

LEGISLATIVE HISTORY
OF THE
COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS
UNITED STATES SENATE
EIGHTY-SECOND CONGRESS



PRESENTED BY MR. CONNALLY

JULY 2 (legislative day, JUNE 27), 1952.—Ordered to be printed

UNITED STATES
GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE
WASHINGTON : 1952

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

TOM CONNALLY, Texas, *Chairman*

WALTER F. GEORGE, Georgia

THEODORE FRANCIS GREEN, Rhode Island

BRIEN McMAHON, Connecticut

J. WILLIAM FULBRIGHT, Arkansas

JOHN J. SPARKMAN, Alabama

GUY M. GILLETTE, Iowa

ALEXANDER WILEY, Wisconsin

H. ALEXANDER SMITH, New Jersey

BOURKE B. HICKENLOOPER, Iowa

HENRY CABOT LODGE, Jr., Massachusetts

CHARLES W. TOBEY, New Hampshire

OWEN BREWSTER, Maine

FRANCIS O. WILCOX, *Chief of Staff*

THORSTEN V. KALIJARVI, *Staff Associate*

CARL M. MARCY, *Staff Associate*

C. C. O'DAY, *Clerk*

PAT M. HOLT, *Associate Clerk*

EMMETT M. O'GRADY, *Assistant Clerk*

MORELLA R. HANSEN, *Assistant Clerk*

MARY PROCTOR, *Assistant Clerk*

NANCY HANSCHMAN, *Assistant Clerk*

JUNE C. PITTS, *Assistant Clerk*

EXTRACT FROM PUBLIC LAW 601, SEVENTY-NINTH CONGRESS

"(i) Committee on Foreign Relations, to consist of 13 Senators, to which committee shall be referred all proposed legislation, messages, petitions, memorials, and other matters relating to the following subjects:

- "1. Relations of the United States with foreign nations generally.
- "2. Treaties.
- "3. Establishment of boundary lines between the United States and foreign nations.
- "4. Protection of American citizens abroad and expatriation.
- "5. Neutrality.
- "6. International conferences and congresses.
- "7. The American National Red Cross.
- "8. Intervention abroad and declarations of war.
- "9. Measures relating to the diplomatic service.
- "10. Acquisition of land and buildings for embassies and legations in foreign countries.
- "11. Measures to foster commercial intercourse with foreign nations and to safeguard American business interests abroad.
- "12. United Nations Organization and international financial and monetary organizations.
- "13. Foreign loans."

INTRODUCTORY NOTE

Since the passage of the Congressional Reorganization Act, the staff of the Foreign Relations Committee has regularly prepared a survey of the work of the committee at the conclusion of each session of the Congress. These reports portray in broad outlines the various activities of the committee including the bills, resolutions and treaties acted upon, the nominations considered and the organizational developments that have taken place during the preceding 2-year period. I believe that this report, like the others, will prove helpful to the Members of the Senate and their staffs, as well as to many others interested in foreign relations. In the heavy work load the committee carried during the Eighty-second Congress is reflected once more the increasingly important role which the Senate and the Congress as a whole are playing in the conduct of foreign policy.

TOM CONNALLY, *Chairman.*

CONTENTS

	Page
A. Summary.....	1
B. Security through strength.....	4
1. Mutual Security Act of 1951.....	6
2. Mutual Security Act of 1952.....	12
3. Mutual Defense Assistance Control Act of 1951 (Battle Act).....	17
4. Greek-Turkish Protocol.....	19
5. The NATO-EDC Protocol and the three treaties relating to security in the Pacific.....	20
6. Troops to Europe.....	21
7. Commission To Study Relations Between the United States and NATO.....	23
C. Peace settlements.....	24
8. Termination of war with Germany.....	25
9. Contractual agreements with Germany and the EDC Protocol.....	25
10. The Japanese Peace Treaty and other treaties relating to security in the Pacific.....	28
11. North Pacific Fisheries Convention.....	34
D. Welfare matters.....	34
12. India Emergency Food Aid Act of 1951.....	35
13. United Nations International Children's Emergency Fund.....	36
14. American relief for Korea.....	37
E. Freedom of information.....	37
15. William N. Oatis.....	38
16. The McMahon resolution reaffirming friendship for all peoples of the world, including the peoples of the Soviet Union.....	38
F. International fairs and conferences.....	40
17. Chicago International Trade Fair.....	40
18. New Orleans International Trade Fair and Inter-American Cultural and Trade Center.....	40
19. World Metallurgical Congress.....	41
20. Invitation of the Council of Europe.....	41
21. Commonwealth Parliamentary Association.....	43
G. The Department of State.....	43
22. Foreign Service annuities.....	44
23. Annuities for Foreign Service widows.....	44
24. Amending the Foreign Service Buildings Act of 1926.....	45
25. Foreign information programs.....	46
26. Continuance of Herve J. L'Heureux as Chief of Visa Division.....	46
H. Commercial and financial matters: Bilateral treaties.....	46
27. Double taxation conventions.....	47
28. Consular conventions.....	49
29. Commercial treaties.....	50
I. Commercial and financial matters: International conventions.....	51
30. Protocols to the International Convention on the Regulation of the Production and Marketing of Sugar.....	51
31. International Labor Conventions.....	52
32. Amendment to International Load-Line Convention.....	52
J. Western Hemisphere problems.....	53
33. Privileges and immunities for the Council of the Organization of American States.....	53
34. Northeastern Forest Fire Compact.....	54
35. Radio convention with Canada.....	54
36. St. Lawrence seaway and power project.....	55
37. Supplementary extradition treaty with Canada.....	55
38. Promotion of safety on the Great Lakes by means of radio.....	57
39. Highway convention with Panama.....	57
40. Nogales sanitation project.....	58

	Page
K. Investigation of the military and political situation in the Far East---	58
L. Consultation with the executive branch-----	61
M. Nominations-----	63

APPENDIXES

Appendix I: List of bills and resolutions enacted into law-----	66
Appendix II: Measures reported and passed by Senate but not finally acted upon in House-----	66
Appendix III: Measures reported and passed by House but not finally acted upon in Senate-----	67
Appendix IV: Action on treaties-----	67
Appendix V: Legislative subcommittees-----	69
Appendix VI: Conference committees-----	70
Appendix VII: Special committee prints and documents-----	70

LEGISLATIVE HISTORY

A. SUMMARY

Collective security was the theme of much of the activity of the Foreign Relations Committee during the Eighty-second Congress.

The 2-year period of 1951-52 was one in which existing security arrangements were strengthened and new ones established.

The political face of the world as the Eighty-second Congress adjourned in July 1952 was not greatly different from what it had been when the Congress met in January 1951. These 18 months had been full of turmoil abroad; yet, developments abroad were marked by a growing strength and unity among the free nations, and at home every important foreign-policy measure on which the Senate acted was approved by a large bipartisan vote as noted below.

Summary of votes in Senate on major items of foreign relations

<i>Measure</i>	<i>Senate vote</i>
Connally-Russell Resolution (S. Res. 99)-----	69-21.
Mutual Security Act, 1951-----	61-5.
Mutual Security Act, 1952-----	64-10.
Mutual Defense Assistance Control Act (Battle Act)-----	55-16.
Extension of North Atlantic Treaty to Greece and Turkey----	73-2.
Convention on Relations with Germany-----	77-5.
Extension of North Atlantic Treaty to European Defense Community.	72-5.
Japanese Peace Treaty-----	66-10.
Mutual Defense Treaty with Philippines-----	Voice vote.
Mutual Defense Treaty with Australia, New Zealand-----	Voice vote.
Security Treaty with Japan-----	58-9.

As the Eighty-second Congress convened in January 1951, the Chinese Communists were threatening to drive the United Nations forces off the Korean Peninsula and were putting the principle of collective security to its severest test. As the Eighty-second Congress adjourned in July 1952, one of the Senate's last acts was to ratify the agreements with Germany and with the European Defense Community, agreements which, if properly executed, should mark the greatest advance in hundreds of years toward the unification of Europe and a great boost for collective security.

During these 18 months, the committee had before it more measures relating to national and collective security than during any other comparable postwar period. It had more meetings and spent more hours considering these measures than at any other time since the war.

The committee took three main steps to strengthen and expand existing security arrangements and to clarify the United States' commitments to her partners in the free world.

The first of these steps was the long series of hearings on the question of sending additional divisions of American ground troops to Europe

as a part of the United States contribution to the North Atlantic Treaty Organization armies, which were just coming into being in early 1951 under the command of General Eisenhower. These hearings, in which the Foreign Relations and Armed Services Committees sat jointly, resulted in passage of the Connally-Russell resolution approving the plans of the President to send four more United States divisions to General Eisenhower's command but calling for congressional approval in the event additional ground forces are sent.

The second step was the Mutual Security Program, authorized by the Mutual Security Act of 1951 and continued by the Mutual Security Act of 1952. These acts consolidated and expanded United States foreign-assistance programs, which had been authorized in separate legislation by previous Congresses, and shifted the emphasis from economic to military aid. They marked the end of Marshall-plan aid to Europe and a rapid acceleration in NATO rearmament. During the 2 years, a total of about \$14 billion was authorized for mutual aid, compared with about \$10 billion authorized during the Eighty-first Congress.

These large expenditures abroad, the increasing military emphasis of the program, and particularly the Chinese Communist intervention in Korea, aroused concern that no American assistance should find its way, directly or indirectly, behind the iron curtain and thereby increase the war-making potential of the Soviet Union or its satellites. In an effort to cope with this problem realistically, the Congress passed the Mutual Defense Assistance Control Act of 1951 (the Battle Act), which established certain controls with respect to east-west trade.

The third step in the effort to expand existing security arrangements was the broadening of the North Atlantic defense system to include Greece, Turkey, and Western Germany.

The Eighty-second Congress was also marked by a stepped-up campaign to liquidate the legal and political vestiges of World War II and to transform former enemies into friends and allies. Treaties of peace with Hungary, Bulgaria, Rumania, and Italy had been ratified in the Eightieth Congress, and Italy had been brought into the western defensive alliance through the North Atlantic Treaty approved by the Eighty-first Congress. The Eighty-second Congress ratified a peace treaty with Japan and passed a joint resolution ending the state of war with Germany.

In each case arrangements were made to integrate these former enemy states into the defensive system of the free world. In the Pacific, as a part of the Japanese settlement, the United States entered into mutual defense treaties with Australia and New Zealand and with the Philippines. A bilateral defense treaty was also negotiated with Japan, supplementing the peace treaty.

In Europe, the unilateral declaration terminating the state of war with Germany was followed up by the negotiation of a convention on relations between France, Great Britain, and the United States, on the one hand, and the Federal Republic of Germany, on the other. A significant part of the European settlement was the formation of the European Defense Community (EDC) and an international army. Besides Western Germany, members of the community are Belgium, Luxemburg, the Netherlands, France, and Italy. The EDC and the

North Atlantic Treaty Organization exchanged reciprocal security guaranties of the kind contained in the North Atlantic Treaty.

The problems of collective security, and more particularly of conducting coalition warfare, were also at the heart of the long hearings which the Foreign Relations and Armed Services Committees conducted jointly on the military and political situation in the Far East. The investigation was touched off by the President's recall of Gen. Douglas MacArthur from his Far East commands in April 1951, and by the time it was concluded in the following July it had filled five volumes with testimony. No formal report or other legislative action resulted from the investigation.

