reduce the drain on United States resources and to assure the production of adequate supplies of essential raw materials for the collective defense of the free world, the Director for Mutual Security is authorized to initiate projects for, and assist in procuring and stimulating increased production of, materials in which deficiencies or potential deficiencies in supply exist among nations receiving United States assistance."

(j) Amend section 516 by inserting "(a)" after "Sec. 516." and by adding at the end of such section the following new subsection:

"(b) To accomplish the purpose of clause (1) of subsection (a) of this section, under the coordination of the Director for Mutual Security—

"(1) The Mutual Security Agency, cooperating with private business groups and governmental agencies to the fullest extent possible, shall encourage a greater participation by private capital in the guaranty program and shall develop broad criteria to facilitate such participation, including programs consistent with the purposes of the Act for International Development. The Agency shall also, in cooperation with such groups and agencies (including the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development), conduct a thorough study of the legal and other impediments, foreign and local, to private investment abroad, and the methods and means whereby those impediments can be removed or decreased and shall make recommendations thereon to the Director for Mutual Security.

"(2) The Department of State, in cooperation with other agencies of the Government concerned with private investment abroad, and taking into account the study and recommendations described in paragraph (1) of this subsection, shall accelerate a program of negotiating commercial and tax treaties, or other arrangements where more suitable or expeditious, which shall include provisions to encourage and facilitate the flow of private investment to countries participating in programs under this act.

"(3) The Technical Cooperation Administration, taking into account the study and recommendations described in paragraph (1) of this subsection, shall encourage and facilitate a greater participation by private industrial groups or agencies in private contracts awarded by the Administration, and shall, in cooperation with the Department of Commerce and the Mutual Security Agency, find and draw the attention of private enterprise to opportunities for investment and development in underdeveloped areas.

"(c) The reports required by section 518 of this act shall include detailed information on the implementation of this section."

(k) Section 519 (a) is amended by adding immediately after the phrase "may be advanced" the words "out of funds made available for assistance under the Economic Cooperation Act."

(l) Add the following new sections:

"EXEMPTION FROM CONTRACT AND ACCOUNTING LAWS

"Sec. 532. The provisions of section 119 of the Economic Cooperation Act of 1948, as amended (22 U. S. C. 1517), shall apply to the performance of functions authorized by this act.

"EMPLOYMENT OF RETIRED OFFICERS OF ARMED FORCES

"Sec. 533. Notwithstanding section 2 of the act of July 31, 1894 (5 U. S. C. 62), any retired officer of any of the services mentioned in the Career Compensation Act of 1949 may hold any office or appointment under this act, and receive compensation in ac-

cordance with the provisions of the act of June 30, 1932 (5 U. S. C. 59a).

"MOVEMENT OF MIGRANTS

"Sec. 534. In order to encourage further the movement of migrants from European countries having surplus population, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated to the President \$10,000,000 for use in making contributions for the calendar year 1953 to the Provisional Intergovernmental Committee for the Movement of Migrants From Europe established at Brussels, Belgium, on December 5, 1951: *Provided*, That no part of the funds authorized to be appropriated under this section may be used to pay the salary (or expenses) of the Director General of the said committee, if such Director General was at any time employed by the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Agency or the International Refugee Organization.

"INTERNATIONAL FINANCE CORPORATION

"Sec. 535. In order to increase the participation of private enterprise and investment in developing the resources of the areas in which assistance is authorized by this act and to mobilize local capital for such development and investment, such amount as may be required, but not to exceed \$100,000,000 of the funds made available for assistance to further military production, economic and technical assistance under the provisions of this act may be utilized for the purpose of subscribing to the capital of the International Finance Corporation, an affiliate of the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development.

"OCEAN FREIGHT CHARGES ON RELIEF PACKAGES

"Sec. 536. The authority to pay ocean freight charges on shipments of relief supplies and packages under subsection 117 (c) of the Economic Cooperation Act of 1948, as amended (22 U. S. C. 1515 (c)), shall be continued and may be exercised after June 30, 1952, by any department or agency of the Government that the President may designate: *Provided*, That not to exceed \$2,800,000 are authorized to be appropriated to the President for the fiscal year 1953 for use in paying ocean freight charges under subsection 117 (c) of the Economic Cooperation Act of 1948, as amended.

"INVESTMENT AND INFORMATIONAL MEDIA GUARANTIES

"Sec. 537. The authority to make investment and informational media guaranties under section 111 (b) (3) of the Economic Cooperation Act of 1948, as amended, shall be fully continued and may be exercised after June 30, 1952, notwithstanding any provision of this act, by any department or agency of the Government that the President may designate."

Sec. 8. The Mutual Defense Assistance Act of 1949, as amended (22 U. S. C. 1571-1604), is further amended as follows:

(a) Change the period at the end of the proviso in the first sentence of section 403 (d) to a comma and insert thereafter the words "and after June 30, 1952, by an additional \$200,000,000."

(b) Change section 408 (e) to read as follows:

"(e) (1) The President may, from time to time, in the interest of achieving standardization of military equipment and in order to provide procurement assistance without cost to the United States, transfer, or enter into contracts for the procurement for transfer of, equipment, materials, or services to: (A) nations eligible for assistance under title I, II, III, or IV of the Mutual Security Act of 1951, or (B) a nation which has joined with the United States in a collective defense and regional arrangement, or (C) any international military organization or headquarters when, in the opinion of the President, such assistance will further the pur-

poses of this act, or (D) any other nation not eligible to join a collective defense and regional arrangement referred to in clause (B) above, but whose ability to defend itself or to participate in the defense of the area of which it is a part, is important to the security of the United States: *Provided*, That, prior to the transfer of any equipment, materials, or services to a nation under this clause (D), it shall provide the United States with assurance that such equipment, materials, or services are required for and will be used solely to maintain its internal security, its legitimate self-defense, or to permit it to participate in the defense of the area of which it is a part, or in United Nations collective security arrangements and measures, and that it will not undertake any act of aggression against any other state: *Provided further*, That, in the case of any such transfer, the President shall forthwith notify the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate, the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and of the House of Representatives, and the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives.

"(2) Whenever equipment or material is transferred from the stocks of, or services are rendered by, any agency, to any nation or international organization as provided in paragraph (1) above, such nation or international organization shall first make available the fair value, as determined by the President, of such equipment, materials, or services before delivery or, when the President determines it to be in the best interests of the United States, within 60 days thereafter. The fair value for the purpose of this paragraph shall not be less for the various categories of equipment or materials than the value as defined in subsection (c) of section 403: *Provided*, That with respect to excess equipment or materials the fair value may not be determined to be less than the value specified in paragraph (1) of that subsection plus (a) 10 percent of the original gross cost of such equipment or materials; (b) the scrap value; or (c) the market value, if ascertainable, whichever is the greater. Before a contract is entered into, or rehabilitation work is undertaken, such nation shall (A) provide the United States with a dependable undertaking to pay the full amount of such contract or the cost of such rehabilitation which will assure the United States against any loss on the contract, or rehabilitation work, and (B) shall make funds available in such amounts and at such times as may be necessary to meet the payments required by the contract or the rehabilitation work in advance of the time such payments are due, in addition to the estimated amount of any damages and costs that may accrue from the cancellation of such contract or rehabilitation work: *Provided*, That the total amount of outstanding contracts under this subsection, less the amounts which have been paid the United States by such nations, shall at no time exceed \$700,000,000."

SEC. 9. (a) The second proviso in section 115 (b) (6) of the Economic Cooperation Act of 1948, as amended, is amended (1) by inserting "from" after "That" and (2) by striking out after "(Public Law 389, 80th Cong.)" the words "shall be used" and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "there shall be allocated to the use of the United States Government whatever sums are necessary to meet United States expenditures for materials required by the United States as a result of deficiencies or potential deficiencies in its own resources: *Provided further*, That any deposit balance remaining in such account shall be used."

(b) Section 115 (b) (6) of the Economic Cooperation Act of 1948, as amended, is further amended by adding at the end thereof the following: "The Administrator shall ex-

ercise the power granted to him by this paragraph to make agreements with respect to the use of funds deposited in the special accounts of 'participating countries' (as defined in sec. 103 (a) hereof) and any other countries receiving assistance under the Mutual Security Act of 1951, as amended, in such a manner that the equivalent of not less than \$100,000,000 in such funds shall be used exclusively in programs furthering the objectives of section 516 of the Mutual Security Act of 1951. The amount to be devoted from each such special account for such use shall be agreed upon by the Administrator and the country or countries concerned: *Provided further*, That whenever funds from such special account are used by a country to make loans all funds received in repayment of such loans shall be redeposited in such special account."

SEC. 10. The Act for International Development is amended as follows:

(a) Add the following proviso before the period at the end of subsection 404 (b) as amended: "*Provided further*, That for the fiscal year 1953 not to exceed \$17,000,000 is authorized to be appropriated to the President for use in making contributions under this subsection."

(b) Change subsection 413 (a) to read as follows:

"(a) The President shall appoint, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, an Administrator for Technical Cooperation, who, under the direction of the President or such other officer as he may designate pursuant to section 412 hereof to exercise the powers conferred upon him by this title, shall be responsible for planning, implementing, and managing the programs authorized in this title. He shall be compensated at a rate fixed by the President without regard to the Classification Act of 1949 but not in excess of \$16,000 per annum. The President may also appoint, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, a Deputy Administrator for Technical Cooperation who shall perform such functions as the Administrator shall designate, and shall be Acting Administrator for Technical Cooperation during the absence or disability of the Administrator or in the event of a vacancy in the office of the Administrator. The Deputy Administrator shall receive compensation at a rate fixed by the President without regard to the Classification Act of 1949 but not in excess of \$15,000 per annum."

SEC. 11. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated to the President not to exceed \$12,000,000 to enable him to make contributions to the United Nations International Children's Emergency Fund, this authority to become immediately available and to extend through December 31, 1953: *Provided*, That the contributions shall be made in such a manner as to give assurance that they will not exceed 33½ percent of contributions from all governments, including contributions made by governments for the benefit of persons located within territories under their control: *Provided further*, That none of the funds authorized shall be used in duplication of the activities of other agencies of the United Nations.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BURLESON: On page 18, line 19, strike out lines 19 to 21, inclusive.

Mr. BURLESON. Mr. Chairman, my amendment would strike out lines 19 to 21, inclusive, on page 18. You will notice that there are no funds involved insofar as it is noted in the bill, but this section extends an authorization previously made to spend \$45,000,000 for the

United Nations Korean Reconstruction Agency.

May I explain briefly that this money was authorized in a bill last year but no money appropriated therefor. There is now in the fund for the United Nations Reconstruction Agency the sum of \$40,200,000 out of \$50,000,000 previously appropriated. So they have only spent about \$10,000,000. There was \$45,000,000 in the bill last year for this purpose but not appropriated.

As far as relief work and reconstruction in Korea is concerned, there is \$67,500,000, found on page 19 of the bill, which is to be expended for these purposes by the military. I am not offering any cut in the \$67,500,000, but only that portion of the bill which extends the authorization granted last year and on which no appropriation has been made. I know the argument will be advanced here that this is needed because if the truce talks should come to a close the Congress would not have time to appropriate new money. As a matter of fact, it should be separate legislation anyway. It has no place in this bill. This is an issue which should be treated independently because there is no way of knowing what the need will be, and we have \$67,500,000 to be used by the Army, regardless of what conditions or what contingencies develop. Therefore, I think we should cut out the appropriation made last year. It would be good legislation to consider separately, and I trust that you will agree with me that this is the thing to do.

Mr. RICHARDS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 5 minutes.

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

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. RIBICOFF].

Mr. RIBICOFF. Mr. Chairman, in many ways this seemingly innocuous amendment is most damaging.

Basically what we are doing is telling the people of Korea if we adopt this amendment:

"We have had this great war; we have come there for a great principle; your country has been destroyed in the process; your cities have been laid to waste. Now we in the United States, together with the other members of the United Nations, after having agreed to establish a fund for rehabilitation have decided that we are going to walk out on it.

"Oh, I know that we are giving our Army a certain amount of money to rehabilitate, but from a civilian point of view we are no longer interested in the problems of Korea when this ends."

The strange part about it is that this does not involve any actual sum of money, but it is an authorization. You will have to have an appropriation later on. Basically, the United Nations Korean relief fund contemplates \$206,000,000, to which 26 nations of the United Nations have made a pledge, and here for

the first time you have a situation where 26 nations of the United Nations have agreed to make their substantial contributions, and we in the United States say, "No, we want to go it alone." If there was ever an act of bad faith, or if there was ever anything that would cast us in a very poor light, it would be the adoption of this amendment. I sincerely trust that the House, for its own self-respect and for the self-respect of this Nation, will not take that view after going through a period of war on Korean soil, giving aid all over the world and then refuse to go along with the United Nations, with contributions from 26 nations who all look forward to the day when the war will be over and we will rehabilitate that sorely broken and destroyed economy.

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

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

Mr. VORYS. Ought we not also in this authorization, which was not appropriated for the last time, because the time had not come—but should we not leave it in here so that if that happy day comes when it is possible to have a post-war Korean relief program, the Committee on Appropriations will have authority to do it? It is just that simple.

Mr. RIBICOFF. That is all it is, and I think the point is well taken.

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

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

Mr. RICHARDS. The gentleman from Ohio took the words out of my mouth. I want to concur in everything you said, as well as the gentleman from Ohio.

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

Mr. RIBICOFF. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. BURLESON. Is it not true that it would take any agency, whether it was the Army or the Korean Reconstruction Agency, or anyone else, quite a long time to spend more than \$100,000,000 in Korea? And that is what you are going to have; you are going to have \$67,500,000 plus \$40,200,000, and it is going to take a long time for them to spend that money, regardless of the conditions, and the Congress will be back in session then to take a look at what needs to be done.

Mr. RIBICOFF. The great difference, I will say to the gentleman, is that this contemplates an over-all fund to which 26 nations are making contributions. You would leave the situation where only the United States would make the contributions for relief. We are always talking about other nations not paying their share, and here we are in the process of destroying one fund where 26 nations say they will come in and help rehabilitate. I certainly do not follow the reasoning of the gentleman from Texas in this matter.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, this is an authorization that Congress made a year ago but the Committee on Appropriations, in view of the situation in Korea, saw fit not to appropriate.

Can we not just leave it on the books, so that if the happy day comes that we can have a postwar period in Korea, the Appropriations Committee will have authority to consider it?

Mr. RIBICOFF. This is a situation where the United States looks good and does not have to pay anything now, but could look awfully bad without giving the taxpayer any benefit at all.

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

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

Mr. FULTON. I agree with the gentleman thoroughly because it does not hurt to leave it in, but it might very severely harm our relations with the Korean people and the Orient to cut it out. It would be a great propaganda weapon.

Mr. RIBICOFF. That is true.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Connecticut has expired. All time has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. BURLESON) there were—ayes 32, noes 87.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. RICHARDS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on the bill close at 5:15 p. m., and that I may have 5 minutes at the close to recapitulate what we have done here today.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there any objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. JAVITS: Page 24, line 18, strike out "subsection" and insert "subsections."

Page 25, line 17, strike out "commercial and tax"; and after "treaties", insert "of commerce and trade"; and after "other" insert "temporary." On line 4, insert "(c)" before the beginning of the sentence, strike out "Agency" and insert "Department of Commerce"; strike out "also." On line 12, strike out "(2)" and insert "(d)." On line 22, strike out "(3)" and insert "(e)." On line 24, strike out "paragraph (1)" and insert "subsection (c)."

On page 26, line 7, strike out "(c)" and insert "(f)."