Besides these broad trends developing out of the international situation, the committee's record during the Eighty-second Congress is remarkable in several respects which deserve special mention. One of these was the unusual number of treaties approved.

During this Congress, the Senate received 39 treaties which together with the 34 held over from previous Congresses made a total of 73 treaties before the committee. Of these, the Senate gave its advice and consent to the ratification of 39, and consented to the withdrawal of 4 by the President. This record compares to 25 treaties approved by both the Eightieth and Eighty-first Congresses. It is interesting to note that 24 of the treaties approved were bilateral and that 10 others (such as the Japanese Peace Treaty, the German contractual agreements, and the NATO protocols) had among their signatories only nations of the free world. The only treaty approved to which the Soviet Union was a party was the amendment to the International Load-Line Convention. Some of its satellites, however, were signatories to the four International Labor Conventions approved during this Congress.

Notable also was the far-reaching utilization of the consultative subcommittee system established during the Eighty-first Congress and continued during the Eighty-second. Consultation between officials of the Department of State and members of the committee through these seven subcommittees reached a new high both in number of meetings and importance of these meetings. This development, more fully described below, shows a commendable effort on the part of both the legislative and executive branches to shape foreign policy on a partnership basis.

Another notable feature of the committee's record during the Eighty-second Congress was the number of hearings held. The extensive hearings on the "troops to Europe" issue and the situation in the Far East arising out of the dismissal of General MacArthur have already been referred to. In addition, the committee held long hearings on the Mutual Security Acts of 1951 and 1952, the nomination of Philip C. Jessup, as a delegate to the U. N. General Assembly, the St. Lawrence seaway, the Japanese Peace Treaty and related security pacts, the German contractual agreements, and other matters. While the committee during the Eighty-first Congress spent only 70 days in hearings, during the Eighty-second Congress it spent 123 days—almost double the number. These hearings filled 10,010 pages, a new record in the committee's history.

As usual, the committee handled a wide diversity of matters—from North Pacific fisheries to the use of highways in Panama, from

extradition to sanitation, from children to widows, from wheat to sugar. These activities, summarized below, show the wide scope of the international activities of the United States and the responsibilities of the committee.

For the statistical record, the committee had referred to it and took action on fewer measures (excluding treaties already referred to above) than during the previous Congress.

It had on its calendar 30 bills (23 Senate and 7 House bills) and 76 resolutions (71 Senate and 5 House). This total of 106 measures compares to 150 measures before the committee during the Eighty-first Congress. Of these, 13 were enacted into law, compared to 36 for the previous Congress. It must be remembered in this connection, however, that the Mutual Security Acts included nine programs separately authorized in the Eighty-first Congress. An additional 11 resolutions, seven of them simple Senate resolutions and four concurrent, were approved by the committee and passed by the Senate, and all but one of the concurrent resolutions passed the House. And, finally, two bills were reported by the committee but not passed by the Senate.

Although the volume of business before the committee (in terms of the actual number of bills passed) decreased somewhat during this Congress, the importance of its business did not. This is reflected in the number of meetings held by the committee. The committee and its legislative subcommittees met 251 times during these 2 years, compared to 175 times during the Eighty-first Congress. One hundred and eighty-eight of these were executive sessions, of which the transcripts of 84 were subsequently made public, and 63 were public meetings. The fact that 96 of the executive sessions were held jointly with the Armed Services Committee of the Senate underlines the close relationship between the foreign policy of this Nation and its national security.

B. SECURITY THROUGH STRENGTH

As noted above, the keynote of the Eighty-second Congress in the field of foreign relations was the security of the United States which is so closely related to the security of the free world. The Eighty-first Congress had witnessed the Communist aggression on South Korea which made apparent the military weakness of the west. In the field of foreign relations the Eighty-second Congress was mainly concerned with measures to correct this weakness.

The principal measures were the Mutual Security Act of 1951 and the Mutual Security Act of 1952, described in detail below. The following table shows the amounts authorized and appropriated by this Congress for foreign aid for fiscal years 1952 and 1953:

Foreign aid authorizations and appropriations, fiscal years 1952 and 1953, by area and type of aid

FISCAL YEAR 1952

Area	Authorizations (Public Law 165)			Appropriations (Public Law 249)		
	Military	Economic and technical	Total	Military	Economic and technical	Total
Europe (title I).....	\$5,028,000,000	\$1,022,000,000	\$6,050,000,000	\$4,774,376,186	\$1,022,000,000	\$5,940,852,457
Forward contracts.....				44,476,271		
Spain.....					100,000,000	
Near East and Africa (title II).....	396,250,000	160,000,000	556,250,000	396,250,000	160,000,000	556,250,000
Asia and the Pacific (title III).....	535,250,000	282,500,000	817,750,000	535,250,000	* 237,155,866	772,405,866
American Republics (title IV).....	38,150,000	21,250,000	59,400,000	38,150,000	21,245,653	59,395,653
Total.....	5,997,650,000	1,485,750,000	7,483,400,000	5,788,502,457	1,540,401,519	7,328,903,976

FISCAL YEAR 1953

Europe (title I).....	\$3,415,614,750	* \$1,282,433,000	\$4,698,047,750	\$3,128,224,750	* \$1,282,433,000	\$4,410,657,750
Near East and Africa (title II).....	560,316,500	* 181,114,000	741,430,500	499,116,500	* 181,114,000	680,230,500
Asia and Pacific Korea (title III).....	564,807,500	* 321,412,500	886,220,000	540,807,500	* 270,571,250	811,378,750
American Republics (title IV).....	57,685,750	20,329,000	78,014,750	51,685,750	20,329,000	72,014,750
Other.....		* 44,017,750	44,017,750		* 28,660,000	27,666,000
Total.....	4,598,424,500	1,849,306,250	6,447,730,750	4,219,834,500	1,783,107,250	6,001,941,750

¹ This sum was not designated as either military or economic assistance.

² \$45,000,000 authorized for Korean rehabilitation was cut from this sum in the appropriation.

³ In the 1953 proposed authorization this amount is designated as "defense support."

⁴ This figure consists of the following amounts:

Technical assistance.....	\$50,822,750
Arab refugees.....	60,063,250
Israel refugees.....	70,228,000

⁵ This figure consists of the following amounts:

	Authorization	Appropriation
Economic.....	\$202,778,250	\$202,778,250
Technical assistance.....	118,634,250	67,793,000

⁶ This figure consists of the following amounts:

	Authorization	Appropriation
United Nations technical assistance.....	\$15,708,750	\$9,171,333
Emigration of surplus manpower from Europe.....	9,240,500	9,240,500
Ocean freight for relief packages.....	2,587,500	2,587,500
United Nations International Children's Emergency Fund.....	16,481,000	6,666,667

Other measures concerned with the security of the United States and its free world partners—already referred to above and summarized fully below—were the Mutual Defense Assistance Control Act of 1951, the protocols to the North Atlantic Treaty for the accession of Greece and Turkey and for the exchange of guaranties between NATO and the European Defense Community, the three security treaties with Australia and New Zealand, the Philippines, and Japan, and the troops-to-Europe hearings.

1. MUTUAL SECURITY ACT OF 1951

Background

The Mutual Security Act of 1951 was one of the most important matters considered by the committee during the first session of the Eighty-second Congress. Its importance arose from the critical world situation which it was designed to meet and from the size and scope of the bill itself.

For a number of years, many Members of Congress had been interested in getting the over-all picture of United States foreign aid programs and activities instead of dealing with them on a piecemeal basis. There was a growing demand, in certain quarters, for omnibus foreign aid legislation—a single-package bill by which Congress could look at all foreign aid programs on a global basis and measure them against the capacity of the domestic economy.

After consultation with the Senate Foreign Relations and House Foreign Affairs committees, the executive branch in 1951 decided to consolidate its foreign aid requests. Accordingly the President, on May 24, 1951, in a message to Congress, asked for the authorization of a world-wide program of economic, military, and technical assistance in the amount of \$8.5 billion. The program was presented on a geographic basis, each area being treated as a unit and the types of aid proposed fitted into its needs and problems. The executive branch allocated the total planned aid by area and by type as follows:

Mutual Security Program, 1952

	Economic	Military
Europe.....	¹ \$1,675,000,000	¹ \$5,293,000,000
Near East and Northern Africa.....	125,000,000	415,000,000
Asia.....	375,000,000	555,000,000
Latin America.....	22,000,000	40,000,000
Total.....	2,197,000,000	6,303,000,000

¹ Includes administrative expense for all areas.

The funds carried in the omnibus bill covered these hitherto independently authorized programs: Mutual defense assistance, economic assistance for Europe, technical assistance (point 4), the Institute of Inter-American Affairs, the United Nations Palestine refugee program, and the Far Eastern economic assistance program. One of the notable features of the legislation proposed by the administration was a shift of emphasis from economic aid to military aid. This recognized the ominous threat to the free world posed by the Korean conflict. The proposed legislation also inaugurated economic grant

aid to some countries in the Near East and Southeast Asia, and military assistance on a grant basis to Latin America. Flexibility to meet changing needs was given by a provision authorizing the President to transfer up to 10 percent of the funds appropriated for one area to another. United States contributions to United Nations programs were also included in the suggested bill—\$50,000,000 for Palestine refugees; \$112,500,000 for Korean relief and reconstruction, and \$13,000,000 for multilateral technical-assistance programs. The President proposed that the administration of these programs be left with the then-existing administering authorities, coordinated through the International Security Affairs Committee (ISAC) in the State Department.

Green subcommittee.—After the President's request had been received by the Senate and the draft bill had been introduced by Chairman Connally as S. 1762 on June 27, 1951, and referred to the Foreign Relations Committee, the committee decided that an on-the-spot survey of our foreign-aid programs in Europe, where the greater part of the funds would be spent, should be made. Headed by Senator Theodore Francis Green, a subcommittee composed of Senators McMahon, Sparkman, Gillette, Wiley, Smith of New Jersey, Hickenlooper, Lodge, and Brewster, visited Europe from July 7 to 23, conferring at most of the capitals with foreign and American officials. On its return, the subcommittee published its hearings and a report, which concluded that—

there is a steadily increasing realization in Europe of the threat the Soviet Union poses for the freedoms of mankind * * *. Neutralism and communism are on the wane—

the subcommittee found, and—

there is, as never before among the people of Europe, general respect and admiration for the American sacrifices which during the war and in the postwar years have helped Europe to its feet.

Committee action.—The committee started hearings on S. 1762, July 26, 1951. These hearings were distinguished by two new features. First, after 3 days of public hearings, the committee continued the rest of its examination in executive session. These transcripts were subsequently edited for security reasons and published as part of the hearings. Secondly, the presentation, after the general public introduction by Secretaries Acheson and Marshall and ECA Administrator Foster, was made by teams of experts from the executive branch with each member of the team testifying on the program—economic, military or technical—in the area for which he had primary responsibility.

The executive hearings were held jointly with the Senate Armed Services Committee after Chairman Connally requested on July 30, 1951, that the bill be referred to both committees. This continued in 1951 a practice begun in 1949 when the Mutual Defense Assistance program was first referred to the two committees jointly.

The joint committee began marking up the bill on August 13 and continued on August 20, 22, 23, and 24, 1951, after the House had passed H. R. 5113 by a vote of 260 to 101 on August 17, 1951.

The major issues during the committee's consideration related to the sums to be authorized and to the administration of the program.

On the matter of amounts, the committee decided in general that the action of the House in cutting approximately \$1 billion from the total requested was justified. Various means by which such a total reduction could be distributed between areas were discussed by the committee and it was finally agreed to reduce military assistance funds by 5 percent and economic assistance funds by 30 percent. This resulted in a total committee cut of \$964,250,000, \$37,000,000 more than the House reduction. As approved by the committee, the total authorized for military aid was \$6,013,000,000 and the total for economic aid, \$1,522,750,000.

On the matter of administration, the committee studied carefully the House bill which would have abolished the ECA and created a new separate agency to handle all foreign aid programs. Guided by the belief, however, that military aid should be administered by the Department of Defense and that the President bore ultimate responsibility for the operation and coordination of the foreign-aid programs, the committee decided to recommend that the administration of the various programs covered by the bill should continue as previously but that they should be coordinated by the Executive Office of the President instead of ISAC.

The other major changes recommended by the committee or adopted from the House bill were as follows:

1. Up to \$100,000,000 of the sum authorized for military assistance to Western Europe was authorized for use to form selected escapees from the iron-curtain countries into military forces for the defense of the free world. (Kersten amendment.)

2. Up to \$10,000,000 of the economic aid funds for Western Europe were authorized for use to encourage the migration of surplus manpower.

3. In addition to aid for the Arab refugees from Palestine, the committee recommended that \$40,000,000 of the economic aid for the Middle East be used to help refugees in Israel.

4. Relief was authorized for Korean students in the United States on the same basis as previously made available to Chinese students.

6. The scope of private investment guaranties, previously limited to Europe, was extended to other areas covered by the bill.

7. The request of the Administration for authority to transfer to foreign nations an additional \$450,000,000 of excess military equipment was reduced to \$150,000,000.

Senate action.—The Senate approved the bill after 3 days of debate. As in the committee, the question of amounts dominated the debate, and a number of amendments were offered to increase or decrease the authorization. Amendments were defeated which would have (1) restored the committee's reduction, (2) cut \$500,000,000 more from the economic aid for Europe, (3) reduced military aid to Western Europe by \$250,000,000, and (4) restored \$250,000,000 in military aid to Western Europe. Amendments were accepted which (1) cut economic aid to Europe by \$250,000,000, (2) restored \$37,500,000 of the committee's cut in the economic assistance for the Near East and Africa by reducing the military assistance funds for Europe by the same amount, and (3) restored \$6,000,000 of economic aid for Latin

America by simultaneously cutting the funds for Korean Relief and Rehabilitation a like sum. Other amendments adopted by the Senate included the elimination of the 10 percent transferability clause between titles, and the addition of a policy statement to the effect that aid to Europe should be administered in such a manner as to discourage cartels and monopolistic practices and encourage free labor union movements. Late on August 31, the Senate passed the bill by a vote of 61 to 5, substituting its version of the bill for the bill as passed by the House.

Conference action.—Of the many differences between the House bill and the Senate amendment, the outstanding ones related to the amounts and the administration. The conferees spent long hours effecting a compromise between the House administrative provisions for a single independent agency and the Senate provisions for coordination of the programs in the White House. To throw more light on the subject, they took the unusual step of asking the Secretary of Defense, Mr. Lovett, the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, General Bradley, the Under Secretary of State, Mr. Webb, and the ECA Administrator, Mr. Bissell (successor to Mr. Foster), to confer with the conference committee on the administrative features of the bill on September 22, 1951. As a result of the discussions the conferees agreed on the establishment of the Mutual Security Agency, headed by a director, of Cabinet rank, in the Executive Office of the President. The Director was to be responsible for the supervision and coordination of all military, economic, and technical assistance authorized by the act. Administration of the military end items program was to remain in the Department of Defense. Technical assistance was to remain under the administration of the Department of State. The conference compromise terminated the Economic Cooperation Administration and provided for the transfer of files, functions, and personnel to the new agency. The functions of the new agency were, however, to be limited by the act to economic assistance in support of the military rearmament endeavor of the free world after June 30, 1952.

All powers of the ECA which were transferred to the new agency were to lapse on June 30, 1952, except those which the President determined to be necessary to further the purposes of the Mutual Security Act after that date.

The President was directed by the legislation to transmit this determination to the appropriate committees of the Congress before April 1, 1952, and notify them which powers he believed should be continued. After June 30, 1952, the new agency was not authorized to extend economic assistance except in occupied countries and for "mutual defense programs."

On amounts, the conferees agreed on the compromise set forth in the table below.

Authorizations, Mutual Security Act of 1951

Items	President's request	House amounts	Senate amounts	Conference agreement	Conference agreement differences		
					Amount, more or less than request	Amount, more or less than House bill	Amount, more or less than Senate amendment
Title I—Europe:							
Military.....	\$5,293,000,000	\$5,028,000,000	\$5,006,350,000	\$5,028,000,000	\$ 265,000,000 less	None	\$21,650,000 more
Economic.....	1,675,000,000	1,040,000,000	1,880,500,000	1,022,000,000	653,000,000 less	\$18,000,000 less	141,500,000 more
Total.....	6,968,000,000	6,068,000,000	5,886,850,000	6,050,000,000	918,000,000 less	18,000,000 less	163,150,000 more
Title II—Near East and Africa:							
Military.....	415,000,000	415,000,000	396,250,000	396,250,000	18,750,000 less	18,750,000 less	None
Economic.....	125,000,000	175,000,000	160,000,000	160,000,000	35,000,000 more	15,000,000 less	None
Total.....	540,000,000	590,000,000	556,250,000	556,250,000	16,250,000 more	33,750,000 less	None
Title III—Asia and Pacific:							
Military.....	555,000,000	530,000,000	535,250,000	535,250,000	19,750,000 less	5,250,000 more	None
Economic:							
All but Korea.....	262,500,000	237,500,000	178,750,000	237,500,000	25,000,000 less	None	58,750,000 more
Korea.....	112,500,000	11,250,000	69,750,000	45,000,000	67,500,000 less	33,750,000 more	24,750,000 less
Subtotal (economic).....	375,000,000	248,750,000	248,500,000	282,500,000	92,500,000 less	33,750,000 more	34,000,000 more
Total.....	930,000,000	778,750,000	783,750,000	817,750,000	112,500,000 less	39,000,000 more	34,000,000 more
Title IV—American Republics:							
Military.....	40,000,000	40,000,000	38,150,000	38,150,000	1,850,000 less	1,850,000 less	None
Economic.....	22,000,000	22,000,000	21,250,000	21,250,000	750,000 less	750,000 less	None
Total.....	62,000,000	62,000,000	59,400,000	59,400,000	2,600,000 less	2,600,000 less	None
Grand total.....	8,500,000,000	7,498,750,000	7,286,250,000	7,483,400,000	1,016,600,000 less	15,350,000 less	197,150,000 more

¹ Includes authorizations for strategic material development.

Of the other differences between the Senate and House bills, only a few need to be mentioned. The conferees agreed to increase the transferability between military and economic funds in title I from 5 to 10 percent, and to restore the 10-percent transferability between titles. They agreed on \$10,000,000 for emigration of surplus manpower instead of the House figure of \$30,000,000. They also agreed to authorize the Secretary of Defense to transfer up to \$1 billion worth of United States military equipment out of current Defense Department appropriations to friendly nations when he found it essential for countries to obtain the equipment expeditiously. Such transfers were to be paid for out of moneys appropriated under the Mutual Security Act. The requirement in the House bill that 20 percent of the economic assistance was to be in the form of loans was modified to 10 percent by the conferees. The provision for the transfer of surplus military equipment was fixed at \$300,000,000, a compromise between the Senate figure of \$150,000,000 and the House figure of \$450,000,000. There were a number of other agreements on minor points which are discussed fully in the conference report.

The Senate agreed to the conference report on October 2, 1951, after some discussion of a point of order raised against the increase of the percentage of transferability in title I. The President of the Senate overruled the point of order and was sustained in his ruling by the Senate. In the House, too, a point of order was raised against a provision in the bill making the new Agency Director a member of the Board of the Export-Import Bank. There, however, the point of order was sustained and the conference report rejected. Instead of asking for a new conference, the House used the parliamentary device of agreeing to the Senate amendment to the House bill, with an amendment which was the text of the conference report except for the controversial Export-Import Bank provision.

The Senate on October 8 concurred in this action by the House and the bill was signed into law 2 days later. In pursuance of the authorization, \$7,328,903,976 was appropriated for Mutual Security.

<i>Dates</i>	<i>Documents</i>
Message from the President, May 24, 1951.	House Document 147.
Bill introduced by Senator Connally, June 27, 1951.	S. 1762.
Subcommittee visit to Europe, July 7 to July 23, 1951.	Printed hearings.
Subcommittee report, August 13, 1951.	Senate Document 56.
House hearings, June 26-29, July 2 and 3, 10-13, 17-21, 23-28, 30, and 31, 1951.	Printed hearings.
Reported to House, August 14, 1951.	House Report 872 (H. R. 5113).
Passed House, August 17, 1951, by vote of 260 to 101.	Congressional Record, August 16 and 17, 1951.
Senate hearings, July 26 and 27, 30 and 31, August 1-3, and 6-9, 1951.	Printed hearings.
Reported to Senate, August 27, 1951.	Senate Report 703.
Passed Senate, August 31, 1951, by vote of 61 to 5.	Congressional Record, August 28, 29, 30, and 31, 1951.
Conference, September 19, 20, 21, 22, 24, 25, and 27, 1951.	House Report 1090 and Senate Document 73.
Conference report adopted in Senate October 2, 1951.	Congressional Record, October 1 and 2, 1951.

<i>Dates</i>	<i>Documents</i>
Conference report rejected; Senate amendment concurred in with an amendment in House, October 5, 1951, by vote of 235 to 98.	Congressional Record, same date.
House amendment accepted by Senate, October 8, 1951.	Do.
Signed by President, October 10, 1951.	Public Law 165.

Miscellaneous:

The Mutual Security Program for fiscal year 1952: Basic data supplied by the executive branch (committee print).

Proposals regarding the Administration of Foreign Aid: Background information (Senate committee print).

2. MUTUAL SECURITY ACT OF 1952

Background.—On March 6, 1952, the President asked the Congress to continue the programs embodied in the Mutual Security Act of 1951. This continuation of United States foreign-aid programs in approximately the same magnitude as the previous year was necessitated by the relatively unchanged world picture.

The principal change in the picture was the increased ability of the Western World to defend itself against unprovoked attack. The groundwork for an adequate defense of the west had been built. Although it still could not be said in 1952 that the west could be sure of its ability to repel an attack from the east, a beginning had been made and the goals agreed upon at the Lisbon meeting of the North Atlantic Council in February gave promise of reliable defenses becoming a reality in two more years.

Tremendous steps forward had been taken during the year toward European integration. The Schuman and Plevén (EDC) plans were signed and in the process of ratification, marking perhaps the greatest advance toward the unification of Europe in many centuries. The work of the temporary committee of the North Atlantic Treaty Council (TCC) also marked an unparalleled degree of cooperation among sovereign nations. In addition, the Council of Europe gave signs of expanding its functions and powers.