Mr. RICHARDS. Mr. Chairman, the amendment is agreeable to us.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. FULTON: On page 23, line 3, strike out the period, insert a colon and "Provided, That none of such funds shall be utilized for such procurement at prices higher than those quoted in the United States, adjusted for differences in the cost of transportation to destination and for quality."

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Chairman, this is an amendment to the \$1,000,000,000 of required off-shore procurement. The present provision of the bill means \$1,000,000,000 of the total amount of equipment to be procured in this pro-

gram must be required to be procured overseas.

My amendment says that when items are procured overseas, they must nevertheless not buy any products at higher prices than those quoted in the United States, adjusted for differences in transportation, destination, and quality. That means instead of the \$1,000,000,000 off-shore procurement being mandatory regardless of price, and without any chance for United States businesses to bid, my amendment lets the American businessmen and the American farmers compete, if their prices are lower.

This amendment will be a protection for the American taxpayer as it requires the awarding of contracts to the lowest bidder. Why should not the American businessman and the American farmer be permitted to get the business when they bid lowest? As a matter of fact, my amendment is part of an amendment which has been prepared and endorsed by the American Farm Bureau for the protection of the people from the United States who want to sell goods, products and commodities to be purchased under this program.

I believe it is wrong to take \$1,000,000,000 from the general money under this program and say that the agency and the foreign purchasers cannot buy the goods in America, and that you can only buy abroad with this amount of the appropriation. The present provision of this bill keeps our American farmer and our American businessman out of the program to the extent of \$1,000,000,000.

If the American farmer or the American businessman sells cheaper considering transportation, destination, and quality, then the American taxpayer is entitled, under this program, to say, "Under this Mutual Security Program of arms and commodity purchases for our allies, you must buy it where it is cheaper."

We, therefore, by my amendment, permit the participation by the American farmer and the American businessman in the entire procurement program, and we protect the American taxpayer by saying that every item has to be bought where it is the cheapest.

The taxpayers of this country must be protected.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. FULTON) there were—ayes 19, noes 63.

So the amendment was rejected.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. MERROW: On page 23, strike out all of lines 6 through 16 and substitute the following:

"(c) (1) The Congress of the United States finds that mutual security can be realized only to the extent that the countries who receive our aid do their utmost to help themselves and cooperate among themselves and with the United States to the fullest extent in achieving the objectives of the free world. In providing assistance under this act, the Congress of the United States affirms the desire of the United States to continue to use its leadership and

resources for the purpose of uniting the efforts of recipient countries to the end that positive accomplishments toward mutual security may be realized with a maximum of efficiency and a minimum of delay and cost.

"(2) In addition to the provisions of subsections (a) and (b) of this section, the Director, in administering this act, shall insure that, where necessary to the mutual-security effort no country shall receive any assistance hereunder unless it take decisive action to marshal its resources collectively, or individually where more suitable, with integration and unification plans in the appropriate area, and participate in programs which promote collective security in that area. The Director shall insure that, where suitable or necessary to the success of the mutual-security effort, countries take adequate steps to mobilize their industries for mutual defense and gear their fiscal, budgetary, capital, political, and military resources to the objectives of this act and take appropriate other steps toward self-help and mutual cooperation.

"(3) Assistance shall be given on a country-by-country basis to a degree and at a rate commensurate with the rate of progress made in the attainment of the objectives of this act."

Mr. MERROW. Mr. Chairman, the chairman of the subcommittee that made a study of European countries last fall, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. ZABLOCKI], and the gentlewoman from New York [Mrs. KELLY] join with me in supporting this amendment which was offered in the committee. For several years I have maintained the position that United States assistance, both economic and military, should be accompanied by reasonable conditions formulated in such manner that the requirements would be mutually advantageous to ourselves and the recipients of our aid.

Certain definite achievements are imperative in realizing the objectives of the free world. If continued progress in this direction is not insisted upon, then our aid may not be used to the fullest advantage in realizing the purposes for which it is given.

There has been considerable progress in the development of a policy requiring the recipients of our aid to adhere to certain definite principles. Last year the Foreign Affairs Committee wrote into the Mutual Security Act a section on eligibility for assistance. In the bill which we are now discussing there is a section that deals with this matter which I proposed to amend.

The purpose of the amendment which has just been offered is to strengthen this section. The proposed substitute is for the express purpose of helping both ourselves and the recipient nations to move more quickly in achieving the objectives of mutual security.

Mr. LANTAFF. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment in the nature of a substitute for the Merrow amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. LANTAFF as a substitute for the amendment offered by Mr. Merrow: On page 23, strike out lines 6 through 16, and substitute the following:

"TERMINATION OF ASSISTANCE FOR FAILURE TO MAKE FULL CONTRIBUTION

"SEC. 532. (a) (1) The Director shall determine for each fiscal year (A) the gross national product of the United States and the

proportion thereof which the United States expends for the development and maintenance of its own defensive strength and the defensive strength of the free world, and (B) the gross national product of each recipient nation and the proportion thereof which such nation expends for the development and maintenance of its own defensive strength and the defensive strength of the free world.

"(2) All nations receiving United States military, economic, or financial assistance shall be kept informed of the determinations made under this section. If the Director determines that the proportion of any recipient nation's gross national product for any fiscal year which is expended for the development and maintenance of its own defensive strength and the defensive strength of the free world is less than the proportion of the gross national product expended by the United States for such purposes for the corresponding fiscal year, he shall give such nation notice of an intent to terminate assistance authorized by this act.

"(3) The determinations required by this subsection for the first fiscal year of the United States which ends after the date of the enactment of this section shall be made not later than 30 days after such date, and the determinations for the corresponding fiscal year of each recipient nation shall be made not later than 30 days after such date or the date on which such fiscal year begins, whichever date is the later. Determinations for each succeeding fiscal year for each nation (including the United States) shall be made within 30 days after the beginning of such fiscal year.

"(4) For the purposes of this section—
 "(A) In determining the amount expended by any nation (including the United States) for the development and maintenance of its own defensive strength and the defensive strength of the free world there shall be included only (i) items (excluding items for the pay and allowances of members of the Armed Forces) corresponding to those for which appropriations were made by the Department of Defense Appropriation Act, 1952 (Public Law 179, 82d Cong.), under the heading 'Department of Defense Military Functions', (ii) expenditures for military assistance to other nations, and (iii) expenditures for atomic energy purposes.

"(B) If the fiscal year of a nation does not begin on July 1, the fiscal year of such nation which corresponds to the fiscal year of the United States shall be the 12-month period, beginning within the fiscal year of the United States, designated by the Director as appropriate for the purposes of this section.

"(d) All military, economic, and financial assistance to any nation which has been notified under subsection (a) of an intent to terminate assistance shall, upon the recommendation of the Director, be terminated forthwith unless within 60 days after the date on which such notice was given the President determines—

"(1) that adequate measures have been or are being taken by the nation concerned to assure that the proportion of its gross national product expended for the development and maintenance of its own defensive strength and the defensive strength of the free world will not be less than the proportion of the gross national product expended by the United States for such purposes, or

"(2) that (A) the contribution required by paragraph (1) would seriously jeopardize the political or economic stability of the nation, and (B) adequate measures have been or are being taken by the nation to assure that it will make, consistent with its political and economic stability, the full contribution permitted by its manpower, resources, facilities, and general economic condition to the development and maintenance

of its own defensive strength and the defensive strength of the free world.

"(e) There shall be included in each report required by section 518 of this act full and complete information with respect to the determinations and actions taken under this section during the period covered by the report."

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Florida is recognized.

Mr. LANTAFF. Mr. Chairman—
 Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LANTAFF. I yield.
 Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record.

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

There was no objection.
 Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, these remarks are made under permission granted to me to extend my remarks. The Record should clearly show that these remarks were not made on the floor of the House because time to present amendments and debate was cut off in spite of objections made on the floor. At least four persons were on their feet objecting at the time the Chairman put the unanimous request, at 4:30 p. m., that all debate close at 5:15 p. m., the last 5 minutes reserved to the chairman of the committee. The Chair gavelled the request through and then ruled that the objectors had not objected in time.

Mr. Chairman, it is impossible to present an amendment intelligently in 1 or 2 minutes. There were seven amendments at the desk when the debate was shut off. I had three amendments ready to offer, but under the circumstances I withheld them.

The amendment that the gentleman from Florida has presented as a substitute to the amendment from the gentleman from New Hampshire is an amendment that he has spent long hours working out. It is an amendment that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MEADER] and myself are quite familiar with and very much concerned about its passage. Our concern is the result of the information we gathered in Europe this last fall as members of the Bonner subcommittee.

The amendment that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MEADER] will have to present in 2 minutes time is also an amendment that he has spent long hours in working up. It too is based upon the testimony elicited at the Bonner subcommittee hearings abroad and from rather far-reaching studies made here in Washington. It is a most worthwhile amendment, in my opinion it deserved serious consideration.

Some of the other amendments that are at the desk, indeed probably all the amendments at the desk represent hard work and study by the Members of the House presenting them.

The Speaker of the House took the floor this afternoon to state that the mutual security bill before the House today is one of the most important and far-reaching pieces of legislation that will come before this body. I fully agree

with him on this particular point, although I must beg to disagree with him as to the details which go to make up the legislation. Nonetheless on this important piece of legislation the Chairman and, I must state in fairness that he was reflecting what seemed to be the wishes of the majority of the Members present, cut off debate and consideration of serious and far-reaching amendments to this legislation.

I am going to briefly state what the amendments I was going to offer constituted. Fortunately, unlike Mr. LANTAFF's or Mr. MEADER's amendments mine are amendments that can be implemented through the appropriation bill appropriating sums authorized by the bill before us. Nonetheless, the amendments I was to propose are matters that go to the philosophy of the Mutual Security Act and therefore should be considered when considering the legislation and not considered so much in the appropriation. Although I again say they would not be ruled out of order as legislation on an appropriation bill if offered.

On page 20, line 2, I would have offered an amendment to strike out the following words: "not to exceed \$62,400,000 to carry out the purposes and provisions of section 401 and". This was a cut in the bill of \$62,000,000 for military assistance to Latin America. I refer my colleagues to the committee report, page 45, where this item is discussed and again point out that the \$38,000,000 appropriated last year for this purpose has still not been obligated and at the time authorization was sought, and later appropriation, those requesting this sum did not know what they were going to do with it. Now as far as Latin America is concerned, I think it is quite obvious that there is no direct threat there from Soviet Russia. It is impossible to use scare tactics to get us to arm Latin America. The most that Latin America would be used for in a war against Russia is for antisubmarine bases such as we established in World War II. The policy of arming certain Latin American governments is certainly open to grave question. We would in effect be turning over to military dictators the further means of maintaining their dictatorship. Whether the House would agree with this line of reasoning or not I do not know. But I do know that this was a proper and important matter for the House to discuss and decide.

On page 27, line 7, I would have cut the figure \$10,000,000 to \$5,000,000 for movement of migrants. On page 59 and 60 of the committee report you will see this item discussed. For calendar year 1952 the United States contribution to the PICMME budget of \$41,350,660 was \$10,000,000. But in that year it was expected that 24,000 of the 31,000 migrants would move to the United States. Under present law there will be little or no movement of migrants to the United States during calendar year 1953. The other countries in this program with the United States are Canada, Australia, Latin America, and New Zealand. None of these countries are war casualties in any way. All of them seem to be anxious to obtain these migrants. Under the cir-

cumstances it would appear that the United States portion of the budget should be reduced and that was what my amendment intended to effect.

My third proposed amendment was on page 33, line 5, to reduce the \$17,000,000 figure to \$9,000,000, effecting a saving of \$8,000,000. The program affected is the one under the provisions of the act for international development to international organizations for technical cooperation programs. Sixteen million dollars of the seventeen million dollars was to go to the United Nations for this program. This in effect is the United Nations point 4 program. The total budget for this program is \$27,000,000 of which we furnish the \$17,000,000, or 63 percent. Now this Congress has clearly expressed itself in this very bill, and in other bills, that it feels the proper percentage of contribution for the United States to United Nations programs is 33½ percent. My amendment sought to implement this congressional policy to reduce our contribution to 33½ percent.

I am not going to draw any conclusions from the record I have heretofore set out as to how the House of Representatives in May 1952 considered and debated the Mutual Security Act. Unfortunately the procedure is not extraordinary. It is almost common. I have only one further comment to add to complete the record. The program for the House next week is a light one. For the following week it is even lighter. The House is so far ahead of the other body in its legislative program that it is quite obvious that the House will be marking time through June. In other words, it is not for lack of time or because of a crowded schedule that the representatives of the people have failed to devote the proper time and study to the serious legislative matters of the day. The reason, whatever it may be, lies elsewhere.

Mr. LANTAFF. Mr. Chairman, the amendment that has just been offered by the gentleman from New Hampshire [Mr. MERROW] is a sound amendment, and I intend to vote for it if my amendment is not agreed to. However in my opinion it does not go far enough.

In brief, the substitute amendment merely says to the recipient nations: To be entitled to our aid you must contribute to your own defense the same proportion of your gross national product as we in America are contributing to defense.

All of us will recall that in 1938 these same nations were supporting large armies through their own economy without benefit of the Marshall plan. Their economies have been strengthened by the Marshall plan, and I believe that today they are fully capable of so reorganizing their tax structures as to contribute much more to our mutual effort. If you will refer to page 18 of the committee report you will see how little these countries are contributing to their own defense. You will see that not one even approaches the portion of our gross national product being contributed by the American taxpayer.

The amendment is workable. I call your attention to what happened in the

Philippines. We told them to revise their tax structure to collect taxes from those with the ability to pay. We said unless you do so we will not furnish any more economic aid. Today they are getting in 60 percent more revenue. The same can be done in Europe to benefit the American taxpayer. I regret that the time is so limited as to prohibit further discussion of this amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. ZABLOCKI] is recognized.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Chairman, the Lantaff substitute to the Merrow amendment is about as unworkable as the amendments we were considering yesterday. It will be recalled that yesterday I brought to the attention of the committee the fact that the gentleman from New Hampshire [Mr. MERROW] was going to present an amendment that would be a workable and practical approach. The gentleman from New Hampshire has now proposed such an amendment.

I hope the committee will turn down the amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida and vote for the well-thought-out amendment offered by the gentleman from New Hampshire [Mr. MERROW].

Mr. Chairman, I think it is the temper of the House and surely it is the temper of our country that the assistance to our allies be effective. Certainly we desire that the moneys expended in assistance be wisely spent. With regard to the House action on the Mutual Security bill, I strongly feel that the extensive additional cuts made in the bill can seriously endanger the entire program. I believe it is wiser to give full assistance with certain conditions.

I was among those who originally felt that substantial reductions could be made in the President's request for mutual-security aid; however, after a sincere study of all of the evidence available I have reached the conclusion, as have a considerable number of people not only in Congress but throughout the Nation, that the cuts made by the Foreign Affairs Committee, which, as you know exceed \$1,000,000,000, were about as far as we could go in cutting this bill without crippling the mutual-security program.

Mr. Chairman, I should like to read to the membership a cablegram that the chairman of the Foreign Affairs Committee has received from Arthur Sloan, chairman of the United States Council of International Chambers of Commerce, who is now on board the steamship *Mauretania* returning from Europe. He has surveyed the situation in Europe and has summarized his observations in this telegram which reads as follows:

After conferring with business leaders in NATO countries and our own diplomatic and military representatives in Paris and London, strongly feel substantial reduction below the \$6,900,000,000 would be detrimental to mutual security and European morale. Fully sympathizing with effort of Congress holding down deficit, but believe further major cuts to this bill a fatal mistake.

Mr. Chairman, I hope that the Committee will adopt the Merrow amendment and when the Committee rises that

the membership will vote down the crippling cuts.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the substitute amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida [Mr. LANTAFF].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. LANTAFF) there were—ayes 42, noes 69.

So the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New Hampshire [Mr. MERROW].

The amendment was agreed to.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SCRIVNER: Page 22, lines 6 and 7, after the words "may furnish", insert "subject to reimbursement from funds appropriated pursuant to this act."

(By unanimous consent, the time allotted to Mr. MAHON was yielded to Mr. SCRIVNER.)

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

Mr. SCRIVNER. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Kansas has offered a very valuable contribution to this bill. His amendment restores language which was previously in the bill.

The Herter amendment provides that a billion dollars in military appropriations can be taken from the Department of Defense without reimbursement and devoted to the Mutual Security Program. The pending amendment provides for reimbursement.

I have conferred with Department of Defense officials about this and they are in favor of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. SCRIVNER]. It is most important if we are going to have a proper military fiscal policy to adopt the amendment offered by the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. SCRIVNER].

Mr. SCRIVNER. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON], chairman of the Military Subcommittee on Appropriations, has stated that all this amendment does is to make the language read just exactly as it did in last year's bill. The section as it now stands would provide that the Secretary of Defense could take a billion dollars' worth of arms, tanks, and equipment used by the United States Army, the United States Air Force, the United States Navy, the United States Marines, and transfer it to different foreign countries without any reimbursement to the Department of Defense at all, which would be equivalent to a \$1,000,000,000 cut in our military appropriations providing for our own troops. In other words that would be equivalent to a billion-dollar raid on the arms of our own troops.

The situation might arise where there might be some material that we have on hand that some of these foreign nations might have to have in a hurry. If that situation arises and the Secretary of Defense is called upon to provide some of those things in a hurry, right away, that is all right, there is no objection to that, but when such equipment is furnished all this language provides, as last year, is that there shall be reimbursed into

the defense appropriation, United States defense appropriation, an amount equivalent to pay for that material out of the appropriation herein provided.

Now, that is the only right and proper way to do it. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON] has told you that the Defense Department does not want this. They have been before our committee and told us what they needed under their tables of organization and equipment. They have told the Committee on Foreign Affairs that the request for foreign military aid has been based on the needs of the tables of equipment and organization; therefore, if we are to have orderly process, if we are to be able to maintain and keep track of the military expenditures, our domestic and foreign military programs, this is the only commonsense practical way of doing it. In other words, let the Defense Department tell us what they need for our own troops and then let them come in under another authorization and tell what they need for the foreign troops.

I trust the amendment will be adopted.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida [Mr. SIKES].

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Chairman, the language which now is on the bill is, to all intents and purposes, utterly meaningless, because there simply is not a billion dollars worth of arms and ammunition that possibly could be transferred out of the current military stocks or those which are provided for in the fiscal 1953 bill, which has been passed by the House. We have already cut those stocks to the absolute minimum, or they have been used in Korea, or the bill that passed the House was cut to the point that it would not be possible for any of this material to be transferred to other countries without ruinous effect upon our own military services. Therefore the language which has been proposed by the gentleman from Kansas, which would make this reimbursable, is certainly desirable, if the language in the bill is to remain.

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

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

Mr. RICHARDS. I would like to say to the gentleman from Florida that he is making a fair statement. This amendment was offered by Mr. HERTER in committee. I never thought, and I do not assume now, that this program will not get any benefit out of it. Therefore, I cannot conscientiously oppose the amendment offered by the gentleman.

Mr. RIBICOFF. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that 1 minute of my time be given to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. JUDD] and 1 minute of my time be given to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. VORYS].

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

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. VORYS].

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, if we ever have a billion dollars' worth of military equipment that is needed for use by troops of other countries rather

than our own for our own security, we certainly ought not to have to stand on ceremony about reimbursing the Defense Department. You talk about reimbursement. The taxpayer does not get any reimbursement. I do not see any reason why, if we get to a situation where we need equipment in our defense, we need to worry and fret about reimbursing the Pentagon. Of course, they like to have reimbursement from all kinds of funds, get all the money they can, and I do not blame them, but it seems to me that we should think first about the best use of the weapons we have for our own security and not about paying the Pentagon back.

Mr. Chairman, I am opposed to the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. SCRIVNER].

The amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BREHM].

Mr. BREHM. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed out of order, and to revise and extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD under the title "Guilty of What?"

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

There was no objection.

[Mr. BREHM addressed the Committee. His remarks appear in the Appendix of the RECORD.]

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. Gross: On page 33, strike out lines 8 through 24, and on page 34 lines 1 through 5.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, this provision of the bill would be laughable were it not so tragic.

The foreign spending woods are literally full of payrollers. We have about as much use for a \$16,000-a-year technical director and a \$15,000-a-year deputy technical director as a bull frog has for feathers.

Why is it, practically every time the administration brings in a spending bill, it sets up personnel, an office or sometimes an entire agency to do the spending?

Do not insult the American people by establishing two more, expensive and absolutely unnecessary jobs at their expense. My amendment will halt this election year payroll padding.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa.

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, this legislation provides for the expenditure of an additional \$6,900,000,000, almost all in European countries. It is an addition of \$12,000,000,000 already appropriated and unexpended. It means you will have \$18,000,000,000 to spend.

for mutual assistance in European countries between now and July 1, 1953. Do not forget that none of these funds are for Korea. Not at all. This money goes to Europe with a small share to Asiatic countries.

We are told that about \$13,500,000,000 is for military aid, and four and a half billion is for economic aid for these countries.

Before I proceed further, do you realize this \$18,000,000,000 is more than the total to be expended in the United States of America, next year outside of military expenditures. Think that over. More money being spent for those countries under mutual assistance than all of the combined civilian agencies in our own country. That includes funds for agriculture, highways, flood control, salaries, and other expenditures combined. Incidentally, it is reported by one of the members of this great committee that we are reducing military expenditures in our own country and increasing military expenditures abroad.

Mr. Chairman, I don't want to be placed in a position of being unwilling to assist other people in their need. I think we ought to cooperate and help people who show a willingness to help themselves. I agree with those who insist that what we need is a better understanding with other people of the world. If I thought for a minute the expenditure of this additional \$6,900,000,000 is really needed on top of \$12,000,000,000 on hand, in order to help prevent a world catastrophe, I would not hesitate to support it.

Let me quote right here, if I may, from an address delivered only a few days ago by a distinguished American, an authority on foreign affairs. He is a chief adviser on foreign policy for our Government appointed by the President. He is John Foster Dulles. He has already been quoted by a distinguished member of the House Committee on Foreign Affairs. Here is what he says in part. I hope you will weigh his words carefully and thoughtfully:

With nations, as with men, money is no substitute for character. Our Nation today is spending fabulous sums for security. The target this year is about \$60,000,000,000. We have given away, in one form or another, about \$40,000,000,000 since 1945. If money could buy security and happiness, we should have them. Yet we have them not. Today we are insecure, we have less good will than ever before in our history, and our people feel a sense of frustration.

Mr. Chairman, the distinguished chairman of this committee made a most important statement when he said, "We must maintain a solvent United States." I know he means every word of it. I would like to add he is one of the most earnest and sincere Members of this House.

Let me call your attention to a few facts. Our national debt is about \$255,000,000,000. That is almost twice the total indebtedness of all the countries we seek to help under this program. Here is another thing. It is estimated that, on an average, only about 50 percent of taxes levied in these countries is really collected. Evidently, the United States of America takes care of a good share of the rest of it. Incidentally, it

would help if it could be explained why the French Government should charge our Government 20-percent tax for material we use in building airfields and highways in France, all materials being paid for with money of our taxpayers. Also, why she charges \$2 and \$3 for every member of the American Armed Forces that lands in France. Where is the mutuality in that transaction? I know these are incidental, but they are relevant.

It might be well right here to remind ourselves again that this mutual assistance is in addition to the hundreds of millions our Government is spending to maintain military personnel abroad, together with housing and equipment of various kinds.

Another thing difficult for our taxpayers to understand is that so much of these funds go for expensive improvements abroad. It is claimed that the amount spent for power dams and flood control abroad is almost as much as the amount spent for flood control in our own country.

Mr. Chairman, I do not think these expenditures are as carefully checked as should be done. Why, for instance, should American taxpayers' money be used for building the biggest and most modern railway station now under construction in Rome?

It ought to be related that the economy in each and every country sought to be assisted under this legislation is in much better condition than prior to World War II. I do not mean they are in good shape. They are not. They will need more assistance. It seems to me that, taking everything into consideration, that \$12,000,000,000 now on hand is sufficient. Make sure it is expended carefully and judiciously. Then look the situation over. Do not forget our taxpayers have reached the limit. And please do not forget the deficit for this year is approximately \$14,000,000,000.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. MEADER: On page 24, strike out line 19 and all that follows down to line 9 on page 26, and insert the following:

"(b) (1) To assist in carrying out the purposes of this act, through encouraging and facilitating the development of the natural resources of foreign areas by the investment of private capital and eliminating barriers to and providing incentives for engaging in business enterprises in such areas by persons or business organizations who are nonnationals of such areas, there is hereby established a bipartisan commission to be known as the Commission on Aid to Underdeveloped Foreign Areas (hereafter referred to as the 'Commission').

"(2) (A) The Commission shall be composed of 14 members as follows:

"(i) Ten appointed by the President of the United States, four from the executive branch of the Government and six from private life;

"(ii) Two Members of the Senate appointed by the Vice President; and

"(iii) Two Members of the House of Representatives appointed by the Speaker.

"(B) Of each class of members, not more than one-half shall be from each of the two major political parties.

"(C) Any vacancy in the Commission shall not affect its powers, but shall be filed in

the same manner in which the original appointment was made.

"(3) The Commission shall elect a Chairman and a Vice Chairman from among its members.

"(4) Eight members of the Commission shall constitute a quorum.

"(5) (A) Members of Congress who are members of the Commission shall serve without compensation in addition to that received for their services as Members of Congress; but they shall be reimbursed for travel, subsistence, and other necessary expenses incurred by them in the performance of the duties vested in the Commission.

"(B) The members of the Commission who are in the executive branch of the Government shall each receive the compensation which he would receive if he were not a member of the Commission, plus such additional compensation, if any, as is necessary to make his aggregate salary \$12,500; and they shall be reimbursed for travel, subsistence, and other necessary expenses incurred by them in the performance of the duties vested in the Commission.

"(C) The members from private life shall each receive \$50 per diem when engaged in the performance of duties vested in the Commission, plus reimbursement for travel, subsistence, and other necessary expenses incurred by them in the performance of such duties.

"(6) The Commission shall have the power to appoint and fix the compensation of such personnel as it deems advisable, without regard to the provisions of the civil-service laws and the Classification Act of 1949, as amended.

"(7) The service of any person as a member of the Commission, the service of any other person with the Commission, and the employment of any person by the Commission, shall not be considered as service or employment bringing such person within the provisions of sections 281, 283, or 284 of title 18 of the United States Code, or of any other Federal law imposing restrictions, requirements, or penalties in relation to the employment of persons, the performance of services, or the payment or receipt of compensation in connection with any claim, proceeding, or matter involving the United States.

"(8) There is hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, so much as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this subsection (b).

"(9) (A) The Commission shall study and investigate the problem of aiding underdeveloped foreign areas and shall formulate and recommend to the President and the Congress specific programs for carrying out the purposes of this subsection (b).

"(B) The Commission shall report to the President and to the Congress from time to time the results of its study and investigation, together with such recommendations as it deems advisable. The Commission shall file its first report within 1 year after the date of enactment of this act, and annually thereafter.

"(10) (A) The Commission may create such committees of its members with such powers and duties as may be delegated thereto.

"(B) The Commission, or any committee thereof, may, for the purpose of carrying out the provisions of this subsection (b), hold such hearings and sit and act at such times and places, and take such testimony, as the Commission or such committee may deem advisable. Any member of the Commission may administer oaths or affirmations to witnesses appearing before the Commission or before any committee thereof.

"(C) The Commission, or any committee thereof, is authorized to secure directly from any executive department, bureau, agency, board, commission, office, independent establishment, or instrumentality, information,

suggestions, estimates, and statistics for the purpose of this act; and each such department, bureau, agency, board, commission, office, establishment, or instrumentality is authorized and directed to furnish such information, suggestions, estimates, and statistics directly to the Commission, or any committee thereof, upon request made by the chairman or vice chairman of the Commission or of the committee concerned.

"(D) The Commission, or any committee thereof, shall have power to require by subpoena or otherwise the attendance of witnesses and the production of books, papers, and documents; to administer oaths; to take testimony; to have printing and binding done; and to make such expenditures as it deems advisable within the amount appropriated therefor. Subpenas shall be issued under the signature of the chairman or vice chairman of the Commission or committee and shall be served by any person designated by them. The provisions of sections 102 to 104, inclusive, of the Revised Statutes (U. S. C., title 2, secs. 192-194), shall apply in the case of any failure of any witness to comply with any subpoena or to testify when summoned under authority of this section."

Mr. MEADER (interrupting the reading of the amendment). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the further reading of the amendment be dispensed with. It appears on page 874 of the committee hearings and page 5673 of Wednesday's CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MEADER. Mr. Chairman, the purpose of this amendment is to set up a bipartisan commission, like the Hoover Commission, charged with the task of aiding private investment overseas.

I point out that the bill before you now carries a provision ordering the Secretary of State, the Director of Mutual Security, and the Technical Assistance Agency to encourage private investment overseas by tearing down legal and political impediments to such investments. That is attacking the problem with a feather duster. The Department of State and these other agencies are not going to do anything effective. They could have and should have done that job in the past if they had the capacity and the will to do so. They have not encouraged private enterprise, and have no real interest in doing so.

I hold in my hand the most recent figures on investments overseas since World War II. Do you know that we have only \$13,500,000,000 of private investment in foreign areas today, and only \$5,000,000,000 of that is an increase since the last World War? Most of that investment is in the Western Hemisphere. Outside the Western Hemisphere the total new investments overseas since 1945 are \$1,792,000,000, of which \$1,050,000,000 is in petroleum properties. This leaves only \$742,000,000, including reinvested earnings, in 5 years, or about \$150,000,000 a year of private investments, outside of petroleum properties. At the same time we are spending seven to eight billion dollars a year of taxpayers' money, much of it in economic undertakings.

The proof of the pudding is in the eating. These puny figures on private investment overseas indicate that the ad-

ministration of our foreign-aid programs has not been helping, but hindering, private investment. These leopards will not change their spots, no matter how earnestly the Congress urges—or orders—they to stand up and fight for free enterprise.

The committee itself does not believe these agencies are going to do much good. It says on page 63 of its report:

In carrying out its programs, the TCA should intensify its implementation of the legislative mandate: "The participation of private agencies and persons shall be sought to the greatest extent practicable." Thus far the TCA appears to have given this provision a most gentle nod, where a push is required.

The provision of the bill is an illusion. We need a new approach and new thinking. The commission, with substantial representation from private life, may solve this difficult problem and provide real impetus for private investment. The executive agencies will not.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. MEADER) there were—ayes 34, noes 76.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Chairman, I offer a perfecting amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. JUDD: On page 24, line 1, strike out "in the interest of" and insert "important to."

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Chairman, this amendment was adopted in committee, and by inadvertence was not contained in the bill.

Mr. RICHARDS. The gentleman from Minnesota is correct about that. This is a perfecting amendment, and we are indebted to the gentleman for calling it to our attention. This should be in the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. JUDD].

The amendment was agreed to.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. GROSS: On page 22, strike out lines 22 through 25, and on page 23, strike out lines 1 through 3.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I am certain many American companies and thousands of American workers would be glad to get the billion dollars in military contracts which this bill proposes to give to foreigners. My amendment will prevent this proposed double-cross of American industry and labor.