This was the setting for consideration of the Mutual Security Act of 1952. The Soviet threat was unabated and the security of the free world required that its military and economic defenses be maintained and strengthened.

The President's message of March 6 emphasized the need of positive action. Pointing out that "the countries concerned are driving to accomplish objectives which will bring close to full realization our mutual goals of freedom and peace under the great principles of the Charter of the United Nations," the President stated that "without some resources from us to add to their own, these objectives cannot be accomplished."

The resources that the administration recommended be contributed consisted of \$7,900,000,000 of economic, military, and technical assistance to the free areas of the world. The requested division of these funds between the types of assistance and the areas was as follows:

Proposed Mutual Security Program, 1953

[In millions]

	Direct military	Defense support	Economic and tech- nical	Area total
Europe.....	¹ 4,145	² 1,819		5,964
Near East and Africa.....	606		196	802
Asia and the Pacific.....	611		³ 408	1,019
American Republics.....	62		22	84
Multilateral technical assistance, migration, and relief package freight.....			30	30
Total.....	⁴ 5,425	1,819	656	⁴ 7,900

¹ Includes \$75 million for participation in SHAPE and other international security organizations; Battle Act expenses; and administrative expenses for all titles.

² Includes economic assistance for Austria.

³ Includes assistance to support military efforts in southeast Asia and the Pacific.

⁴ Columns do not add to totals because of rounding.

The draft legislation was in the form of amendments to the Mutual Security Act of 1951, the Mutual Defense Assistance Act of 1949, and the Act for International Development. It authorized the new amounts set forth above, provided for the carry-over of unspent balances, and proposed a number of minor changes in the existing legislation. Transferability between economic and military aid for Western Europe would have been reduced from 10 to 5 percent by the administration's request. Authority was sought to extend economic aid to certain countries in Asia and the Pacific which are not carrying on mutual defense programs as required by the Mutual Security Act of 1951. The draft bill extended previous authorizations for contributions to the United Nations Korean Reconstruction Agency (UNKRA) and provided a set-off of \$67,500,000 against these contributions for the value of goods and services which the United States Army might furnish to UNKRA when that agency took over relief operations. The administration further asked the repeal of two existing provisions on developing strategic materials for the United States and on providing 10 percent of economic aid in the form of loans. In addition, four new sections were suggested: (1) Exemption of certain offshore procurement activities from the provisions of laws governing the placing of contracts in United States; (2) authorization for retired officers of the Armed Forces to be appointed to civilian positions under the act, with appropriate provision for their salaries; (3) authorization for United States contributions to the recently established PICMME (Provisional Intergovernmental Committee for the Movement of Migrants in Europe); and (4) continuation and extension of provisions for payment of ocean freight for relief packages.

The President requested that the MDAP Act of 1949 be amended to authorize the furnishing of more excess equipment, to provide for extending reimbursable aid to organizations like SHAPE, and to authorize rehabilitation of materials transferred from stock if the recipient-to-be makes a firm commitment for the rehabilitation. Minor amendments to the act for International Development were proposed. This in broad outlines was the program the committee was asked to consider.

Committee action.—After 4 days of public hearings beginning on March 13, 1952, the committee met in executive session to hear the

detailed country program presentations by teams of MSA, State Department, and Defense Department experts. Much of the testimony received was related to matters involving the security of the United States. These hearings lasted until April 4, 1952, and were subsequently edited for security and published. All private witnesses who asked to testify were heard by the committee in public session on March 28. The committee marked up the draft bill on April 7, 16, 17, 18, 21, 28, and 30. On the latter date, the committee voted 12 to 0 to report an original bill S. 3086, favorably to the Senate.

A change from last year was the reference of the Mutual Security Program to the Foreign Relations Committee alone and not jointly to it and the Armed Services Committee. On May 5, however, the Senate voted 40 to 33 to refer the bill to the Armed Services Committee for consideration of the military aspects of the program with instructions to report back to the Senate by May 15. The Armed Services Committee's report of that date proposed no changes in the bill as reported by the Foreign Relations Committee.

The major amendment recommended by the Foreign Relations Committee to the administration's draft legislation was a reduction of \$1 billion in the requested authorization to be distributed equally between the various areas and the various programs. This cut amounted to a 12.66 percent reduction of all figures in the bill. To give greater flexibility in the use of the remaining amounts, the committee voted to retain the administration's present authority for 10-percent transfers within certain titles and between titles if the funds are to be used for the same general purposes. Other provisions recommended by the committee included (1) authorization for the furnishing of assistance directly to the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, the European Coal and Steel Community, and the European Defense Community; (2) the separation of technical assistance programs in the Near East from the relief programs for Arab refugees from Israel and immigrants to Israel; (3) authorization for officers of the United States Public Health Service and the Coast and Geodetic Survey to serve abroad on the same basis as other personnel; (4) continuation of the informational media guaranties originally authorized in the ECA Act of 1948, as amended; and (5) amendment of the Surplus Property Act of 1946 to make it possible to use counterpart funds for the Fulbright exchange program. In most other respects, the committee accepted the administration's recommendations.

Senate action.—On the floor of the Senate, much of the debate centered on proposals to reduce further the \$6.9 billion figure reported by the committee. Amendments were offered reducing the \$6.9 billion figure by \$1 billion, by \$500,000,000, and by \$400,000,000. These amendments were defeated 27 to 35, 33 to 41, and 37 to 40, respectively. An amendment to cut \$200,000,000 from the \$6.9 billion figure was finally adopted by a vote of 37 to 34. Many other amendments were considered by the Senate but only these were adopted: (1) a minimum of \$25 million was earmarked for Spain; (2) \$150 million was earmarked for counterpart funds to stimulate free enterprise in Europe and \$2.5 million for the Organization for European Economic Cooperation; (3) the use of MSA funds for dissemination of general propaganda in the United States on MSA activities

was prohibited; (4) the grant of any aid to any nation engaging in certain types of east-west trade was prohibited (second Kem amendment) and the Battle Act repealed; (5) an amendment to assist small business in learning about procurement opportunities was adopted; and (6) the use of counterpart funds was authorized only for purposes for which new funds could be used. The Senate then passed the bill by a vote of 64 to 10, after first striking out everything after the enacting clause of the previously House-approved H. R. 7005 and inserting the provisions of the amended S. 3086.

The differences between the House and Senate versions of H. R. 7005 were not great and the conferees reached agreement in 1 day. The biggest difference between the bills related to the amounts. The House cut was over \$500 million more than the Senate cut and was applied to different areas of the bill. The conferees agreed to split the difference between the House and Senate figures for each area and activity. The result was a total authorization of \$6,447,730,750, with cuts from the Administration's proposal ranging from 7.6 to 29.5 percent in the individual figures. House amendments adopted by the conferees included the following: (1) repeal of the ECA Act except for certain enumerated sections which were continued in effect; (2) a 5 percent reduction in personnel engaged in carrying out programs under the act; and (3) an increase in the availability of counterpart funds for use in the development of strategic materials. Some Senate amendments were modified slightly in conference to bring them into line with similar House amendments. The Senate conferees receded on the Kem amendment relative to east-west trade thereby leaving the Battle act on the books.

The conference report was agreed to in the House on June 5 by a vote of 230 to 115 and in the Senate on June 9 by a vote of 59 to 11.

The following table shows the amounts authorized by the bill as passed and in various stages beforehand:

detailed country program presentations by teams of MSA, State Department, and Defense Department experts. Much of the testimony received was related to matters involving the security of the United States. These hearings lasted until April 4, 1952, and were subsequently edited for security and published. All private witnesses who asked to testify were heard by the committee in public session on March 28. The committee marked up the draft bill on April 7, 16, 17, 18, 21, 28, and 30. On the latter date, the committee voted 12 to 0 to report an original bill S. 3086, favorably to the Senate.

A change from last year was the reference of the Mutual Security Program to the Foreign Relations Committee alone and not jointly to it and the Armed Services Committee. On May 5, however, the Senate voted 40 to 33 to refer the bill to the Armed Services Committee for consideration of the military aspects of the program with instructions to report back to the Senate by May 15. The Armed Services Committee's report of that date proposed no changes in the bill as reported by the Foreign Relations Committee.

The major amendment recommended by the Foreign Relations Committee to the administration's draft legislation was a reduction of \$1 billion in the requested authorization to be distributed equally between the various areas and the various programs. This cut amounted to a 12.66 percent reduction of all figures in the bill. To give greater flexibility in the use of the remaining amounts, the committee voted to retain the administration's present authority for 10-percent transfers within certain titles and between titles if the funds are to be used for the same general purposes. Other provisions recommended by the committee included (1) authorization for the furnishing of assistance directly to the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, the European Coal and Steel Community, and the European Defense Community; (2) the separation of technical assistance programs in the Near East from the relief programs for Arab refugees from Israel and immigrants to Israel; (3) authorization for officers of the United States Public Health Service and the Coast and Geodetic Survey to serve abroad on the same basis as other personnel; (4) continuation of the informational media guaranties originally authorized in the ECA Act of 1948, as amended; and (5) amendment of the Surplus Property Act of 1946 to make it possible to use counterpart funds for the Fulbright exchange program. In most other respects, the committee accepted the administration's recommendations.

Senate action.—On the floor of the Senate, much of the debate centered on proposals to reduce further the \$6.9 billion figure reported by the committee. Amendments were offered reducing the \$6.9 billion figure by \$1 billion, by \$500,000,000, and by \$400,000,000. These amendments were defeated 27 to 35, 33 to 41, and 37 to 40, respectively. An amendment to cut \$200,000,000 from the \$6.9 billion figure was finally adopted by a vote of 37 to 34. Many other amendments were considered by the Senate but only these were adopted: (1) a minimum of \$25 million was earmarked for Spain; (2) \$150 million was earmarked for counterpart funds to stimulate free enterprise in Europe and \$2.5 million for the Organization for European Economic Cooperation; (3) the use of MSA funds for dissemination of general propaganda in the United States on MSA activities

was prohibited; (4) the grant of any aid to any nation engaging in certain types of east-west trade was prohibited (second Kem amendment) and the Battle Act repealed; (5) an amendment to assist small business in learning about procurement opportunities was adopted; and (6) the use of counterpart funds was authorized only for purposes for which new funds could be used. The Senate then passed the bill by a vote of 64 to 10, after first striking out everything after the enacting clause of the previously House-approved H. R. 7005 and inserting the provisions of the amended S. 3086.

The differences between the House and Senate versions of H. R. 7005 were not great and the conferees reached agreement in 1 day. The biggest difference between the bills related to the amounts. The House cut was over \$500 million more than the Senate cut and was applied to different areas of the bill. The conferees agreed to split the difference between the House and Senate figures for each area and activity. The result was a total authorization of \$6,447,730,750, with cuts from the Administration's proposal ranging from 7.6 to 29.5 percent in the individual figures. House amendments adopted by the conferees included the following: (1) repeal of the ECA Act except for certain enumerated sections which were continued in effect; (2) a 5 percent reduction in personnel engaged in carrying out programs under the act; and (3) an increase in the availability of counterpart funds for use in the development of strategic materials. Some Senate amendments were modified slightly in conference to bring them into line with similar House amendments. The Senate conferees receded on the Kem amendment relative to east-west trade thereby leaving the Battle act on the books.

The conference report was agreed to in the House on June 5 by a vote of 230 to 115 and in the Senate on June 9 by a vote of 59 to 11.