Is it the purpose of our foreigners-first administration to make us dependent, in part, upon foreign manufacturers and cheap labor for our military needs?

Here is the opportunity for you to make your decision as between American industry and labor and those foreign alleged "friends" who are conspicuous by their absence on the battle front.

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

The amendment was rejected.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. GROSS: On page 23, strike out lines 17 through 25, and on page 24 strike out lines 1 through 5.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I ask again, as I have asked so many times on the floor of this House—how many more multi-million-dollar blank checks are we going to give the President under the guise of so-called emergency or national security?

We all know he has millions in his contingent fund, and other expense accounts, to handle any dole not provided for in this bill.

Let us save this \$100,000,000 by voting for my amendment.

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

The amendment was rejected.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. GROSS: On page 27, strike out lines 3 through 25, and on page 28, strike out lines 1 through 3.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, the American taxpayers have been saddled for more than seven long years with the European refugee problem. I hesitate to say how much money has already been extracted from our people in this connection.

This problem has no place in this bill. Let some of the alleged friends in foreign countries that the administration talks so glibly of take over this European refugee program for a while. My amendment will give them that opportunity.

It will also wipe out the proposed international middleman or middle organization. Why put those fingers in the jam jar? If there is anything more expensive than direct dole, it is indirect dole through a grasping middleman.

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

The amendment was rejected.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. GROSS: On page 28, strike out lines 16 through 23.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, why continue this business of virtually gagging and bribing American newspapers in foreign countries with subscriptions and advertising paid for, in some instances, at exorbitant rates—and always with our taxpayers' money?

For example, subscriptions listed in the Rome Daily American as costing about \$12.50 were bought with American taxpayers' money at the rate of \$15 to \$24 each. As a result of my discovering this there have been some so-called downward revisions of these contracts by our striped pants give-away artists, but I have been unable thus far to ascertain how much money, if any, actually has been recovered, and if the recovery is or will be retroactive for several years that this fleecing of the American taxpayers went on.

In addition, Members of this House will be interested to know that the various foreign dole programs, such as this one, included vast sums of American tax dollars for subscriptions to the European edition of the New York Herald Tribune at the rate last reported to me of almost 82,000,000 French francs a year; and to the European edition of the New York Times at the rate, last reported, of more than 86,000,000 French francs a year. I do not know how many dollars these millions of French francs represent, but it is nothing to sneeze at, that is certain. If there is anything worse than a gagged press, it is a bought or bribed press, whether directly or indirectly. Not to mention the alleged bilking the American taxpayers are getting as a result of foreign movies and other films and such projects dished out lavishly by our foreign spenders.

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

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment, but I am unable to speak on the amendment at page 27, lines 18 through 25, and continuing on page 28, lines 1 through 3, which strikes out the International Finance Corporation.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Chairman, a point of order. I believe that amendment was included in the amendments offered by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS] which have just been rejected by the committee.

The CHAIRMAN. It appears on examination of the amendment that it bears on a different proposition.

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

The amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair has called the names of all Members on the list who indicated they intended to offer amendments or wanted time to speak. The two remaining are the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK] and the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RICHARDS].

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK].

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, before the Committee of the Whole concludes its deliberations and rises, and before we return to the House, I want to make a few observations in the hope that when we get into the House, the two amendments which will be voted upon, namely the two Vorys amendments, one reducing title I by \$615,000,000 and the other reducing title III by \$111,000,000 will be defeated. In connection with the threat to our security, as I see it, our job is:

(a) To prevent war; it is our duty to prevent the outbreak of war.

(b) To stop the Soviet Union through its aggressive actions from obtaining its goal sought without war, and that involves the policy of internal subversion by the Communists and also aggressive action through satellites.

(c) If war is forced upon us to make certain that our country and other free countries will win.

As I see it, all three of these factors are necessary in our strategy as it relates to the threat that faces us from international communism and the Soviet Union.

Some years ago in the well of this House I made a speech in which I said that the Soviet Union was using international communism as an ideological approach to win over country by country through internal subversion, and thereafter to follow its imperialistic policy of actually taking over the control of such countries, the ultimate country in mind being the United States of America. I think events that have occurred subsequent to the time I made that speech some 3 or 4 years ago confirm the judgment and the prediction I expressed on that occasion.

By an amendment we have just adopted we have taken away the very basis of the argument of my friend the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. VORYS] in offering his two amendments; to wit, that under the provisions of this bill and previous legislation there is an opportunity to transfer or interchange \$1,000,000,000 from War Department appropriations to mutual assistance. The Scrivner amendment, adopted by the Committee of the Whole only a few minutes ago, takes away the strength of that argument because that opportunity no longer exists.

Only yesterday we heard General Ridgway address a joint session of the Congress. In a few days he will go abroad to succeed General Eisenhower. He has a very serious task to perform, the same as General Eisenhower had when he received his NATO assignment. General Ridgway spoke to us only yesterday, and yet by our actions of yesterday and today we are limiting his ability to accomplish to the maximum extent possible that which we hope for and that which we desire.

It is only a few days ago that General Eisenhower sent communications to prominent Members of Congress urging the Congress not to make any reductions beyond the \$1,000,000,000 already made by the Senate committee and as made by the House committee. General Eisenhower, in those communications, said that while it was dangerous to make the \$1,000,000,000 reduction, it would be far more so to make a larger reduction.

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

Mr. RICHARDS. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman from Massachusetts 1 minute of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Massachusetts is recognized for one additional minute.

Mr. McCORMACK. I thank the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. Chairman, I quote another distinguished American gentleman from a reprint in Life magazine of May 19, 1952, in which he said:

There are a few Republicans and some Democrats who would turn their backs on all the world's problems and place the United States in some magically impregnable isolation. Such policies would really give 100-percent cooperation to the Soviet Communist effort to encircle and isolate us as a preliminary to a final assault once Asia,

Europe, Africa, and probably South America were consolidated against us, which effort would be desperate.

The gentleman who made those remarks a few days ago is John Foster Dulles.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from South Carolina is recognized for 4 minutes to close the debate.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a unanimous-consent request?

Mr. RICHARDS. I yield.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at that point in the RECORD where the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS] was considered, my remarks to follow immediately after those of the gentleman from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD].

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

There was no objection.

Mr. RICHARDS. Mr. Chairman, before we take final action on this bill I want to call the attention of the Members to the issues involved and say that I expect to demand two roll call votes in addition to a roll call on passage of the bill.

The first roll call will be on the Vorys amendment which would strike \$615,300,000 from defense support in title I, and the second roll call will be on the Vorys amendment to title III which reduces the amount of \$408,000,000 down to \$296,800,000, a net cut of \$111,200,000.

Mr. Chairman, we have crossed the plains, we have gone up the incline and are nearing the top of the hill. Like the climbers of Mt. Everest who seek to reach the peak, we must realize that while the last stages of the climb are difficult, there is no place for men to stand like reeds bending in every wind that blows. We must realize that to turn back after reaching the final stages can only mean the loss of the progress we have already attained.

The real issue before us is to decide what course is best for our country. I give full faith and credit to the honesty of purpose, the sincerity and patriotism of every man and woman in this House, and I have the fullest respect for the views of those with whom I have differed in voting on amendments offered to this bill today. This mutual security bill is so vital a measure that on our judgment today depends an issue that will affect not only our children, but our children's children and their grandchildren. We are all concerned and justly so, about the costs of the Mutual Security Program in terms of the strains they make on the economy and the stability of the United States, but, in weighing all the facts which confront us, I sincerely believe that when most of us search deep down in our hearts we will realize beyond doubt that this is a premium we must pay to insure the future of our children and our country.

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Chairman, I rise to question the practical wisdom of this proposal to so drastically reduce the moderate appropriation provision in this bill to sensibly assist the development of

Israel and help solve the Arab refugee problem. I earnestly hope no tragic mistake will be made here today by any hasty action that could well result in diminishing the growing spirit of the courageous people of Israel and destroy any cooperative desire of the Arab States to work toward the establishment of permanent peace in the Middle East trouble zone.

The new state of Israel was founded upon the same fundamental principles of liberty and justice that originated our own national beginning. The leaders and people of Israel have demonstrated consistently courageous determination to erect a cornerstone of democratic example and strength, modeled on the great traditions of the United States, in a part of the world that is dynamic in potentiality to incite world conflict. Israel and the Arab neighbors need full assurance from us that we are most willing to reasonably aid them toward peaceful settlement of the gravely complex difficulties surrounding the birth and growth of any new cradle of freedom. Let us not forget we ourselves once knew the trying days when the withholding of the hand of genuine friendship and help might well have meant our death at birth. The amount of financial aid in this bill is reasonable; its vital need for the particular purpose has been proven. It is designed to give American confidence and encouragement to Israelis and Arabs to steadfastly work with us, and against the Communist enemy, to preserve and promote peace in a harassed world. I urge you, my colleagues, to carefully reflect and reject this untimely amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. All time has expired.

The question is on the committee amendment, as amended.

The committee amendment as amended was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. COOPER, 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. 7005) to amend the Mutual Security Act of 1951, and for other purposes, pursuant to House Resolution 640, he reported the bill back to the House with an amendment adopted in the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment?

Mr. RICHARDS. Mr. Speaker, I demand a separate vote on the Vorys amendment to title I and on the Vorys amendment to title III, involving amounts.

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:

Amendment offered by Mr. VORYS: On page 14, line 1, after "and of", strike out "the Eco-

nomie Cooperation Act of 1948, as amended (22 U. S. C. 1501-1522)" and insert in lieu thereof "section 503 of this act."

On page 15, line 4, amend subsection (c) to read as follows:

"(c) Amend section 101 (a) (2) to read as follows: 'There is hereby authorized to be appropriated to the President for the fiscal year 1953 not to exceed \$1,022,000,000 to provide assistance to any country covered by paragraph (1) of this subsection in accordance with the provisions of section 503 of this act; and in addition balances of appropriations heretofore made pursuant to this paragraph unobligated as of June 30, 1952, or subsequently released from obligation, are authorized to be continued available for obligation for their original purposes through June 30, 1953, and to be consolidated with the appropriation hereby authorized.'

The SPEAKER. The question is on the amendment.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 221, nays 137, not voting, 73, as follows:

[Roll No. 84]
YEAS—221

- | | | |
|------------------|-----------------|----------------|
| Abernethy | Eaton | McMillan |
| Adair | Ellsworth | McVey |
| Allen, Calif. | Elston | Mack, Wash. |
| Allen, La. | Evins | Mahon |
| Andersen, | Fallon | Martin, Iowa |
| H. Carl | Fenton | Martin, Mass. |
| Anderson, Calif. | Fisher | Mason |
| Andresen, | Ford | Meader |
| August H. | Frazier | Morrow |
| Andrews | Fulton | Miller, Md. |
| Angell | Gamble | Miller, Nebr. |
| Arends | Gathings | Miller, N. Y. |
| Auchincloss | Gavin | Mills |
| Ayres | George | Morano |
| Baker | Golden | Mumma |
| Barden | Goodwin | Murray |
| Baring | Gore | Nicholson |
| Bates, Mass. | Graham | Norblad |
| Beall | Grant | Norrell |
| Beamer | Gross | O'Brien, Mich. |
| Belcher | Gwinn | O'Konski |
| Bender | Hagen | Osmers |
| Bennett, Fla. | Hall | Fassman |
| Bennett, Mich. | Edwin Arthur | Patten |
| Bentsen | Halleck | Philbin |
| Berry | Hand | Phillips |
| Betts | Harden | Pickett |
| Bishop | Harris | Poage |
| Blackney | Harrison, Nebr. | Potter |
| Boggs, Del. | Harrison, Va. | Prouty |
| Bolton | Harrison, Wyo. | Radwan |
| Bow | Harvey | Rankin |
| Bray | Hess | Reece, Tenn. |
| Brehm | Hill | Reed, Ill. |
| Brooks | Hinshaw | Reed, N. Y. |
| Brown, Ohio | Hoffman, Ill. | Rees, Kans. |
| Brownson | Hoffman, Mich. | Regan |
| Budge | Holmes | Riehlman |
| Burdick | Hope | Rogers, Colo. |
| Burleson | Horan | Rogers, Fla. |
| Busbey | Hull | Rogers, Mass. |
| Bush | Ikard | Rogers, Tex. |
| Butler | James | Ross |
| Byrnes | Jarman | Sadlak |
| Cannon | Jenison | Saylor |
| Carrigg | Jenkins | Schenck |
| Chenoweth | Jensen | Scrivner |
| Chiperfield | Jonas | Seely-Brown |
| Church | Jones, Mo. | Shafer |
| Clevenger | Jones, | Sheehan |
| Cole, Kans. | Woodrow W. | Short |
| Cole, N. Y. | Kearns | Sikes |
| Colmer | Keating | Simpson, Ill. |
| Corbett | Kersten, Wis. | Simpson, Pa. |
| Cotton | Kilburn | Sittler |
| Crawford | Kilday | Smith, Kans. |
| Crumpacker | King, Pa. | Smith, Wis. |
| Curtis, Mo. | Lantaff | Springer |
| Curtis, Nebr. | Larcade | Stanley |
| Davis, Ga. | Latham | Steed |
| Davis, Tenn. | LeCompte | Stockman |
| Davis, Wis. | Lovre | Sutton |
| Denny | Lucas | Taylor |
| Devereux | McConnell | Teague |
| Dooliver | McCulloch | Thomas |
| Dondero | McDonough | Thompson, |
| Donohue | McGregor | Mich. |
| Doughton | McIntire | Tollefson |

- | | | |
|-----------|-----------------|--------------|
| Vail | Wharton | Wilson, Tex. |
| Van Pelt | Whitten | Winstead |
| Van Zandt | Widnall | Withrow |
| Velde | Wigglesworth | Wolcott |
| Vorys | Williams, Miss. | Wolverton |
| Vursell | Williams, N. Y. | Wood, Ga. |
| Watts | Willis | |
| Weichel | Wilson, Ind. | |

NAYS—137

- | | | |
|---------------|----------------|----------------|
| Addonizio | Forand | Marshall |
| Anfuso | Forrester | Mitchell |
| Aspinall | Fugate | Morgan |
| Bailey | Furcolo | Morrison |
| Bakewell | Garmatz | Morton |
| Barrett | Gary | Multer |
| Bates, Ky. | Gordon | Murdock |
| Battle | Granahan | Murphy |
| Blatnik | Granger | O'Brien, Ill. |
| Boggs, La. | Green | O'Brien, N. Y. |
| Bolling | Greenwood | O'Neill |
| Bosone | Gregory | Patman |
| Brown, Ga. | Hale | Perkins |
| Bryson | Hardy | Polk |
| Buchanan | Hart | Powell |
| Buckley | Hays, Ark. | Preston |
| Burnside | Hedrick | Price |
| Burton | Heffernan | Rabaut |
| Camp | Heller | Rains |
| Canfield | Heselton | Ramsey |
| Carnahan | Howell | Rhodes |
| Case | Jackson, Wash. | Ribicoff |
| Celler | Javits | Richards |
| Chelf | Jones, Ala. | Riley |
| Chudoff | Judd | Rivers |
| Clemente | Karsten, Mo. | Roberts |
| Combs | Kean | Rodino |
| Cooley | Kee | Rooney |
| Cooper | Kelley, Pa. | Roosevelt |
| Cox | Kelly, N. Y. | Sasser |
| Crosser | Keogh | Scott, |
| Dawson | Kirwan | Hugh D., Jr. |
| DeGraffenried | Klein | Shelley |
| Delaney | Lane | Sieminski |
| Denton | Lanham | Smith, Miss. |
| Dingell | Lesinski | Smith, Va. |
| Dollinger | Lind | Spence |
| Donovan | Lyle | Staggers |
| Durham | McCarthy | Thompson, Tex. |
| Eberharter | McCormack | Thornberry |
| Elliott | McGuire | Trimble |
| Feighan | McMullen | Walter |
| Fernandez | Machrowicz | Wier |
| Fine | Madden | Yates |
| Flood | Magee | Yorty |
| Fogarty | Mansfield | Zablocki |

NOT VOTING—73

- | | | |
|-------------|-----------------|---------------|
| Aandahl | Hébert | Ostertag |
| Abbitt | Herlong | O'Toole |
| Albert | Herter | Patterson |
| Allen, Ill. | Hillings | Poulson |
| Armstrong | Hoeven | Priest |
| Beckworth | Holifield | Reams |
| Bonner | Hunter | Redden |
| Boykin | Irving | Robeson |
| Bramblett | Jackson, Calif. | Sabath |
| Buffett | Johnson | St. George |
| Carlyle | Jones, | Scott, Hardie |
| Chatham | Hamilton C. | Scudder |
| Coudert | Kearney | Secret |
| Cunningham | Kennedy | Sheppard |
| Dague | Kerr | Stigler |
| Deane | King, Calif. | Taber |
| Demsey | Kluczynski | Tackett |
| D'Ewart | McGrath | Talle |
| Dorn | McKinnon | Vinson |
| Doyle | Mack, Ill. | Welch |
| Engle | Miller, Calif. | Werdel |
| Hall, | Morris | Wheeler |
| Leonard W. | Moulder | Wickersham |
| Havener | Nelson | Wood, Idaho |
| Hays, Ohio | O'Hara | Woodruff |

So the amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

- On this vote:
- Mr. Leonard W. Hall for, with Mr. Hébert against.
 - Mr. Allen of Illinois for, with Mr. Miller of California against.
 - Mr. Dague for, with Mr. Moulder against.
 - Mr. Jackson of California for, with Mr. McGrath against.
 - Mr. Taber for, with Mr. King of California against.
 - Mr. Dorn for, with Mr. Deane against.
 - Mr. Secret for, with Mr. Holifield against.
 - Mr. Werdel for, with Mr. Havener against.
 - Mr. Ostertag for, with Mr. McKinnon against.