The following table shows the amounts authorized by the bill as passed and in various stages beforehand:

Authorization, Mutual Security Act of 1952

	Executive request	House authorization	Percent reduction	Senate authorization	Percent reduction	Difference between House and Senate authorizations	Conference agreement	Percent reduction from Executive request
Europe:								
Military.....	\$4,145,000,000	\$3,316,000,000	20.0	\$3,515,229,500	15.2	Senate \$199,229,500 more than House	\$3,415,614,750	17.6
Defense support.....	1,819,200,000	1,022,000,000	43.8	1,542,866,000	15.2	Senate 520,866,000 more than House	1,282,433,000	29.5
Near East:								
Military.....	606,370,000	606,370,000	0	514,263,000	15.2	House 92,107,000 more than Senate	560,316,500	7.6
Technical assistance.....	55,000,000	55,000,000	0	46,645,500	15.2	House 8,354,500 more than Senate	50,822,750	7.6
Arab refugees.....	65,000,000	65,000,000	0	55,126,500	15.2	House 9,873,500 more than Senate	60,063,250	7.6
Israeli refugees.....	76,000,000	76,000,000	0	64,456,000	15.2	House 11,544,000 more than Senate	70,228,000	7.6
	196,000,000	196,000,000	0	166,228,000	15.2	House 29,772,000 more than Senate	181,114,000	7.6
Asia:								
Military.....	611,230,000	611,230,000	0	518,385,000	15.2	House 92,845,000 more than Senate	564,807,500	7.6
Economic.....	¹ 258,000,000	208,800,000	19.1				202,778,250	21.4
Technical assistance.....	150,000,000	¹ 88,000,000	41.3				¹ 118,634,250	20.9
	408,000,000	296,800,000	27.3	346,025,000	15.2	Senate 49,225,000 more than House	321,412,500	21.2
Latin America:								
Military.....	62,400,000	62,400,000	0	52,971,500	15.2	House 9,428,500 more than Senate	57,685,750	7.6
Technical assistance.....	22,000,000	22,000,000	0	18,658,000	15.2	House 3,342,000 more than Senate	20,329,000	7.6
UN technical assistance.....	17,000,000	17,000,000	0	14,417,500	15.2	House 2,582,500 more than Senate	15,708,750	7.6
Emigration of surplus manpower from Europe.....	10,000,000	10,000,000	0	8,841,000	15.2	House 1,159,000 more than Senate	9,240,500	7.6
Ocean freight for relief packages.....	2,800,000	2,800,000	0	2,375,000	15.2	House 425,000 more than Senate	2,587,500	7.6
Total.....	7,900,000,000	6,162,600,000	22.0	6,699,899,500	15.2	Senate 537,299,500 more than House	6,431,249,750	18.6
UNIOCEF.....		12,000,000		20,962,000		Senate 8,962,000 more than House	16,481,000	
Grand total.....		6,174,600,000		6,720,861,500			6,447,730,750	

¹ Includes Burma and Indonesia.

By Public Law 547, \$6,001,947,750 was appropriated for the purposes of the act.

<i>Dates</i>	<i>Documents</i>
Message from the President, March 6, 1952.	House Document 382.
Public hearings in Senate, March 13-April 4, 1952.	Printed hearings.
Public hearings in House, March 13-April 29, 1952.	Do.
S. 3086 introduced and reported by Foreign Relations Committee to the Senate, April 30, 1952.	Senate Report 1490.
H. R. 7005 reported to House, May 12, 1952.	House Report 1922.
S. 3086 reported to Senate by Armed Services Committee, May 15, 1952.	Senate Report 1575.
Passed House, by vote of 245 to 110, May 23, 1952.	Congressional Record, May 20-May 23, 1952.
Passed Senate, by vote of 64 to 10, May 28, 1952.	Congressional Record, May 26-May 28, 1952.
Conference Report adopted in House, June 5, 1952, 230-115.	House Report 2031, Congressional Record, same date.
Conference Report adopted in Senate, June 9, 1952.	Congressional Record, same date.
Signed by President, June 20, 1952----	Public Law 400.
	Miscellaneous committee prints:
	Foreign Aid, 1950-53: Foreign aid authorization and appropriations, fiscal-year 1950-52 and proposed authorizations for fiscal year 1953.
	The Mutual Security Program for Fiscal Year 1953: Basic data supplied by the executive branch.
	Powers Proposed To Be Transferred to the Director for Mutual Security: Presidential communication pursuant to sec. 502 (C) of the Mutual Security Act of 1951 (Public Law 165, 82d Cong., 1st sess.).

3. MUTUAL DEFENSE ASSISTANCE CONTROL ACT OF 1951 (THE BATTLE ACT)

Background.—Since the beginning of large-scale United States foreign-aid programs in 1948, Congress has been concerned that our assistance to other states should not result directly or indirectly in increasing the war-making potential of the Communist bloc although it was realized that some east-west trade was necessary for complete economic recovery in Western Europe. The original ECA act provided that the Administrator should refuse delivery to ERP recipients of commodities which would go into the manufacture of items for export to the Soviet which items would be refused export licenses from the United States.

As tensions between the eastern and western powers increased, American interest in the commodities and goods involved in east-west trade mounted. This was a subject which the Foreign Relations Committee explored fully every year during consideration of foreign aid legislation. Reliance for the control of this trade was placed at first primarily on informal moral suasion rather than official action.

These informal discussions resulted in more commodities being placed on restricted or prohibited lists by recipients of American assistance.

The outbreak of hostilities in Korea, and reports of shipments of strategic materials such as rubber and heavy machinery to iron curtain countries through Western Germany, free ports, Hong Kong, and other places, raised doubts about the effectiveness of these methods of control.

Two steps were taken by Congress designed to reduce or cut off exports of potential war-making material to Russia and her satellites. The first of these was the Cannon amendment to the Supplemental Appropriations Act of 1950 (Public Law 843) which provided that during any period when United States Armed Forces were engaged in hostilities pursuant to a decision of the United Nations Security Council, no economic aid should be given to any foreign country whose trade with the Soviet Union was found by the National Security Council of the United States to be against the security interests of the United States. The second action was the Kem amendment to the Third Supplemental Appropriations Act of 1951 (Public Law 45) which superseded the Cannon amendment with more stringent provisions. It prohibited economic or financial assistance during any period when United States Armed Forces were engaged in hostilities under a decision of the U. N. Security Council to any country which shipped to the Soviet bloc anything subject to embargo by the United States. However, the National Security Council was empowered to make exceptions in the security interests of the United States, and a number of such exceptions were made and reported to the appropriate congressional committees.

Legislative action.—Almost simultaneously with the consideration of the Kem amendment, a subcommittee of the House Foreign Affairs Committee, headed by Mr. Battle, of Alabama, was investigating this same problem. After hearings and a series of executive sessions the House Committee on Foreign Affairs reported H. R. 4550, the Mutual Defense Assistance Control Act of 1951. That bill was passed by the House on August 2, 1951, by voice vote.

The Foreign Relations Committee of the Senate considered H. R. 4550 and S. 1987, introduced by Senator Kem, together. The principal purpose of the Kem bill was to tighten up further the restrictions imposed by the Kem amendment. The Battle bill, on the other hand, recognized that some types of east-west trade might be of benefit to the west in some instances. It therefore permitted the exercise of some discretion in such cases. The committee decided to report H. R. 4550 to the Senate with minor amendments pertaining to administration. These amendments and the bill were adopted by the Senate on August 28, 1951, by a vote of 55 to 16. The House subsequently concurred in the Senate amendments. (An attempt to repeal the Battle Act by another Kem amendment to the Mutual Security Act of 1952 failed in 1952.)

Provisions.—The bill provided for control by the United States and cooperating foreign nations of exports to any nation or combination of nations threatening the security of the United States, including the Soviet Union and its satellites. No military, economic, or financial assistance was to be supplied by the United States to any nation unless it embargoed shipments of arms, ammunition, and implements of war, atomic materials, petroleum, transportation materials of strategic value, and items of primary strategic significance used in the

production of arms, ammunition, and implements of war to any nation or combination of nations threatening the United States. Assistance to any nation which knowingly permitted such trade was to be terminated. However, the President was authorized to direct the continuance of aid on the advice of the Administrator of the act if he found that unusual circumstances indicated that the cessation of trade would be clearly detrimental to the security of the United States.

<i>Dates</i>	<i>Documents</i>
Reported to House, July 16, 1951-----	House Report 703.
Passed House, August 2, 1951-----	Congressional Record, same date.
Reported to Senate, August 21, 1951---	Senate Report 698.
Passed Senate, amended, August 28, 1951.	Congressional Record, same date.
House concurs in Senate amendments, October 11, 1951.	Do.
Signed by President, October 26, 1951.	Public Law 213.

4. GREEK-TURKISH PROTOCOL

Background.—Largely as the result of congressional encouragement (see for example S. Con. Res. 18, S. Rept. 703, 82d Cong., S. Doc. 56, 82d Cong.), the United States took the initiative in proposing the admission of Greece and Turkey to the North Atlantic Treaty Organization. A protocol to the North Atlantic Treaty providing for the accession of Greece and Turkey was signed on October 17, 1951, transmitted to the Senate on January 10, 1952, and considered by the committee shortly thereafter.

This was the first change in the treaty since the Senate considered and approved it in 1949. At that time, the President of the United States, through the Secretary of State, had assured the committee and the Senate that the accession of new members would in effect create new treaties between the United States and those members and—

therefore the President would consider it necessary to ask for the advice and consent of the Senate before himself agreeing to the admission of a new member.

Greece and Turkey had indicated their interest in joining the North Atlantic Treaty Organization. The darkening world situation, increasing instability in the Middle East, and the valor of Greek and Turkish troops in Korea finally paved the way for their accession.

Committee and Senate action.—The committee took quick action shortly after the President's transmittal. Earlier committee reports had expressed the conviction that Greece and Turkey should be integrated with the defense plans of Western Europe. The committee had been consulted prior to the Ottawa meeting of the North Atlantic Council at which the United States proposed that steps be taken to provide for the accession of Greece and Turkey to the treaty. The committee was therefore familiar with the issue and reported the protocol on January 15, 1952, after hearing the testimony of Secretary Acheson and General Bradley. In its report on the protocol the committee summarized the reasons which persuaded it to approve the accession of Greece and Turkey to the treaty:

1. The protection of their territory will serve to insure the benefits which our economic and military aid has brought these countries.

2. Their accession will also add to the security of the eastern Mediterranean and the Middle East, which are strategically important to the defense of the free world.

3. The southeastern flank of General Eisenhower's NATO army will be greatly strengthened.

4. Greece and Turkey have sizable forces in a good state of readiness and of tested valor.

5. The two nations have been strengthening their democratic institutions and have actively cooperated with the west for many years.

6. They are devoted to the cause of peace and collective security.

The Senate approved the protocol on January 29 by a voice vote. In the opinion of some Senators, however, the time devoted to discussion of the protocol on January 29 was not sufficient. Senator Gillette on January 30, therefore, entered a motion to reconsider the vote, which was agreed to on February 6, 1952. Beginning on February 6 and continuing the following day, the Senate carefully examined United States relationships and commitments under the North Atlantic Treaty and the protocol. As the result of a reservation proposed by Senator Watkins, the question of the constitutional powers of the President and Congress in sending troops abroad was reopened and explored. Senator Watkins, however, withdrew his reservation prior to the final vote, and on February 7, the Senate again advised and consented to the ratification of the protocol, this time by a roll-call vote of 73 to 2.