Mrs. St. George for, with Mr. Sheppard against.
 Mr. O'Hara for, with Mr. O'Toole against.
 Mr. Hoeven for, with Mr. Sabath against.
 Mr. Coudert for, with Mr. Welch against.
 Mr. Bramblett for, with Mr. Doyle against.
 Mr. Wood of Idaho for, with Mr. Irving against.
 Mr. Nelson for, with Mr. Stigler against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Aandahl with Mr. Hays of Ohio.
 Mr. Armstrong with Mr. Chatham.
 Mr. Buffett with Mr. Dempsey.
 Mr. Cunningham with Mr. Engle.
 Mr. D'Ewart with Mr. Priest.
 Mr. Herter with Mr. Mack of Illinois.
 Mr. Hillings with Mr. Kennedy.
 Mr. Hunter with Mr. Herlong.
 Mr. Johnson with Mr. Robeson.
 Mr. Poulson with Mr. Albert.
 Mr. Hardie Scott with Mr. Bonner.
 Mr. Scudder with Mr. Vinson.
 Mr. Talle with Mr. Tackett.
 Mr. Woodruff with Mr. Wickersham.

Mr. JONES of Missouri 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:

Amendment offered by Mr. VORYS: Page 18, line 7, strike out "\$408,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$208,800,000" and on page 18, line 8, after "subsection" insert "in accordance with the provisions of section 503 of this act and not to exceed \$88,000,000 to carry out the purposes and provisions of this subsection in accordance with the applicable provisions of the act for international development (Public Law 535, 81st Cong.)."

Mr. RICHARDS. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 192, nays 165, not voting 74, as follows:

[Roll No. 85]

YEAS—192

Abernethy	Chelf	Harrison, Va.
Adair	Chenoweth	Harrison, Wyo.
Allen, Calif.	Chiperfield	Harvey
Allen, La.	Church	Hess
Andersen,	Clevenger	Hill
H. Carl	Cole, Kans.	Hoffman, Ill.
Anderson, Calif.	Colmer	Hoffman, Mich.
Andresen,	Corbett	Horan
August H.	Cotton	Hull
Andrews	Cox	Ikard
Angell	Crawford	James
Arends	Crumpacker	Jenison
Ayres	Curtis, Mo.	Jenkins
Baker	Curtis, Nebr.	Jensen
Barden	Davis, Ga.	Jonas
Baring	Davis, Wis.	Jones, Ala.
Bates, Mass.	Denny	Jones,
Beamer	Devereux	Woodrow W.
Belcher	Dolliver	Kilburn
Bender	Dondero	Kilday
Bennett, Mich.	Doughton	Larcade
Berry	Ellsworth	Latham
Betts	Elston	LeCompte
Bishop	Fenton	Lovre
Blackney	Fisher	Lucas
Boggs, Del.	Forrester	Lyle
Bolton	Gathings	McConnell
Bow	Gavin	McCulloch
Brehm	George	McDonough
Brooks	Golden	McGregor
Brown, Ga.	Goodwin	McMillan
Brown, Ohio	Graham	McVey
Bryson	Grant	Mack, Wash.
Budge	Gregory	Mahon
Burdick	Gross	Martin, Iowa
Burleson	Gwinn	Martin, Mass.
Busbey	Hagen	Mason
Bush	Halleck	Meador
Butler	Hand	Merrow
Byrnes	Harden	Miller, Md.
Camp	Harris	Miller, Nebr.
Carrigg	Harrison, Nebr.	Miller, N. Y.

Morton
 Mumma
 Murray
 Nicholson
 Norblad
 Norrell
 O'Konski
 Passman
 Patten
 Perkins
 Philbin
 Phillips
 Pickett
 Poage
 Potter
 Radwan
 Rankin
 Reece, Tenn.
 Reed, Ill.
 Reed, N. Y.
 Rees, Kans.
 Regan
 Riley
 Rivers

Roberts
 Rogers, Colo.
 Rogers, Fla.
 Rogers, Mass.
 Rogers, Tex.
 Sadlak
 Schenck
 Scrivner
 Shafer
 Sheehan
 Short
 Simpson, Ill.
 Simpson, Pa.
 Smith, Kans.
 Smith, Va.
 Smith, Wis.
 Springer
 Stanley
 Steed
 Stockman
 Sutton
 Taylor
 Teague
 Thomas

Thompson,
 Mich.
 Vail
 Van Pelt
 Van Zandt
 Velde
 Vorys
 Vursell
 Watts
 Weichel
 Wharton
 Whitten
 Williams, Miss.
 Williams, N. Y.
 Willis
 Wilson, Ind.
 Wilson, Tex.
 Winstead
 Withrow
 Wolcott
 Wolverton
 Wood, Ga.

St. George
 Scott, Hardie
 Scudder
 Secrest
 Sheppard
 Stigler

Taber
 Tackett
 Talle
 Vinson
 Welch
 Werdel

Wheeler
 Wickersham
 Wood, Idaho
 Woodruff

So the amendment was agreed to.
 The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Taber for, with Mr. Hébert against.
 Mr. Allen of Illinois for, with Mr. Miller of California against.
 Mr. Dorn for, with Mr. Deane against.
 Mr. Engle for, with Mr. Holifield against.
 Mr. Engle for, with Mr. Herlong against.
 Mr. Tackett for, with Mr. Moulder against.
 Mr. Bonner for, with Mr. McGrath against.
 Mr. Dague for, with Mr. King of California against.
 Mr. Leonard W. Hall for, with Mr. Havenner against.
 Mr. Jackson of California for, with Mr. McKinnon against.
 Mr. Werdel for, with Mr. Sheppard against.
 Mr. Ostertag for, with Mr. O'Toole against.
 Mrs. St. George for, with Mr. Sabath against.
 Mr. O'Hara for, with Mr. Welch against.
 Mr. Hoeven for, with Mr. Doyle against.
 Mr. Coudert for, with Mr. Irving against.
 Mr. Bramblett for, with Mr. Stigler against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Armstrong with Mr. Kennedy.
 Mr. Herter with Mr. Hayes of Ohio.
 Mr. Buffett with Mr. Dempsey.
 Mr. Patterson with Mr. Mack of Illinois.
 Mr. Talle with Mr. Wickersham.
 Mr. Wood of Idaho with Mr. Vinson.
 Mr. Hillings with Mr. Morriss.
 Mr. Nelson with Mr. Kerr.
 Mr. Woodruff with Mr. Robeson.
 Mr. Cunningham with Mr. Redden.
 Mr. D'Ewart with Mr. Wheeler.
 Mr. Poulson with Mr. Chatham.
 Mr. Eaton with Mr. Hamilton C. Jones.
 Mr. Hardie Scott with Mr. Carlyle.
 Mr. Hale with Mr. Boykin.
 Mr. Scudder with Mr. Albert.
 Mr. Hunter with Mr. Abbitt.
 Mr. Kearney with Mr. Beckworth.
 Mr. Johnson with Mr. Reams.

Mr. FALLON changed his vote from yea to nay.

Mr. BEALL changed his vote from nay to yea.

Mr. DONOHUE changed his vote from yea to nay.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the committee substitute as amended.

The committee substitute as amended was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. 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 pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. I am, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman qualifies. The Clerk will report the motion.

NAYS—165

Addonizio
 Anusio
 Aspinall
 Auchincloss
 Bailey
 Bakewell
 Barrett
 Bates, Ky.
 Battle
 Beall
 Bennett, Fla.
 Bentsen
 Blatnik
 Boggs, La.
 Bolling
 Bosone
 Bray
 Brownson
 Buchanan
 Buckley
 Burnside
 Burton
 Canfield
 Cannon
 Carnahan
 Case
 Jackson, Wash.
 Jarman
 Javits
 Clemente
 Cole, N. Y.
 Combs
 Cooley
 Cooper
 Crosser
 Davis, Tenn.
 Dawson
 DeGraffenried
 Delaney
 Denton
 Dingell
 Dollinger
 Donohue
 Donovan
 Durham
 Eberhart
 Elliott
 Ewins
 Fallon
 Feighan
 Fernandez
 Fine
 Flood
 Fogarty
 Forand
 Ford
 Frazier

Fugate
 Fulton
 Furcolo
 Gamble
 Garmatz
 Gary
 Gordon
 Gore
 Granahan
 Granger
 Green
 Greenwood
 Hall,
 Edwin Arthur
 Hardy
 Hart
 Hays, Ark.
 Hedrick
 Heffernan
 Heller
 Heselton
 Hinshaw
 Holmes
 Hope
 Howell
 Jackson, Wash.
 Jarman
 Javits
 Jones, Mo.
 Judd
 Karsten, Mo.
 Kean
 Kearns
 Keating
 Kee
 Kelley, Pa.
 Kelly, N. Y.
 Keogh
 Kersten, Wis.
 King, Pa.
 Kirwan
 Klein
 Lane
 Lanham
 Lantaff
 Lesinski
 Lind
 McCarthy
 McCormack
 McGuire
 McIntire
 McMullen
 Machrowicz
 Madden
 Magee
 Mansfield

Marshall
 Mills
 Mitchell
 Morano
 Morgan
 Morrison
 Multer
 Murdock
 Murphy
 O'Brien, Ill.
 O'Brien, Mich.
 O'Brien, N. Y.
 O'Neill
 Osmer
 Patman
 Polk
 Powell
 Preston
 Price
 Priest
 Prouty
 Rabaut
 Rains
 Ramsay
 Rhodes
 Ribicoff
 Richards
 Riehlman
 Rodino
 Rooney
 Roosevelt
 Ross
 Sasser
 Saylor
 Scott,
 Hugh D., Jr.
 Seely-Brown
 Shelley
 Steminski
 Sikes
 Stittler
 Smith, Miss.
 Spence
 Staggers
 Thompson, Tex.
 Thornberry
 Tollefson
 Trimble
 Walter
 Widnall
 Wier
 Wigglesworth
 Yates
 Yorty
 Zablocki

NOT VOTING—74

Aandahl
 Abbott
 Albert
 Allen, Ill.
 Armstrong
 Beckworth
 Bonner
 Boykin
 Bramblett
 Buffett
 Carlyle
 Chatham
 Coudert
 Cunningham
 Dague
 Deane
 Dempsey
 D'Ewart
 Dorn
 Doyle

Eaton
 Engle
 Hale
 Hall,
 Leonard W.
 Havenner
 Hays, Ohio
 Hébert
 Herlong
 Herter
 Hillings
 Hoeven
 Holifield
 Hunter
 Irving
 Jackson, Calif.
 Johnson
 Jones,
 Hamilton C.
 Kearney

Kennedy
 Kerr
 King, Calif.
 Kluczynski
 McGrath
 McKinnon
 Mack, Ill.
 Miller, Calif.
 Morris
 Moulder
 Nelson
 O'Hara
 Ostertag
 O'Toole
 Patterson
 Foulson
 Reams
 Redden
 Robeson
 Sabath

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin moves to recommit the bill H. R. 7005 to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to recommit.

The motion to recommit was rejected.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

Mr. RICHARDS. Mr. Speaker, on the vote on final passage I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 246, nays 109, present 1, not voting, 75, as follows:

[Roll No. 86]
YEAS—246

Addonizio	Flood	Madden
Allen, Calif.	Fogarty	Magee
Anfuso	Forand	Mahon
Angell	Ford	Mansfield
Aspinall	Forrester	Marshall
Auchincloss	Frazier	Martin, Mass.
Ayres	Fugate	Meader
Bailey	Fulton	Morrow
Bakewell	Furcolo	Miller, Md.
Baring	Gambie	Miller, N. Y.
Barrett	Garmatz	Mills
Bates, Ky.	Gary	Mitchell
Bates, Mass.	Gathings	Morano
Battle	George	Morgan
Beall	Goodwin	Morrison
Bender	Gordon	Morton
Bennett, Fla.	Gore	Multer
Bentsen	Granahan	Murdock
Blatnik	Granger	Murphy
Boggs, Del.	Grant	Murray
Boggs, La.	Green	Norblad
Bolling	Greenwood	Norrell
Bolton	Gregory	O'Brien, Ill.
Bosone	Hall	O'Brien, Mich.
Brown, Ga.	Edwin Arthur	O'Brien, N. Y.
Brownson	Halleck	O'Neill
Bryson	Hardy	Osmer
Buchanan	Harris	Patman
Buckley	Harrison, Va.	Perkins
Burleson	Hart	Philbin
Burnside	Hays, Ark.	Poage
Burton	Hedrick	Polk
Byrnes	Heffernan	Preston
Camp	Heller	Price
Canfield	Heseltun	Priest
Cannon	Hinshaw	Prouty
Carnahan	Holmes	Rabaut
Carrigg	Hope	Radwan
Case	Howell	Rains
Celler	Ikard	Ramsay
Chelf	Jackson, Wash.	Rhodes
Chiperfield	James	Ribicoff
Chudoff	Jarman	Richards
Clemente	Javits	Riehlman
Cole, Kans.	Jones, Ala.	Riley
Cole, N. Y.	Jones, Mo.	Rivers
Combs	Jones,	Roberts
Cooley	Woodrow W.	Rodino
Cooper	Judd	Rogers, Colo.
Corbett	Karsten, Mo.	Rogers, Fla.
Cotton	Kean	Rogers, Mass.
Cox	Keating	Rooney
Crosser	Kee	Roosevelt
Crumpacker	Kelley, Pa.	Ross
Curtis, Mo.	Kelly, N. Y.	Sadiak
Davis, Ga.	Keogh	Sasscer
Davis, Tenn.	Kersten, Wis.	Saylor
Dawson	Kilburn	Scott,
DeGraffenried	Kilday	Hugh D., Jr.
Delaney	Kirwan	Seely-Brown
Denny	Klein	Shelley
Denton	Lane	Sheminski
Devereux	Lanham	Sikes
Dingell	Lantaff	Sittler
Dollinger	Latham	Smith, Miss.
Donohue	LeCompte	Smith, Va.
Donovan	Lesinski	Spence
Doughton	Lind	Springer
Durham	Lucas	Staggers
Eberharter	Lyle	Steed
Elliott	McCarthy	Taylor
Ellsworth	McConnell	Teague
Evins	McCormack	Thomas
Fallon	McDonough	Thompson, Tex.
Feighan	McGuire	Thornberry
Fenton	McMillan	Tollefson
Fernandez	McMullen	Trimble
Fine	Machrowicz	Van Zandt
Fisher	Mack, Wash.	Vorys