The protocol went into effect on February 15, 1952, when all the parties to the North Atlantic Treaty had notified the United States of their acceptance of the protocol.

<i>Dates</i>	<i>Documents</i>
Signed October 17, 1951-----	
Transmitted to the Senate, January 10, 1952.	Executive E, Eighty-second Congress, second session.
Executive hearings and ordered reported, January 15, 1952.	Executive transcript.
Reported to the Senate, January 21, 1952.	Executive Report 1, Eighty-second Congress, second session.
Approved by Senate, January 29, 1952.	Congressional Record, same date.
Motion to reconsider offered, January 30, 1952.	Do.
Motion to reconsider adopted, February 6, 1952.	Do.
Approved by Senate, February 7, 1952, by vote of 73 to 2.	Do.

5. THE NATO-EDC PROTOCOL AND THE THREE TREATIES RELATING TO THE SECURITY IN THE PACIFIC

Reference is made at this point to these four security instruments because of their direct relationship to the security of the United States. Their discussion in this section would be entirely proper. The committee's consideration of them, however, was so interwoven with the contractual agreements with Germany and the Japanese peace treaty which they accompanied that it was impractical to separate them from these agreements. A full summary of them will, therefore, be found in the section dealing with the peace settlements. These four security agreements, nevertheless, should be kept in mind in any evaluation of the committee's activities in strengthening the collective security fabric.

6. TROOPS TO EUROPE

Background.—As a result of the President's announcement on September 9, 1950, that there would be a substantial increase in United States forces stationed in Western Europe and his announcement on December 19, 1950, of General Eisenhower's appointment as Supreme Allied Commander, Europe, a great deal of concern was expressed as to the nature and extent of American manpower contributions to the defense of Western Europe. A debate on foreign policy—the so-called great debate—was touched off immediately when the Eighty-second Congress convened. On January 8, 1951, Senator Wherry introduced Senate Resolution 8, which after 2 weeks of floor debate was referred to the Senate Foreign Relations and Armed Services Committees jointly.

Committee action.—The joint committee held its first meeting on the afternoon of February 1, 1951, to hear General Eisenhower in executive session after his report to a joint meeting of Congress on the situation in Europe. During the public hearings from February 15 until February 28, the preponderant weight of testimony endorsed the appointment of General Eisenhower and favored approval of the President's decision to send four additional divisions of American ground forces to Europe. Chairman Connally and Chairman Russell drafted a resolution giving voice to these sentiments, and this draft resolution was considered by the committees during the seven executive sessions that followed. A number of amendments were adopted, the most important of which were:

1. An amendment by Senator Lodge, predicating the despatch of additional U. S. troops upon a certification by the Joint Chiefs of Staff that the NATO countries are doing their utmost to develop their capacity for self-defense.

2. A second amendment by Senator Lodge, stating the Senate's understanding that the bulk of the troops for the NATO forces in Europe were to be supplied by our European partners and that United States troops would be assigned to Europe only after certification by the Joint Chiefs of Staff that such action was necessary and in the interests of United States security. Both certifications were to be transmitted to the appropriate Senate and House committees.

3. An amendment by Senator Smith of New Jersey, stating that, in the opinion of the Senate, congressional approval should be obtained by the President before sending any divisions to General Eisenhower, under article 3 of the North Atlantic Treaty, and approving the sending of four additional divisions to Europe.

Before voting finally on the draft resolution, the committee discussed the question of what form the resolution should take. It was finally agreed to report a Senate resolution which would not require House concurrence for quick action, and a concurrent resolution which would in effect invite the House to participate in the decision. Both resolutions were identical in language except that the Senate resolution referred to "the Senate" while the concurrent resolution referred to "the Congress". On March 8, 1951, they were ordered reported as Senate Resolution 99 by a vote of 23 to 0 and as Senate Concurrent

Resolution 18, by a vote of 16 to 8. A few days later the committee had another meeting to give final approval to the language of the resolutions.

Senate action.—The Senate began debate on the two resolutions on March 16, 1951, and approved them on April 4, 1951. The major issues in the debate revolved around the constitutional powers of the President and Congress with respect to the use of the Armed Forces and the over-all defense strategy for the free world. On the constitutional question the debate centered on whether or not the President has the power to send United States ground forces to Europe to participate in an "international army" without specific congressional authorization. A further point in the discussion involved the interpretation of article 3 of the North Atlantic Treaty relative to the development of individual and collective capacity to resist armed attack. On the defense aspects of the debate, the Senate examined thoroughly the military security interests of the United States on a global basis. The preponderant sentiment was in favor of sending the four divisions to Europe to partake in the defense of that continent, in the belief that an attack on free Europe would endanger the security of the United States.

Before voting on the resolutions, the Senate adopted several amendments. One expressed the sense of the Senate that the United States should seek revision of the Italian Peace Treaty to permit Italy to make a greater contribution to the defense of Western Europe (by Senator Watkins). Another specified that no ground troops in addition to the four divisions should be sent to Europe without further congressional approval (by Senator McClellan). A third amendment provided that the defense plans of Europe be revised so as to provide for the utilization of the military resources of Spain and Germany on a voluntary basis (by Senator McCarthy). Several attempts to modify these amendments failed. Senate Resolution 99, as amended, was passed by the vote of 69 to 21 on April 4, 1951. Immediately thereafter Senate Concurrent Resolution 18 was taken up, and amended so as to conform to Senate Resolution 99. There was one change, however, namely the inclusion of Greece and Turkey in the amendment relating to the utilization on a voluntary basis of the military resources of Spain and Germany. Senate Concurrent Resolution 18 was then passed by a vote of 45 to 41.

Provisions of the resolutions.—The resolutions as passed by the Senate stated the sense of the Senate (or Congress) (1) That it approves the appointment of General Eisenhower as Supreme Allied Commander, Europe, and the decision to place Armed Forces of the United States in Europe under his command; (2) that the security of the United States and the NATO countries is so threatened that it is necessary to station United States troops abroad for the joint defense effort; (3) that the President should consult the Secretary of Defense, the Joint Chiefs of Staff, the Foreign Relations and Armed Services Committees of the Senate and House, and the Supreme Commander, Europe, before sending additional troops to Europe under article 3 of the North Atlantic Treaty; (4) that the Joint Chiefs of Staff should certify to the Secretary of Defense that our allies are doing their fair share under article 3 of the North Atlantic Treaty before any troops are sent; (5) that the major portion of the ground forces under SHAPE should be supplied by our NATO partners and the Joint

Chiefs of Staff should certify their opinion that the sending of United States troops is necessary to strengthen the security of the United States; (6) that congressional approval should be obtained of any policy requiring the sending of troops to Europe under article 3 of the North Atlantic Treaty; approval was given for the sending of four divisions of ground troops, but it was stated that the dispatch of additional divisions should also be subject to congressional approval; (7) that regular reports to Congress should be submitted by the President on how the North Atlantic Treaty is implemented; (8) that the peace treaty with Italy should be revised to modify limitations on her military strength, thereby enabling her to increase her contributions to the mutual defense of free Europe; and (9) that the defense plans of Europe should be revised to provide for the utilization on a voluntary basis of the military and other resources of Western Germany and Spain (and, in S. Con. Res. 18, Greece and Turkey).

<i>Dates</i>	<i>Documents</i>
Senate Resolution 8 introduced January 8, 1951.	Congressional Record, same date.
Senate Resolution referred to Foreign Relations and Armed Services Committees, January 23, 1951.	Do.
Public hearings, February 1, 15, 16, 19, 20-24, 26-28, 1951.	Printed hearings.
Reported Senate Resolution 99 and Senate Concurrent Resolution 18, March 14, 1951.	Senate Report 175.
Passed Senate, April 4, 1951, 45-41.	Congressional Record, March 16, 19, 20-22, 27-30, April 2-4, 1951.
No further action by House or by the President.	

Miscellaneous committee prints:

Basic Information on Implementation of the North Atlantic Treaty: Report prepared by the staffs of the two committees for the use of the joint committee made up of the Committee on Foreign Relations and the Committee on Armed Services of the Senate.

Powers of the President to Send the Armed Forces Outside the United States: Studies prepared by the executive departments for the use of the joint committee made up of the Committee on Foreign Relations and the Committee on Armed Services of the Senate.

7. COMMISSION TO STUDY RELATIONS BETWEEN THE UNITED STATES AND NATO

Although this bill, which was introduced by Senator Gillette for himself and a number of other Senators, was not considered by the Senate, it is mentioned briefly in this section as evidence of the committee's follow-up activities on measures approved by previous Congresses. Three years of NATO operations had brought to light a number of criticisms about the effectiveness of the organization. The Lisbon Conference of the North Atlantic Treaty Council in February 1952 devoted much of its time to streamlining the organization. The

committee, however, felt that an impartial bipartisan study by a commission of mixed public and private members modeled on the Hoover Commission could contribute a great deal toward better understanding in the United States of the work of the organization. The committee also felt that such a study might develop methods of economizing in the operation of the organization, and would make valuable suggestions and recommendations in connection with future consideration of problems related to NATO. The bill was objected to several times on the call of the calendar and was not acted upon by the Senate before adjournment.

*Dates**Documents*

Introduced, October 12, 1951----- S. 2269.
Reported to Senate, April 22, 1952----- Senate Report 1465.

C. PEACE SETTLEMENTS

Not since the Eightieth Congress, when the Senate approved the peace treaties with Rumania, Hungary, Bulgaria, and Italy, has the Senate been confronted with so many measures liquidating various aspects of World War II. The reason it has taken nearly 7 years to reach the point of settlement of some of these matters is so well known that it hardly needs repetition. The Western Powers since 1947 have attempted repeatedly to come to terms with the Soviet Union on the major peace treaties with Germany, Japan, and Austria. Negotiations, however, always bogged down because of the conflicting aims of the Western Powers and the Soviet bloc. The Council of Foreign Ministers, charged with responsibility for negotiating the German and Austrian peace treaties, has not met since 1949, and meetings of their deputies in the past few years have resulted in little progress. The Far Eastern Commission, which attempted to work out a peace treaty with Japan, ran into similar complications when the Soviet Union insisted that the Japanese Peace Treaty should also be negotiated by the Council of Foreign Ministers, where each power could veto action.

By 1951 and 1952, continued occupation of Germany and Japan reached the point of diminishing returns and the nations of the free world sought means to bring the war and occupation to an end. The first step was termination of the state of war with Germany in 1951. This was taken by most of the free states, still technically at war with Germany. The second step, chronologically, was the negotiation and signature of the Japanese Peace Treaty. The third step during this Congress was the negotiation of the contractual agreements with Germany and approval of the NATO-EDC protocol which will enable Western Germany to participate in the joint defenses of Western Europe. The North Pacific Fisheries Convention is also discussed in this section because of its close relationship to the Japanese Peace Treaty.

Since 1947 the Committee on Foreign Relations had kept itself informed on negotiations being carried on with regard to the peace settlements. It received reports from time to time on the work of the Council of Foreign Ministers, the problems and decisions of the Big Three Foreign Ministers, and on State Department planning related to resolution of the peace settlement deadlocks. When the measures relating to Germany and Japan came before the committee during this Congress, the committee was able to take prompt action on each.