Walter	Wier	Wolverton
Watts	Wigglesworth	Yates
Weichel	Williams, N. Y.	Yorty
Widnall	Willis	Zablocki

NAYS—109

Abernethy	Elston	Pickett
Adair	Gavin	Potter
Allen, La.	Golden	Rankin
Andersen,	Graham	Reece, Tenn.
H. Carl	Gross	Reed, Ill.
Anderson, Calif.	Gwinn	Reed, N. Y.
Andresen,	Hagen	Rees, Kans.
August H.	Hand	Regan
Andrews	Harden	Rogers, Tex.
Arends	Harrison, Nebr.	Schenck
Baker	Harrison, Wyo.	Scrivner
Barden	Harvey	Shafer
Beamer	Hess	Sheehan
Belcher	Hill	Short
Bennett, Mich.	Hoffman, Ill.	Simpson, Ill.
Berry	Hoffman, Mich.	Simpson, Pa.
Betts	Horan	Smith, Kans.
Bishop	Hull	Smith, Wis.
Blackney	Jenison	Stanley
Bow	Jenkins	Stockman
Bray	Jensen	Sutton
Brehm	Jonas	Thompson,
Brooks	Kearns	Mich.
Brown, Ohio	King, Pa.	Vall
Budge	Larcade	Van Pelt
Burdick	Lovre	Velde
Busbey	McCulloch	Vursell
Bush	McGregor	Wharton
Butler	McIntire	Whitten
Chenoweth	McVey	Williams, Miss.
Church	Martin, Iowa	Wilson, Ind.
Clevenger	Mason	Wilson, Tex.
Colmer	Miller, Nebr.	Winstead
Crawford	Mumma	Withrow
Curtis, Nebr.	Nicholson	Wolcott
Davis, Wis.	Passman	Wood, Ga.
Dolliver	Patten	
Dondero	Phillips	

PRESENT—1

O'Konski

NOT VOTING—75

Aandahl	Hays, Ohio	Ostertag
Abbitt	Hébert	O'Toole
Albert	Herlong	Patterson
Allen, Ill.	Herter	Poulson
Armstrong	Hillings	Powell
Beckworth	Hoeven	Reams
Bonner	Hollfield	Redden
Boykin	Hunter	Robeson
Bramblett	Irving	Sabath
Buffett	Jackson, Calif.	St. George
Carlyle	Johnson	Scott, Hardie
Chatham	Jones,	Scudder
Coudert	Hamilton C.	Secret
Cunningham	Kearney	Sheppard
Dague	Kennedy	Stigler
Deane	Kerr	Taber
Dempsey	King, Calif.	Tackett
D'Ewart	Kluczynski	Talle
Dorn	McGrath	Vinson
Doyle	McKinnon	Welch
Eaton	Mack, Ill.	Werdel
Engle	Miller, Calif.	Wheeler
Hale	Morris	Wickersham
Hall,	Moulder	Wood, Idaho
Leonard W.	Nelson	Woodruff
Havener	O'Hara	

So the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Leonard W. Hall for, with Mr. Hoeven against.

Mr. Deane for, with Mr. Dorn against.

Mr. Hollfield for, with Mr. Secret against.

Mr. Kearney for, with Mr. Werdel against.

Mr. Hays of Ohio for, with Mr. Bramblett against.

Mr. Herter for, with Mr. Allen of Illinois against.

Mr. Dague for, with Mr. Buffet against.

Mr. Coudert for, with Mr. Poulson against.

Mr. Hillings for, with Mr. Nelson against.

Mr. Kennedy for, with Mr. O'Hara against.

Mr. Jackson of California for, with Mr. Wood of Idaho against.

Mr. McKinnon for, with Mr. Taber against.

Mr. McGrath for, with Mrs. St. George against.

Mr. Doyle for, with Mr. Woodruff against.

Mr. Miller of California for, with Mr. Powell against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Armstrong with Mr. Reams.
Mr. Hunter with Mr. Vinson.
Mr. Aandahl with Mr. Wickersham.
Mr. Hale with Mr. Mack of Illinois.
Mr. Talle with Mr. Dempsey.
Mr. Scudder with Mr. Engle.
Mr. Eaton with Mr. Chatham.
Mr. Hardie Scott with Mr. Bonner.
Mr. D'Ewart with Mr. King of California.
Mr. Patterson with Mr. O'Toole.
Mr. Cunningham with Mr. Albert.
Mr. Ostertag with Mr. Havener.
Mr. Johnson with Mr. Sheppard.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND REMARKS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members who desire to do so may extend their remarks in today's RECORD just before the vote on the committee amendment.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. WALTER). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Montana?

There was no objection.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have five legislative days in which to extend their remarks on the bill H. R. 7005, just passed.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Montana?

There was no objection.

PRICE OF NEWSPRINT

Mr. HARRIS. 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 Arkansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, a number of the Members of this body have expressed concern this past week over the proposed \$10 a ton increase in the price of newsprint imported from Canada.

I wish to report to the Members that the Subcommittee on Newsprint of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce has been continuously in touch with the situation, has been in daily contact with the appropriate agencies involved. We will have a full review presented to our committee in a special-called meeting on next Monday.

Undoubtedly, the contemplated price increase will seriously affect the publishers in this country, and it is hoped some sort of remedial action will be forthcoming.

POLISH IMMIGRATION

Mr. SIEMINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks and include a statement.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. SIEMINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the opportunity given me at this time, by unanimous consent of the House to include testimony in the RECORD given this day on H. R. 7376 before Subcommittee No. 1 of the House Committee on the Judiciary.

The testimony was submitted on behalf of the Polish Immigration Committee of New York City, 25 St. Marks Place, by Mr. Henry M. Zaleski, vice president of the committee. I here express thanks to Mr. Wladyslaw Zachariasiewicz, executive secretary of the Polish Immigration Committee, who with Mr. Zaleski, journeyed to Washington for this noble cause, and who drew my attention to the testimony below cited. I trust their cause will succeed:

STATEMENT OF VICE PRESIDENT HENRY M. ZALESKI ON BEHALF OF THE POLISH IMMIGRATION COMMITTEE OF NEW YORK CITY, 25 ST. MARKS PLACE, NEW YORK, N. Y., BEFORE SUBCOMMITTEE NO. 1 OF THE HOUSE COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY, RE H. R. 7376

It is indeed a privilege and an honor for me to have this opportunity to appear before your body, the Subcommittee of the Judiciary Committee of the House of Representatives to testify in support of the bill introduced by Congressman Emanuel Celler, H. R. 7376. The Polish Immigration Committee of New York under the able and splendid leadership of the Right Rev. Msgr. F. Burant, together with a group of Polish-American leaders of various organizations and societies, secured assurances for approximately 24,000 displaced persons, ex-Polish soldiers from Great Britain, and refugees under the Displaced Persons Act of 1948. From this number about 20,000 persons were resettled in the United States. We work in close cooperation with the War Relief Services, National Catholic Welfare Conference. We are recognized by the Department of State and the Displaced Persons Commission. We appear here today on behalf of Polish Displaced Persons, escapees, refugees and ex-Polish soldiers in Great Britain.

It is not our intention to review here the glorious and almost continuous fight of Poland over the centuries for freedom, democracy, and independence. However, it is important to mention that once again Poland is indeed partitioned. At the present time Poland is ruled by a satellite Red Russian government and deprived of her freedom, which is so dear and vital to the democratic-loving Polish nation. The first nation to resist the onslaught of the might of the Hitler armies was Poland. This resistance continued even after the fall of Poland. Americans of Polish descent are indeed very proud of the heroic achievements of the exiled Polish army and the gallant and magnificent resistance of the Polish underground.

During World War II 2,000,000 Poles were deported to Germany and 1,500,000 to Russia. A few more million were tragic victims of Hitler's barbarism.

As a result of all this, the Poles now have the biggest number of refugees and displaced persons scattered all over the world. The vast number of these unfortunate Polish victims are still exiled and are not resettled. They well know that the United States has assumed world leadership in the fight for freedom and the democratic way of life. They, therefore, are always vigilant and watchful for a sign of our leadership in order that their hope may not die. The President's message to Congress urging the passage of adequate legislation for many thousands of war victims gives en-

couraging hope in that direction. The great humanitarian traditions of our country do not permit us to forsake these unfortunates.

This matter of immigration that we are concerned with today deals primarily with surplus population. The problem is indeed a serious and important one. There can be no question but that it has become a grave threat to the political and social stability of the entire world. As a member of the Counterintelligence Corps of the United States Army during the last war, I had a splendid opportunity over a period of approximately 30 months to observe the poverty and distress that gripped overpopulated Italy, especially after the termination of hostilities so that it became a breeding ground for communism.

However, we do believe that displaced persons and refugees should be given equal consideration since they have been forced into exile for such a long time and have no home or country. The Polish-American press and the Polish-American organizations in this country have recently stressed this point very emphatically in connection with their support of the bill now under consideration.

Under the existing immigration laws, the Polish quota is 6,529 out of the annual quota of 153,000 immigrants to the United States. Under the terms of the Displaced Persons Act, as amended, the Poles admitted under said act [like others] will be subtracted from future Polish quotas. Thus, the Polish quota is mortgaged 50 percent until 1999. This is completely unreal and tragic, since the refugees from Communist tyranny are thus barred from entering the United States. The provision of 3 (c) of the Displaced Persons Act, as amended, which intends to bring some relief to the problem, for the so-called out-of-zone refugees, falls entirely in its purpose because of the meager number of available visas.

In your consideration of the present bill, it is the sincere hope of our committee that you will provide for the inclusion in said bill of the following four items:

1. Fifteen thousand more displaced persons who are still living in Germany and were covered by the Displaced Persons Act, as amended, but who did not succeed in immigrating to the United States, because they did not obtain visas before January 1, 1952, or were unable to get assurance in time to meet the dead line of July 31, 1951. According to our information the Poles themselves number 52,000, of which about 8,000 qualified under the 1948 Displaced Persons Act, as amended, but failed to obtain assurances or visas in time.

2. Seven thousand ex-Polish soldiers from Great Britain, who were deprived of the privilege of the Displaced Persons Act, as amended, merely because they did not register before June 16, 1950, out of 18,000 visas allotted to this category under said act, only approximately 11,000 were profited from. In view of this, we believe that this proposition or suggestion will not be in any way a disregard of the intention of Congress, concerning the admittance to the United States of these 18,000 ex-Polish soldiers, who fought so bravely and gallantly in the last war, as expressed in the aforesaid act.

3. Section 4 (f) of H. R. 7376, limits the classification of refugees to those who reside in certain countries enumerated therein. We believe that this should be changed to include all European countries so as to embrace the residences of all eligible refugees. (For instance, there are many recent escapees from countries behind the iron curtain presently in Sweden.)

4. The definition of refugees as contained in H. R. 7376 should be changed to exclude the condition "who has not been firmly resettled." Our experience shows that it is almost impossible to determine who is firmly resettled except in those cases where the

refugee-resident in the foreign country has applied for citizenship in that country. The use of the above phrase in actual practice makes it almost mandatory that the American consul use his own discretion in determining the question.

Our experience in the field of immigration and resettlement, especially with the Polish element, has been gratifying and pleasing. Indeed, the United States has benefited from the skills, abilities, and culture of the new immigrants. Many of them are now fighting in the United States Army in Korea and are giving an excellent account of themselves as American soldiers.

We, therefore, feel that the Poles, like others behind the iron curtain, merit your careful and serious consideration. Whatever you accomplish here will indeed reach the enslaved people there and I hope your verdict will demonstrate to them that they have not been entirely forgotten.

We respectfully submit for your serious consideration the amendments as above outlined and sincerely hope that you will act favorably upon our recommendations.

FEDERAL MINIMUM WAGE LEGISLATION

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include a letter from Seymour E. Harris to the Boston Herald.

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

There was no objection.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, the letter from Mr. Seymour Harris to the editor of the Boston Herald, which I shall include in my remarks, protests the Fulbright amendment, which, if enacted, would virtually kill Federal minimum-wage legislation. It would still further hurt us in New England, especially our textiles, shoes, jewelry, electrical supplies, and apparel.

Mr. Speaker, the South is indeed in the saddle. Even in the awarding of Government contracts the South is receiving contracts when they are not the low bidders.

The very unfortunate part of it is that businessmen are afraid to fight the awards for fear that they will be further penalized. It is a Russian way of doing things, and it is very unfair.

The article is as follows:

THE MAIL BAG

FULBRIGHT RIDER HITS NEW ENGLAND

TO THE EDITOR OF THE HERALD:

I am writing about the Fulbright amendment which, if enacted, would virtually kill Federal minimum-wage legislation. The effects of passage of this amendment on the New England economy would be serious indeed, and especially for textiles, shoes, jewelry, electrical supplies, and apparel.

It is important that New England mobilize to fight this amendment. I am glad that the Herald realizes the importance of the issue. But the Herald gives too much credit to the business spokesmen. I have it on excellent authority that it is the failure of business spokesmen to express their opposition as well as in some instances their positive endorsement, which in part account for the failure to reject the Fulbright amendment. Mr. William Sullivan, of the National Association of Cotton Manufacturers, is the only business spokesman of New England interests known to me who has fought

energetically to kill the Fulbright amendment, and he has done a fine job.

Our committee has alerted New England Congressmen, Governors as well as other Northern Congressmen, and others. We have issued two memoranda explaining the issues to our Congressmen. Senators LODGE and SALTONSTALL have now vigorously attacked the amendment. Governor DEVER has also intervened. Undoubtedly other Congressmen and Governors are interested. Senator BENTON had to fight the amendment (a rider to the Defense Production Act) in the Banking and Currency Committee almost single-handed; and by one vote a Southern coalition and a few others thwarted the attempt to transfer the issue to the Labor Committee where it belonged, and where it would probably not have received sympathetic consideration.

It will require a concerted effort by all New England interests to save the minimum wage legislation. And they must act quickly. According to the best information available, the origin of this legislation has been an attempt of a large electrical company to get Senator FULBRIGHT to intervene in order that it might establish a plant in Arkansas to exploit cheap labor. Minimum-wage legislation is an obstacle to the exploitation of cheap labor. But the well-organized southern congressional bloc, spearheaded by Senator MAYBANK, chairman of the Senate Banking and Currency Committee, is behind FULBRIGHT, for they see in minimum wages an attempt on the part of the North to keep from the South its rightful share of industry.

A weakening of minimum wages at this point would be especially costly to the New England textile industry where much excess capacity, a depression in the industry, and the weakening of trade unionism in the South, greatly increase the pressure to reduce wages, and therefore to increase cost differentials—now at record levels.