8. TERMINATION OF WAR WITH GERMANY

Background.—The impossibility of terminating the war by a final treaty of peace with Germany in view of the Soviet attitude was acknowledged by the Foreign Ministers of France, the United Kingdom, and the United States when on September 18, 1950, in New York they stated that the Big Three would take the necessary steps in their domestic legislation to terminate the state of war with Germany. Following this agreement, some 30 countries took action to this end. On July 9, 1951, the President sent a message to Congress recommending legislation that would terminate the state of war with Germany.

Legislative action.—House Joint Resolution 289, to terminate the state of war between Germany and the United States, was passed by the House on July 27, 1951. The Senate Foreign Relations Committee considered the joint resolution at meetings on August 17 and October 1. At the latter meeting, the committee adopted an amendment relating to suits to recover property seized by the Alien Property Custodian and then voted to report the resolution favorably.

Since some opposition to the committee amendment developed and threatened favorable action on the resolution before adjournment, the committee accepted a move in the Senate to delete the amendment.

The Senate passed the joint resolution by a voice vote on October 18, 1951, and it was signed the following day by the President.

Provisions.—The resolution brought to an end the state of war between the United States and Germany which began on December 11, 1941, and provided that the rights and privileges of the United States and its nationals acquired with regard to Germany, as a result of the war, should not be affected by the termination.

<i>Dates</i>	<i>Documents</i>
Message from the President, July 9, 1951.	House Document 188.
Reported to House, July 18, 1951-----	House Report 706.
Passed House, July 27, 1951-----	Congressional Record, same date.
Reported to Senate with amendments, October 8, 1951.	Senate Report 892.
Passed Senate, unamended, October 18, 1951.	Congressional Record, same date.
Signed by President, October 19, 1951--	Public Law 181.

9. THE CONTRACTUAL AGREEMENTS WITH GERMANY AND THE NATO-EDC PROTOCOL

Background.—After terminating the state of war with Germany in 1951, the next logical step, short of a final treaty of peace which was not possible under present world conditions, was to end the occupation of Germany and restore to her the widest range of sovereignty compatible with the security requirements of the United States, Western Europe, and Western Germany. In September 1951 the Big Three Foreign Ministers at Washington declared as their common policy—the integration of the Federal Republic on a basis of equality within a European community itself included in a developing Atlantic Community—

and instructed their High Commissioners in Germany to negotiate “contractual agreements” with the Federal Republic. The result of these negotiations was a Convention on Relations between the Three Powers and the Federal Republic of Germany, and three supplementary conventions, all signed at Bonn, Germany, on May 26, 1952.

Concurrently, related and equally significant negotiations were carried on between France, Italy, the Netherlands, Belgium, Luxembourg and the Federal Republic of Germany looking toward the establishment of a European Defense Community (EDC). The EDC would control a European army made up of national units of about 13,000 men each with a common uniform, a common budget, common procurement of military equipment, and a common training program. Since this European army would be under the general command of the Supreme Headquarters, Allied Powers Europe (SHAPE), the North Atlantic Treaty Powers, including the United States, were vitally interested in and concerned with this development. At the Lisbon Conference of the North Atlantic Treaty Council in 1952, the members of that community agreed to exchange security guarantees between NATO and the EDC, thereby, in effect, making the North Atlantic Treaty applicable to Western Germany which was the only EDC country not also a member of NATO. These reciprocal security agreements were signed at Paris on May 27, 1952, along with the EDC Treaty, a tripartite declaration issued by the United States, the United Kingdom, and France, and a treaty between the United Kingdom and the EDC nations for automatic assistance in the event of an armed attack.

Senate action.—On June 2, 1952, the President requested the Senate's advice and consent to ratification for the Convention on Relations between the Three Powers and the Federal Republic of Germany and for the protocol to the North Atlantic Treaty. At the same time the President transmitted to the Senate three supplementary conventions (which did not require formal ratification). These were the convention on the settlement of matters arising out of the war and the occupation, the convention on the rights and obligations of foreign forces and their members in the Federal Republic of Germany, and the finance convention. The tripartite declaration of the Three Powers, and the text of a number of exchanges of notes which form part of the contractual agreements were also submitted and, to round out the background of this network of treaties, the President also sent, for the information of the Senate, two treaties to which the United States is not a party, namely, the European Defense Community and the European Coal and Steel Community.

During its consideration of the contractual agreements, the committee gave particular attention to the two instruments before it for formal ratification. As stated in the committee's report:

During the public hearings on the conventions from June 10 to June 17 committee members availed themselves of the opportunity to examine in a comprehensive and detailed manner the many ramifications of the subject.

In the subsequent executive sessions, the committee adopted an interpretation of the Convention on Relations as follows:

Resolved, That the Senate advise and consent to the ratification of the Convention on Relations between the Three Powers and the Federal Republic of Germany, with the following interpretation:

1. The Constitutional procedures as referred to in this Convention require that any military implementation of the provisions, other than the retained powers referred to in Paragraph 1 of Article 2, of this Convention (including all other conventions, agreements, or understandings, which may become effective as a result of ratification of this Convention) must have authorization by the Congress.

The committee explained its action in the report:

The committee does not desire nor intend to raise the constitutional question of the powers of the President and the Congress with respect to the deployment of United States military forces abroad. The Senate voiced its views on this matter last year in Senate Resolution 99, relating to the troops-to-Europe issue. Nevertheless, the convention under consideration raises a number of important security questions which involve the stationing and use of our Armed Forces in West Germany. Consequently, the committee believes that the Senate should make clear that, in approving the convention, it does so with the understanding that the convention does not grant to the President any authority to implement its terms from a military point of view. To the extent that any such military implementation is necessary—with the exceptions indicated below—congressional authorization would be required.

The exceptions referred to were stated in paragraph 1 of article 2 of the convention—preexisting rights relating to—

(a) the stationing of armed forces in Germany and the protection of their security, (b) Berlin, and (c) Germany as a whole, including the unification of Germany and a peace settlement.

A similar interpretation of the North Atlantic Treaty protocol was not adopted. On June 27, 1952, the committee voted to report the Convention on Relations favorably by a vote of 13 to 0, and the protocol to the North Atlantic Treaty by a vote of 12 to 0.

Provisions of the agreements.—The Convention on Relations is the instrument for ending the occupation and restoring Western Germany to the community of free nations as a sovereign equal. Under its terms the occupation statute was repealed and the Allied High Commission abolished. Control over internal and external affairs was turned over to the Federal Republic of Germany which agreed to be governed in its international relationships by the principles of the United Nations Charter and the aims of the Statute of the Council of Europe. Occupation forces in the Federal Republic were henceforth to be troops for the common defense, and not for occupation purposes. Inasmuch as the contractual agreements did not constitute a final peace settlement, certain rights were reserved to the three powers. These related to the stationing of armed forces in Germany and the protection of their security, to the city of Berlin which is not part of the Federal Republic, and to the unification of Germany and the peace treaty.

The protocol to the North Atlantic Treaty was the instrument for bringing Western Germany into the Western European defense system by extending the guaranties of that treaty to the territory, forces, vessels, or aircraft of any members of the EDC. Since all members of the EDC except Germany are members of NATO, the NATO guaranty was thus extended to the Federal Republic. In a similar instrument, the EDC members extended the same guaranty to members of NATO.

Article 8 of the Convention on Relations states that the three powers and the Federal Republic have entered into three other agreements which will go into force on the same date as the Convention on Relations. The first of these, the Convention on the Settlement of Matters Arising out of the War and the Occupation, contained provisions for the work of the occupation courts, the handling of war criminals, the continuation of the decartelization program, the payment of compensation to the victims of Nazi persecution, reparations, the handling of displaced persons and refugees, the restitution

of property, and the status of allied legislation. The second was the Convention on the Rights and Obligations of Foreign Forces in Germany, which regulated the status of foreign troops and their dependents in Germany by dealing with such diverse subjects as the general rights and obligations of the members of foreign forces, jurisdiction in civil and criminal proceedings, extradition, customs treatment, health and sanitation, the movement of foreign troops in Germany, communications, etc. The third was the Finance Convention, which regulated the financial arrangements for the foreign forces stationed in Germany, dealt with the contribution of Germany to the common defense, the facilities and services to be made available to the foreign forces in Germany, the settlement of intergovernmental claims for damage arising from the activities of the foreign forces, and the payment for accommodations, goods, and services. The committee's report discusses many of the matters covered by these conventions since they relate to subjects normally covered in a treaty of peace.

<i>Dates</i>	<i>Documents</i>
Signed May 26 and May 27, 1952-----	
Transmitted to Senate, June 2, 1952---	Senate Executives Q and R, Eighty-second Congress, second session.
Public hearings, June 10 to 17, 1952---	Printed hearings.
Reported to the Senate, June 28, 1952--	Senate Executive Report 15, Eighty-second Congress, second session.
Approved June 30, 1952, Executive Q with an interpretation by vote of 77 to 5; Executive R by a vote of 72 to 5.	Congressional Record, same date.

Miscellaneous committee print:

Summaries of the Contractual Agreements With Germany and Supporting Documents: Texts of a protocol to the North Atlantic Treaty, and the Tripartite Declaration issued at the signing of the European Defense Community Treaty at Paris.

10. THE JAPANESE PEACE TREATY AND OTHER TREATIES RELATING TO SECURITY IN THE PACIFIC

Background.—This was the first peace treaty to come before the Senate since 1947 when the Senate gave its advice and consent to the ratification of the peace treaties with the former Axis satellites. Those peace treaties had been signed only after long and arduous negotiations. Peacemaking since that time has become virtually impossible as a result of Soviet intransigence in international dealings. Peace treaties with Germany and Austria are still outstanding. The Japanese treaty was negotiated only over the protestations of and abstention by the Soviet Union and its satellites.

The United States began its efforts to arrive at a peace settlement with Japan in 1947 but was blocked by Russia's insistence that the negotiations be carried on in the Council of Foreign Ministers where it exercises a veto. In 1950 the United States initiated discussions for a peace treaty with Japan with nations outside the Soviet orbit. All agreed that such a treaty was necessary and on January 11, 1951, John Foster Dulles was appointed as the special representative of the President to conduct the negotiations.

The treaty was negotiated after extensive consultation with interested governments, including the circulating of several revised drafts among the parties concerned. It was signed at San Francisco on September 8, 1951, after a conference of 4 days, in which a United States delegation including several Senators and Congressmen participated. About the same time, three other treaties were signed which had been negotiated simultaneously and were designed to further strengthen the fabric of peace and security in the Pacific. These treaties were: (1) the mutual defense treaty between the United States and the Republic of the Philippines, signed at Washington on August 30, 1951; (2) the security treaty between Australia, New Zealand, and the United States signed at San Francisco on September 1, 1951; and (3) the security treaty between Japan and the United States, signed at San Francisco immediately following the signing of the peace treaty on September 8, 1951. The four treaties were referred to the Senate for advice and consent to ratification on January 10, 1952.

Main provisions.—The preamble sets forth Japan's intention of applying for membership in the United Nations and of fulfilling the obligations of members of that organization; of realizing the objectives of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights; of creating conditions of stability within Japan; and of conforming to internationally accepted fair practices in public and private trade.