SEYMOUR E. HARRIS,

Chairman, Committee on the New England Textile Industry (Appointed by the Conference of New England Governors).

BOSTON.

ADJOURNMENT OVER

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet on Monday next.

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

There was no objection.

CALENDAR WEDNESDAY

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that business in order on Calendar Wednesday next week be dispensed with.

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

There was no objection.

ANNUAL REPORT OF CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 281)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read and together with the accompany-

ing papers referred to the Committee on Post Office and the Civil Service, and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

I am transmitting herewith the annual report of the Civil Service Commission for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1951.

Our national defense effort has necessitated a rapid, temporary expansion in Federal employment, particularly in the three military departments. Adapting the civil-service system to meet these emergency conditions has involved many difficult problems. Nevertheless, I directed that the temporary expansion of the civil service be accomplished, to the maximum extent possible, on the basis of open competitive examinations. I am pleased that the Civil Service Commission has performed a highly creditable job in this regard, although I am most desirous that the method of making appointments through the competitive merit system be strengthened and extended as rapidly as conditions permit.

In meeting the urgent personnel needs of the Federal service, the Civil Service Commission has drawn increasingly upon women, older workers, and the physically handicapped. I am glad to note, too, that veterans constituted approximately 50 percent of the placements made during the last fiscal year.

With respect to the legislative recommendations contained in the Commission's annual report, I should like to call attention to some of the measures which will be of especial value in strengthening the civil-service system.

1. The Senate has already approved S. 1135, Eighty-second Congress, the proposed Federal Personnel Recruitment Act, providing for modernization of examining and recruitment procedures. I am hopeful that the House of Representatives will give favorable consideration to this legislation.

2. I have repeatedly recommended to the Congress the elimination of the requirement for Presidential appointment and Senate confirmation of postmasters. This recommendation is carried forward in Reorganization Plan No. 2 of 1952, which is now before the Congress. In addition, Reorganization Plans Nos. 3 and 4 of 1952 will bring customs officials and United States marshals into the competitive service. Approval of these three reorganization plans will do much to strengthen our civil-service merit system.

3. Operating experience under the Classification Act of 1949 has demonstrated a need for a larger number of positions in grades 16, 17 and 18 of the general schedule. Existing limitations on the number of positions for these grades have constituted a serious administrative problem. I again urge the Congress to take action to relieve this situation.

4. As a step toward improving the efficiency of the Federal service, the Congress should provide authority for Government agencies to assign selected personnel to educational institutions and other organizations for professional and technical training.

5. Unemployment compensation coverage should be extended to include Fed-

eral employees. This is particularly important in view of the provisions for reduction of annual leave benefits which have been enacted into law during the past year.

While these legislative recommendations are of considerable importance, there are many other areas in which the Congress and the executive branch must work together to improve the efficiency and character of the civil service. Through our mutual efforts, I am sure we will continue to solve the many complex problems involved in securing and retaining the best qualified personnel to conduct the public business.

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

THE WHITE HOUSE, May 23, 1952.

COMPENSATION AND PENSIONS FOR VETERANS AND THEIR DEPENDENTS—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 473)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read and together with the accompanying papers referred to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

I have today approved H. R. 4387, to increase the annual income limitations governing the payment of pension to certain veterans and their dependents, and H. R. 4394, to provide certain increases in the monthly rates of compensation and pension payable to veterans and their dependents, and for other purposes. These are companion bills designed to provide for veterans and members of their families a financial offset to rises in the cost of living. The bills are applicable to those who draw compensation for service-connected disability and to those who are on the pension rolls as a result of non-service-connected disabilities.

H. R. 4387 has been justified primarily on the ground that the income limitations now governing eligibility for non-service-connected pensions have not been raised since the 1930's when the present limits were established. I agree that the cost of living has risen markedly since these limits of \$1,000 in the case of a veteran without dependents, and \$2,500 in the case of a veteran with dependents were established, but it is only with great reluctance that I have signed this measure. I would not have done so if there were available any other practical means of lessening economic pressures upon those veterans and their dependents who have come to rely on pensions as their chief means of support.

Basically, I believe that H. R. 4387 and those provisions of H. R. 4394 which pertain to non-service-connected pensions are bad legislation from the point of view of our long-run objectives. Their enactment will give still another excuse to defer facing up to a difficult decision which we must make in the course of a relatively few years.

There was no social-security system when the veterans pension laws were

passed. When the social-security law was enacted in 1935, the world was at peace and the fact that we were establishing a basic economic security system alongside the existing benefit program for veterans seemed comparatively unimportant. Little attention was paid to the 839,000 cases receiving pensions and compensation from the Veterans' Administration in 1935, and since then no major steps have been taken to integrate and relate the two systems of benefits.

I have pointed out several times in the past my belief that our first obligation to our veterans is to care for those who have disabilities resulting directly from their service to their country. Financial assistance to veterans with non-service-connected disabilities, on the other hand, should be put as soon as possible on the same basis as financial assistance payable to the nonveterans of our population.

World War II left us with over 19,000,000 veterans. World events since then meant that hundreds of thousands more will be added each year. At the same time, we have expanded and perfected our social-security laws so that they now protect most of our people. The consequences are obvious. Thousands upon thousands of veterans and their families have entitlement to Government payments under both laws. This is confusing, wasteful, and, to many people, hard to understand.

Within the next few decades, the relaxation of eligibility standards for pensions under H. R. 4387 will cost over \$200,000,000 a year. The increase in non-service-connected pension rates under H. R. 4394 will also cost about \$200,000,000 a year ultimately. Neither of these estimates takes in account the large increase in the veterans' population which appears certain. These cost factors, as well as the inequities of present duplication in benefits, make it clear that this is a national problem to which the Congress should give thorough study.

I strongly urge the Congress to authorize at this session a complete study of our veterans benefit programs and their relationships with our social insurance and other general welfare programs. I assure the Congress that it will have the full support and assistance of the executive branch in making such a study.

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

THE WHITE HOUSE, May 23, 1952.

SPECIAL ORDER

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the previous order of the House, the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. PERKINS] is recognized for 10 minutes.

IMPROVEMENTS NECESSARY IN THE SOCIAL-SECURITY LAW

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, last Monday I supported H. R. 7800, the social-security bill up for a vote in the House of Representatives. I have felt for some time that many improvements are necessary in our social-security law and should be made at the earliest possible

date. However, many of those improvements will require further study by the committee.

Mr. Speaker, all of the changes provided for in H. R. 7800 are within the scope of studies made by the appropriate committees during the Eighty-first Congress. This bill does not embrace any new subject matter not heretofore thoroughly studied by the Ways and Means Committee during the Eighty-first Congress. In fact, H. R. 7800 may well have included the disability provision passed by the House in 1949 and removed from the bill by the Senate in 1950.

I supported this legislation because it proposed to make some much-needed improvements in our social-security system, and improvements that are urgently and immediately needed. I am hopeful that this legislation will be brought back to the floor of the House for a vote at an early date.

Mr. Speaker, this social-security legislation that was defeated here last Monday gives a little lift, and it is really a little lift, to the people in this country who need it most—the aged, widows with children, the blind, the totally and permanently disabled, the men and women who have left the labor market to enter our Armed Forces. If we are to aid these people at this session of Congress, this legislation cannot be brought back to the floor too quickly.

No useful purpose can be served by reiterating what took place here last Monday evening, because the record speaks for itself. This legislation, as clearly spelled out in the bill, sought to accomplish numerous improvements in our present law:

First. It would add at least \$5 per month to the 4,400,000 benefit checks now being paid under old-age and survivors insurance.

Second. It would increase the ceiling on earned income allowed those persons now receiving benefits from \$50 to \$70 per month.

Third. It would cover members of the Armed Forces enrolled since the conflict started in Korea in the same way that World War II veterans were protected.

Fourth. It would freeze the rights of workers during periods of total and permanent disability so that they would not lose benefit rights because of their disability.

Fifth. It would liberalize the 1950 provisions covering employees of State and local governments.

Sixth. It would make it easier for blind persons to improve their family's condition by earning outside income.

Someone may ask, Why should we increase the benefits under old-age and survivors insurance by around \$5 or \$6 per month at this time? Ask the 4,400,000 people who are receiving these benefits today in amounts—do not forget—averaging only \$42 per month. Ask the 69,429 people in Kentucky who are trying to exist on those benefits, and remember that of this number 29,419 are aged workers, 9,218 are their aged wives, and 4,367 are their widows. Consider how the 4,367 young widows of covered workers in Kentucky and their surviving children—21,391 in number—will wel-

come this small but important increase in their ability to exist. It is common knowledge that the increase in the cost of living has worked a special hardship on these people. Are we going to fail to make this necessary adjustment? For my own part, I do not think the provisions of the bill are generous enough. But the fact that it will add at least \$5 to every one of those benefit checks is one of the main reasons why I strongly support H. R. 7800.

And why should we increase the ceiling on the retirement test from \$50 to \$70 at a time like this? First of all, ask the man or woman who has lost his benefit check for a month because, during that period, he earned more than \$50 in covered employment. The major objection to any retirement test is that it has the effect, too often, of penalizing people for finding part-time work, and discourages thrift. World War II gave older workers a chance to demonstrate just how much they can contribute to the national welfare through full- or part-time jobs. We know that men and women 55 and over formed one-fifth of the labor force in 1944, at a time when we greatly needed them. We know that most workers want to continue working after they retire, even though their earnings are small. We know that they need the chance to supplement their meager benefit checks with outside income in order to adjust themselves to the high cost of living. Let us not permit any law to reduce total income because of work.

Why, too, should the Congress provide that the rights of workers who have the misfortune of becoming totally and permanently disabled be protected? Ask the man who, through no fault of his own, has become completely and totally disabled—say at the age of 45. Or ask his wife and children. As the law now is written, he also surrenders all right to maintain his wage record under old-age and survivors insurance, with the result that his benefit—which is figured for the full years of working life to age 65—is always reduced. Too frequently it disappears altogether.

Representative KEAN in his statement before the House stated, and I quote from page 5473 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of May 19:

Under the present law, suppose a worker aged 35 in 1951 becomes permanently and totally disabled after having worked 10 years in covered employment at a yearly average wage of \$2,400. By the time he reaches retirement age—65—his total wages spread over a period of 30 years—20 of them without any earnings—will yield an average of \$800 rather than \$2,400 per year, and his primary old-age insurance benefit would drop from \$65 to \$33 a month.

Congressman KEAN further stated:

This is manifestly unfair and this bill, among its other provisions, would provide that the equity the worker built up before becoming disabled should be protected by freezing his wage record. This proposal would make \$2,400 his average income so that he will receive a \$65 benefit when he reaches the retirement age, instead of \$33 which he would receive under the present law. This provision corresponds to the "waiver of premium" provision used by 119 private life insurance companies, most of them for more than a third of a century.

I have always been interested in the inequity in our existing system. Traveling through the district I represent in eastern Kentucky, you will see hundreds of miners permanently and totally disabled, and in most instances their workman's compensation runs out when the need therefor is the greatest. My bill, H. R. 3921, offers even better protection for such unfortunate workers and their families than those contained in H. R. 7800. I urge the Congress not only to pass the provision contained in H. R. 7800, but to improve it by providing cash income for those families in the form of benefits in the manner which my bill proposes.

We cannot overlook the fact that insurance companies themselves provide a "waiver of premium clause" which amounts to the same kind of protection offered in this bill. It seems to me that the Congress should not any longer delay sound and equitable legislation for the benefit of the unhappy victims of the disaster of disability.

H. R. 7800 makes possible that employees of State and local governments now excluded from coverage under old-age and survivors insurance because they have their own retirement plan, should have that right of coverage if they want it. The bill provides, with certain exceptions, these State and local employees can be covered by old-age and survivors insurance if they demonstrate by a two-thirds vote that they wish such coverage and if their employer agrees.

Mr. Speaker, the amendment that we passed during the eighty-first session of Congress provided that all veterans who served in the armed forces in World War II should get wage credits of \$160 per month so that they would not be discriminated against in comparison with those who stayed home and worked in covered employment. H. R. 7800 proposed to give the same benefits to the Korean war veterans. There cannot be any logical reason why those who have served in the present emergency should not receive similar treatment.

This bill provides for similar wage credits that were extended to World War II veterans. Certainly, all personnel who are now serving their country are entitled to such credits while they are away from their peacetime jobs.

Mr. Speaker, these are some of the reasons why I am so firmly convinced that the improvements which this bill would make in our social-security system are vitally necessary and should be made before the Eighty-second Congress adjourns. In fact, there are many other improvements not embodied in H. R. 7800 that should be made before the closing of this session. If this legislation, or similar legislation, is brought back to the floor at an early date for a vote in order that we may aid the men, women, and children who need it most, we will be rendering much service to our great country.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the Appendix of the

XCVIII—373

RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. FINE and to include a report.

Mr. LANE in two instances, in each to include extraneous matter.

Mr. SIEMINSKI.

Mr. CANFIELD and to include an address by Secretary of the Army Pace.

Mr. ROOSEVELT immediately following the remarks of Mr. JAVITS.

Mr. HOWELL in two instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. REECE of Tennessee.

Mr. EBERHARTER, to revise and extend his remarks made in Committee of the Whole.

Mr. BENTSEN.

Mr. GRANT (at the request of Mr. PRIEST).

Mr. BURTON and to include a letter he received from a constituent.

Mr. SCHENCK and to include a report from FHA.

Mr. JAVITS to revise and extend remarks he made in the Committee of the Whole, and include extraneous matter.

Mr. TOLLEFSON (at the request of Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts) and to include an editorial.

Mr. SHAFER (at the request of Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts) and to include a newspaper excerpt, notwithstanding the fact that it is estimated by the Public Printer to cost \$273.

Mr. MILLER of New York (at the request of Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts) in three instances and to include excerpts from newspapers.

Mr. DONOHUE (at the request of Mr. McCORMACK) to extend his remarks in Committee of the Whole before the vote on the amendment offered by Mr. CHATHAM.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and to include a splendid address recently made by our distinguished colleague from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY].

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

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and to include a fine address recently made by William H. Taylor, of Boston, before the student body of South Boston High School, notwithstanding that it is estimated by the Public Printer to cost \$210.

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

There was no objection.

SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION REFERRED

A joint resolution of the Senate of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. J. Res. 156. Joint resolution to continue the effectiveness of certain statutory provisions until June 15, 1952; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. CARNAHAN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 6 o'clock and 36 minutes p. m.) the House, under its previous order, adjourned until Monday, May 26, 1952, 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:

1462. A letter from the Chairman, United States Motor Carrier Claims Commission, transmitting the report on the claim of Arkansas Motor Freight Lines, Inc., against the United States, pursuant to section 10 of the Motor Carrier Claims Commission Act of July 2, 1948 (62 Stat. 1222; 49 U. S. C. 305 note), as amended; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1463. A letter from the Chairman, United States Motor Carrier Claims Commission, transmitting the report on the claim of Walter H. Schumacher, doing business as Schumacher Motor Express, against the United States, pursuant to section 10 of the Motor Carrier Claims Commission Act of July 2, 1948 (62 Stat. 1222; 49 U. S. C. 305 note), as amended; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1464. A letter from the Chairman, United States Motor Carrier Claims Commission, transmitting the report on the claim of Samuel Shapiro, surviving partner of Louis M. Shapiro and Samuel Shapiro, a partnership, doing business as Hennepin Transportation Co., against the United States, pursuant to section 10 of the Motor Carrier Claims Commission Act of July 2, 1948 (62 Stat. 1222; 49 U. S. C. 305 note), as amended; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1465. A letter from the Chairman, United States Motor Carrier Claims Commission, transmitting the report on the claim of Harry E. Reynolds, as surviving partner of Harry E. Reynolds, and Norman Nold, a partnership, doing business as Tri-State Transportation Co., against the United States, pursuant to section 10 of the Motor Carrier Claims Commission Act of July 2, 1948 (62 Stat. 1222; 49 U. S. C. 305 note), as amended; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1466. A letter from the Chairman, United States Motor Carrier Claims Commission, transmitting the report on the claim of Witte Transportation Co., a corporation, against the United States, pursuant to section 10 of the Motor Carrier Claims Commission Act of July 2, 1948 (62 Stat. 1222; 49 U. S. C. 305 note), as amended; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1467. A letter from the Chairman, United States Motor Carrier Claims Commission, transmitting the report on the claim of Glendenning Motorways, Inc., against the United States, pursuant to section 10 of the Motor Carrier Claims Commission Act of July 2, 1948 (62 Stat. 1222; 49 U. S. C. 305 note), as amended; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1468. A letter from the Chairman, United States Motor Carrier Claims Commission, transmitting the report on the claim of Roland H. Kinney, doing business as Mohawk Freight Lines, against the United States, pursuant to section 10 of the Motor Carrier Claims Commission Act of July 2, 1948 (62 Stat. 1222; 49 U. S. C. 305 note), as amended; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1469. A letter from the Chairman, United States Motor Carrier Claims Commission, transmitting the report on the claim of Des Moines Transportation Co., Inc., against the

Bruce Motor Freight, Inc., against the United States, pursuant to section 10 of the Motor Carrier Claims Commission Act of July 2, 1948 (62 Stat. 1222; 49 U. S. C. 305 note), as amended; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1500. A letter from the Chairman, United States Motor Carrier Claims Commission, transmitting the report on the claim of Consolidated Freightways, Inc., against the United States pursuant to section 10 of the Motor Carrier Claims Commission Act of July 2, 1948 (62 Stat. 1222; 49 U. S. C. 305 note), as amended; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1501. A letter from the Chairman, United States Motor Carrier Claims Commission, transmitting the report on the claim of Hawkeye Motor Express, Inc., against the United States, pursuant to section 10 of the Motor Carrier Claims Commission Act of July 2, 1948 (62 Stat. 1222; 49 U. S. C. 305 note), as amended; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1502. A letter from the Chairman, United States Motor Carrier Claims Commission, transmitting the report on the claim of the Chief Freight Lines Co. against the United States, pursuant to section 10 of the Motor Carrier Claims Commission Act of July 2, 1948 (62 Stat. 1222; 49 U. S. C. 305 note), as amended; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1503. A letter from the Chairman, United States Motor Carrier Claims Commission, transmitting the report on the claim of Harry Hess, doing business as Hess Motor Express, against the United States, pursuant to section 10 of the Motor Carrier Claims Commission Act of July 2, 1948 (62 Stat. 1222; 49 U. S. C. 305 note), as amended; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1504. A letter from the Chairman, United States Motor Carrier Claims Commission, transmitting the report on the claim of Howard Moland, Clarence Moland, Lothard Moland, and H. T. Moland, partnership, doing business as Moland Bros. Trucking Co., against the United States, pursuant to section 10 of the Motor Carrier Claims Commission Act of July 2, 1948 (62 Stat. 1222; 49 U. S. C. 305 note), as amended; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1505. A letter from the Chairman, United States Motor Carrier Claims Commission, transmitting the report on the claim of Denver Chicago Trucking Co., Inc., against the United States, pursuant to section 10 of the Motor Carrier Claims Commission Act of July 2, 1948 (62 Stat. 1222; 49 U. S. C. 305 note), as amended; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1506. A letter from the Chairman, United States Motor Carrier Claims Commission, transmitting the report on the claim of On-Time Transfer Co., a corporation, against the United States, pursuant to section 10 of the Motor Carrier Claims Commission Act of July 2, 1948 (62 Stat. 1222; 49 U. S. C. 305 note), as amended; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1507. A letter from the Chairman, United States Motor Carrier Claims Commission, transmitting the report on the claim of Murphy Motor Freight Lines, Inc., against the United States, pursuant to section 10 of the Motor Carrier Claims Commission Act of July 2, 1948 (62 Stat. 1222; 49 U. S. C. 305 note), as amended; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1508. A letter from the Chairman, United States Motor Carrier Claims Commission, transmitting the report on the claim of B. F. Iles, R. A. Brown, H. E. McKinney, doing business as Meadows Transfer Co., successors to Meadows Transfer, Inc., against the United States, pursuant to section 10 of the Motor Carrier Claims Commission Act of July 2, 1948 (62 Stat. 1222; 49 U. S. C. 305 note), as amended; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1509. A letter from the Chairman, United States Motor Carrier Claims Commission,

transmitting the report on the claim of Commercial Freight Lines, Inc., against the United States, pursuant to section 10 of the Motor Carrier Claims Commission Act of July 2, 1948 (62 Stat. 1222; 49 U. S. C. 305 note), as amended; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1510. A letter from the Chairman, United States Motor Carrier Claims Commission, transmitting the report on the claim of G. & P. Transportation Co., Inc., against the United States, pursuant to section 10 of the Motor Carrier Claims Commission Act of July 2, 1948 (62 Stat. 1222; 49 U. S. C. 305 note), as amended; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1511. A letter from the Chairman, United States Motor Carrier Claims Commission, transmitting the report on the claim of Matthew Leo McKeone, doing business as Red Ball Transfer Co., against the United States, pursuant to section 10 of the Motor Carrier Claims Commission Act of July 2, 1948 (62 Stat. 1222; 49 U. S. C. 305 note), as amended; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1512. A letter from the Chairman, United States Motor Carrier Claims Commission, transmitting the report on the claim of Bos Freight Lines, Inc., against the United States, pursuant to section 10 of the Motor Carrier Claims Commission Act of July 2, 1948 (62 Stat. 1222; 49 U. S. C. 305 note), as amended; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1513. A letter from the Chairman, United States Motor Carrier Claims Commission, transmitting the report on the claim of Riss & Co., Inc., against the United States, pursuant to section 10 of the Motor Carrier Claims Commission Act of July 2, 1948 (62 Stat. 1222; 49 U. S. C. 305 note), as amended; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1514. A letter from the Chairman, United States Motor Carrier Claims Commission, transmitting the report on the claim of Floyd Green, Lena Green, and Herbert Jacobs, trustees for liquidation purposes of Ash Truck Lines, Inc., against the United States, pursuant to section 10 of the Motor Carrier Claims Commission Act of July 2, 1948 (62 Stat. 1222; 49 U. S. C. 305 note), as amended; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1515. A letter from the Chairman, United States Motor Carrier Claims Commission, transmitting the report on the claim of Union Transfer Co., a corporation, doing business as Union Freightways, against the United States, pursuant to section 10 of the Motor Carrier Claims Commission Act of July 2, 1948 (62 Stat. 1222; 49 U. S. C. 305 note), as amended; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1516. A letter from the Chairman, United States Motor Carrier Claims Commission, transmitting the report on the claim of Brashear Freight Lines, Inc., against the United States, pursuant to section 10 of the Motor Carrier Claims Commission Act of July 2, 1948 (62 Stat. 1222; 49 U. S. C. 305 note), as amended; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1517. A letter from the Chairman, United States Motor Carrier Claims Commission, transmitting the report on the claim of Eugene Pikovsky, special administrator of the estate of Hyman Pikovsky, deceased, against the United States, pursuant to section 10 of the Motor Carrier Claims Commission Act of July 2, 1948 (62 Stat. 1222; 49 U. S. C. 305 note), as amended; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1518. A letter from the Chairman, United States Motor Carrier Claims Commission, transmitting the report on the claim of Brady Transfer & Storage Co., Inc., a corporation, Fort Dodge, Iowa, against the United States, pursuant to section 10 of the Motor Carrier Claims Commission Act of July 2, 1948 (62 Stat. 1222; 49 U. S. C. 305 note), as amended; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1519. A letter from the Chairman, United States Motor Carrier Claims Commission,

transmitting the report on the claim of Urban J. Haas and Cyril H. Wissel, doing business as H. & W. Motor Express Co., against the United States, pursuant to section 10 of the Motor Carrier Claims Commission Act of July 2, 1948 (62 Stat. 1222; 49 U. S. C. 305 note), as amended; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1520. A letter from the Chairman, United States Motor Carrier Claims Commission, transmitting the report on the claim of Walter Petersen, doing business as Nielsen and Petersen, against the United States, pursuant to section 10 of the Motor Carrier Claims Commission Act of July 2, 1948 (62 Stat. 1222; 49 U. S. C. 305 note), as amended; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1521. A letter from the Chairman, United States Motor Carrier Claims Commission, transmitting the report on the claim of Frank H. Prucka, doing business as Frank H. Prucka Transportation Co., against the United States, pursuant to section 10 of the Motor Carrier Claims Commission Act of July 2, 1948 (62 Stat. 1222; 49 U. S. C. 305 note), as amended; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1522. A letter from the Chairman, United States Motor Carrier Claims Commission, transmitting the report on the claim of Bos Truck Lines, Inc., against the United States, pursuant to section 10 of the Motor Carrier Claims Commission Act of July 2, 1948 (62 Stat. 1222; 49 U. S. C. 305 note), as amended; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1523. A letter from the Chairman, United States Motor Carrier Claims Commission, transmitting the report on the claim of Tri-State Motor Transport, Inc., against the United States, pursuant to section 10 of the Motor Carrier Claims Commission Act of July 2, 1948 (62 Stat. 1222; 49 U. S. C. 305 note), as amended; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1524. A letter from the Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting a draft of legislation entitled, "A bill relating to burley tobacco farm acreage allotments under the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended"; to the Committee on Agriculture.

1525. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting the report on the audit of the Federal Maritime Board and the Maritime Administration, Department of Commerce, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1951, pursuant to section 207 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936 (46 U. S. C. 1117) (H. Doc. No. 472); to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, and ordered to be printed.

1526. A letter from the Chief Commissioner, Indian Claims Commission, transmitting a letter stating that proceedings have been concluded with respect to the claim of *Menominee Tribe of Indians, petitioner, v. United States of America, defendant* (Docket No. 129), pursuant to section 21 of the Indian Claims Commission Act of August 13, 1946 (60 Stat. 959; 25 U. S. C. 70); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

1527. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting the annual report of the Federal Bureau of Narcotics, prepared by the Commissioner of Narcotics, for the calendar year ended December 31, 1951, pursuant to section 1 of the act of June 14, 1930; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1528. A letter from the Acting President, Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia, transmitting a draft of a joint resolution entitled "A joint resolution authorizing the District of Columbia to enter into interstate civil defense compacts"; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

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. LANTAFF: Committee on Post Office and Civil Service. H. R. 7877. A bill to amend section 1699 of title 18 of the United States Code, relating to the unloading of mail from vessels; without amendment (Rept. No. 1993). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. DAWSON: Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments. Sixteenth Intermediate Report of the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, entitled "Federal Supply Management (Overseas Survey)"; (Rept. No. 1994). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. MURDOCK: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. House Concurrent Resolution 214. Concurrent resolution to commend Mr. and Mrs. Donald D. Dunn, from the State of Washington, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1992). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BAKEWELL:

H. R. 7968. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, section 3182, relating to extradition of fugitives from State or Territory to State, District, or Territory; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ENGLE:

H. R. 7969. A bill granting jurisdiction to the Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon certain claims; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MANSFIELD:

H. R. 7970. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, to authorize lump-sum payments in lieu of annuities to certain widows of officers and employees to whom such act applies; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. MORRISON:

H. R. 7971. A bill to amend section 8 of the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 7972. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. BROOKS:

H. R. 7973. A bill to provide additional pay for combat duty performed by members of the uniformed services in Korea, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. BURNSIDE:

H. R. 7974. A bill to provide increased annuities to certain civilian officials and employees who performed service in the construction of the Panama Canal, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. LYLE:

H. R. 7975. A bill to amend section 112 (f) of the Internal Revenue Code to provide that the sale of cattle necessitated by drought conditions shall be deemed an involuntary conversion of property; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. RIVERS:

H. R. 7976. A bill to amend the Career Compensation Act of 1949, as amended, to extend the application of the special-inducement pay provided thereby to doctors and dentists, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. SIKES:

H. R. 7977. A bill providing for a preliminary examination and survey to determine need for addition to channel in Pensacola Harbor, Fla.; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. VAN ZANDT:

H. R. 7978. A bill to authorize the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to furnish space and facilities, if available, to full-time representatives of certain recognized State organizations; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. RANKIN (by request):

H. R. 7979. A bill to allow certain persons who served in the Armed Forces on and after June 27, 1950, and prior to a date to be determined by Presidential proclamation or congressional concurrent resolution, to purchase and pursue courses of the United States Armed Forces Institute after discharge or release from active duty; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. ROGERS of Colorado:

H. R. 7980. A bill to provide that the tax on admissions shall not apply to admissions to athletic games and certain other events, where the proceeds inure exclusively to the benefit of a community chest; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. RANKIN:

H. J. Res. 462. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to the making of treaties and executive agreements; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi:

H. J. Res. 463. Joint resolution providing that the United States shall give no further financial support to the United Nations until the other member nations are contributing at least one-half of the men and matériel required to prosecute the Korean hostilities; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By Mr. CANFIELD: Joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of New Jersey memorializing Congress to return to the State of New Jersey and other States sufficient moneys from taxes raised in the various States for the administration of employment security and to provide adequately for administration of the employment security program in the State of New Jersey and the other States; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. CURTIS of Nebraska:

H. R. 7981. A bill for the relief of Don B. Whelan; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DONOHUE:

H. R. 7982. A bill for the relief of Danica Maria Vavrova; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 7983. A bill for the relief of Edmund Stevens, Jr.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JACKSON of Washington:

H. R. 7984. A bill for the relief of John Southas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MANSFIELD:

H. R. 7985. A bill for the relief of Sister Louise Marie Josephine Belloir; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 7986. A bill for the relief of Sister Jeanne Maria Henneth Langlo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LATHAM:

H. R. 7987. A bill for the relief of Pasquale Di Scala; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HUGH D. SCOTT, JR.:

H. R. 7988. A bill for the relief of Margarete Dillinger and Gudrund Dillinger; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. THOMPSON of Texas:

H. R. 7989. A bill for the relief of Sato Hamako; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SENATE

MONDAY, MAY 26, 1952

(Legislative day of Monday, May 12, 1952)

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:

O Thou God who art the hope of all the ends of the earth: Amid the tragedy of a broken world, at noonday facing the tasks of a new week, in deep humility of spirit we would ascend the altar stairs of this hallowed shrine of our faith in spiritual verities. Before we talk of the Nation's good we would lift our needy hearts to the Nation's God, for in Thee we trust.

Grant unto us that greatness of vision which shall match the vast patterns of this creative day. Save us from setting narrow limits upon our responsibility to our fellow men. May no pettiness in our patriotism rob us of the ruling passion to sacrifice all for the common good. May we never hesitate when the choice is between honor and self-interest. Bring us, we pray Thee, to an enduring peace, when justice shall roll down like the waters and righteousness as a mighty stream. We ask it in that Name above every name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. McFARLAND, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Friday, May 26, 1952, was dispensed with.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Snader, its assistant reading clerk, informed the Senate that in accordance with the request contained in Senate Resolution 316, Eighty-second Congress, the Clerk of the House had directed the file clerk of the House to grant permission to the Subcommittee on Privileges and Elections of the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, or its counsel, to examine the records of the Joint Committee on Housing of the Eightieth Congress.

The message announced that the House had passed a bill (H. R. 7005) to