1. Japan and the Allied Powers agree to terminate the state of war between them, and the Allied Powers recognize Japan's sovereignty over her home lands and territorial waters.

2. Japan renounces all claim to Korea, Formosa, and the Pescadores, the Kurile Islands and that part of Sakhalin which she acquired under provisions of the Treaty of Portsmouth of September 5, 1905. Japan also renounces all claims in connection with the League of Nations Mandate System and agrees to adhere to the action of the Security Council of April 2, 1947, which extends the trusteeship system to the Pacific Islands which were formerly mandate territories of Japan. Finally she renounces all claim to the Antarctic area and to the Spratly and Paracel Islands.

3. The parties agree that occupation forces shall be withdrawn 90 days after the treaty comes into effect, and that all Japanese property for which compensation has not been made but which was supplied to the occupying powers, shall be returned to Japan within 90 days. The parties further agree that under separate bilateral and multilateral agreements, foreign troops may be kept in Japan, and that all Japanese prisoners are to be returned to their homes.

4. In chapter IV of the treaty, which deals with political and economic clauses, provision is made for the re-entry into force of certain of Japan's prewar treaties and conventions. There are no specific provisions in the treaty for agreements concerned with high seas fishing, civil air transportation problems, and other commercial matters, but pending negotiation of such agreements, the Allied Powers are entitled to most-favored-nation treatment based on reciprocal privileges granted to Japan for a 4-year period.

5. Chapter V stipulates that Japan must pay reparations to the Allied Powers for their losses in the war, such reparations to be paid out of Japan's surplus assets of labor and plant facilities used in processing raw materials.* Subject to stated provisions, the Allied

*In the same article (14 (b)) the Allied Powers waive all reparations with certain exceptions.

Powers are authorized to dispose of all property rights and interests of Japanese nationals and entities owned or controlled by Japanese nationals, such disposal to be carried out in accordance with the laws of the Allied Power concerned. Neutral countries holding Japanese property shall turn these properties over to the International Red Cross to be used to benefit the families of former prisoners of war. China is included in the countries receiving benefits from Japanese payment of reparations, and to China is accorded the right of a peace treaty with Japan on the same terms as the present treaty.

6. Chapter VII provides that the treaty becomes effective upon ratification by the United States and a majority of 10 other specified states.

7. The treaty, in article 2, provides that Korea is an independent nation and is placed on a parity with the Allied Powers with respect to postwar trading, fishing, commercial, and maritime arrangements. Under the treaty terms, all Japanese property in Korea is surrendered to the Republic of Korea.

Committee action.—By the time the peace treaty and related security pacts were submitted to the Senate the committee was already thoroughly familiar with the subject. Beginning the day after his appointment on January 11, 1951, Mr. Dulles met periodically with the consultative Subcommittee on Far Eastern Affairs of the Foreign Relations Committee. These meetings took place on the average of more than once a month, and resulted in the airing and full discussion of all problems and matters relating to the negotiations. Furthermore, there were several meetings with the full committee on specific problems which resulted in committee suggestions that were incorporated into the final text of the treaty. Not only that, but all the members of the consultative subcommittee, in addition to the chairman and ranking minority member of the full committee, were invited to serve as members of the United States delegation for the signature of these instruments.

The committee took special note of the extensive bipartisan legislative-executive teamwork in its report.

The committee wishes to express its appreciation for the cooperative spirit in which the treaties were negotiated by the executive branch of the Government. Rarely, if ever, have committee members seen such legislative-executive teamwork as that which characterized negotiation of the treaties. The committee particularly desires to commend Ambassador Dulles for his outstanding contribution to the cause of world peace and bipartisan consultation.

The committee held public hearings on January 21, 22, 23, and 25, 1952. On February 6, the committee voted unanimously to report the treaties. At the same time, the committee approved an interpretative statement to be made a part of the resolution of ratification. During the course of the hearings, some witnesses complained that the peace treaty in effect gave validity to the Yalta agreement by leaving the physical possession of South Sakhalin and the Kurile Islands in the hands of the Soviet Union, while remaining silent on the legal status of these areas. Although the committee did not subscribe to this view, it approved the following statement to remove any shred of doubt:

Resolved (two-thirds of the Senators present concurring therein), That the Senate advise and consent to the ratification of the treaty of peace with Japan, signed at San Francisco on September 8, 1951. As part of such advice and consent the Senate states that nothing the treaty contains is deemed to diminish or prejudice, in favor of the Soviet Union, the right, title, and interest of Japan, or the Allied

Powers as defined in said treaty, in and to South Sakhalin and its adjacent islands, the Kurile Islands, the Habomai Islands, the island of Shikotan, or any other territory, rights, or interests possessed by Japan on December 7, 1941, or to confer any right, title, or benefit therein or thereto on the Soviet Union; and also that nothing in the said treaty, or the advice and consent of the Senate to the ratification thereof, implies recognition on the part of the United States of the provisions in favor of the Soviet Union contained in the so-called Yalta agreement regarding Japan of February 11, 1945.

<i>Dates</i>	<i>Documents</i>
Signed September 8, 1951-----	Senate Executive A, Eighty-second Congress, second session.
Transmitted to Senate, January 10, 1952.	Senate Executives A, B, C, and D, Eighty-second Congress, second session.
Public hearings, January 21-23 and 25, 1952.	Printed hearings.
Reported to the Senate, February 14, 1952 (with interpretative statement).	Senate Executive Report 2, Eighty-second Congress, second session.
Approved by Senate, March 20, 1952, by vote of 66-10.	Congressional Record, same date.
Ratified by the President April 15, 1952.	Miscellaneous committee print: Japanese Peace Treaty and Other Treaties Relating to Security in the Pacific: Reproduction of the Peace Treaty with Japan for the convenience of Members of the Senate.

(a) *Security treaty between the United States and Japan*

Background.—The conclusion of a security treaty between the United States and Japan resulted from the urgent need to provide Japan with forces adequate to help defend her own and our security in the Far East at a time when occupation troops were being withdrawn. Moreover, it was obvious that Japan had to be protected from possible Communist attack such as that which occurred in Korea in June 1950.

With this in mind, Ambassador Dulles initiated an exchange of correspondence with Premier Yoshida which was preliminary to the negotiation and conclusion of a bilateral security treaty. This treaty is designed to complement and reinforce the peace treaty with Japan which, while providing in article 6 for the withdrawal of occupation troops, also permits foreign armed forces to be stationed in Japanese territory under the terms of bilateral or multilateral agreements with the Allied Powers.

Main provisions.—The preamble states that for purposes of self-defense Japan is entitled to participate in arrangements for collective security and that United States armed forces are to be maintained in Japan at Japan's own wish.

1. United States land, air, and sea forces may be disposed in and about Japan to maintain international security in the far eastern area. Upon request of the Japanese Government, these forces may be used to quell internal disturbances caused by an outside power.

2. The treaty stipulates that Japan will not grant any bases or military facilities to a third power without prior consent of the United States.

3. Provision is made for administrative agreements concerning the disposition of United States Armed Forces in and about Japan.

4. The treaty is to be terminated whenever the Governments of Japan and the United States are in agreement that satisfactory alter-

natives exist for the maintenance of peace and security in the general area of Japan. Whatever form alternative provisions might take, the treaty cannot be terminated without the consent of the United States.

As the committee noted in its report, the security treaty imposes no commitments upon the United States. The United States is not obligated to station any forces in Japan unless it decides such action to be in its own national interest.

Senate action.—On March 20, 1952, the Senate agreed 58-9 to approve ratification of the treaty without amendment or reservation.

<i>Dates</i>	<i>Documents</i>
Signed September 8, 1951-----	Senate Executive D, Eighty-second Congress, second session.
Transmitted to Senate, January 10, 1952.	Senate Executives A, B, C, and D, Eighty-second Congress, second session.
Public hearings, January 21-23 and 25, 1952.	Printed hearings.
Reported to the Senate, February 14, 1952.	Senate Executive Report 2, Eighty-second Congress, second session.
Approved by Senate March 20, 1952, by vote of 58-9.	Congressional Record, same date.
Ratified by the President April 15, 1952.	

(b) *Security treaty between the United States, Australia, and New Zealand*

Background.—At the close of World War II, the United States found itself in the position of leadership in the Far East, with Australia and New Zealand eager to maintain close ties with the United States, and at the same time insure that Japan would not again launch an attack on her neighbors such as she did in 1941. They recognized that a peace treaty with the defeated former enemy was a necessary prerequisite to the cause of world peace, and were willing, therefore, to participate in a settlement which provided adequate safeguards for the future, including United States commitments to aid in resisting aggression. These commitments are found in the security treaty between the United States, Australia, and New Zealand which was signed on September 1, 1951, at San Francisco.

Main provisions.—The preamble enunciates the principle of strength in unity.

1. The parties agree that the settlement of disputes shall be by peaceful means, consistent with the purposes of the United Nations, and that they will by self-help and mutual aid build up their ability to resist aggression.

2. Under article IV, each of the signatories recognizes that an armed attack in the Pacific area on either of the parties would be dangerous to its own peace and safety and declares that it would act to meet the common danger in accordance with its constitutional processes. Such action would, of course, be reported to the Security Council of the United Nations and would cease when peace is restored.

3. The area within which the treaty is to operate is defined in article V. It is stipulated in that article that an armed attack on any of the parties includes an attack upon the metropolitan territory of the party and on the Pacific island territories under the party's jurisdiction. If an armed attack should be made on United States occupation forces in Japan, or if an attack should be made against the former Japanese mandated islands which are now administered by the United

States, or if an attack should be made upon the Ryukyu or Bonin Islands over which the United States will have jurisdiction under the terms of the Japanese Peace Treaty, such an attack would be considered as an attack upon the United States.

4. Provision is made for the establishment of a Council to implement the treaty, and that Council is authorized to maintain a consultative relationship with states, regional organizations, associations of states, or other authorities in the Pacific area to further the security of the area.

Senate action.—The committee voted to report the treaty favorably on February 6, 1952, and on March 20, by a voice vote, the Senate agreed to ratify it without amendment.

<i>Dates</i>	<i>Documents</i>
Signed September 1, 1951-----	Senate Executive C, Eighty-second Congress, second session.
Transmitted to Senate, January 10, 1952.	Senate Executives A, B, C, and D, Eighty-second Congress, second session.
Public hearings, January 21-23 and 25, 1952.	Printed hearings.
Reported to the Senate, February 14, 1952.	Senate Executive Report 2, Eighty-second Congress, second session.
Approved by Senate March 20, 1952---	Congressional Record, same date.
Motion to reconsider offered March 31, 1952, by Senator Watkins.	Do.
Motion to reconsider withdrawn April 1, 1952, by Senator Watkins.	Do.
Ratified by the President April 15, 1952.	

(c) *Mutual defense treaty between the United States and the Philippines*

Background.—The close relationship which existed between the United States and the Philippines as a result of their mutual efforts against the common enemy in World War II was further cemented by President Truman's statement on April 18, 1951, that an armed attack on the Philippines would be considered a threat to the United States. During negotiations of the Japanese Peace Treaty, it became desirable to exchange more formal assurances of mutual protection against aggression, and these were embodied in the treaty between the United States and the Philippines signed in San Francisco September 8, 1951.

Main provisions.—1. The parties agree to settle peacefully any international disputes between them, and to refrain from threats or the use of force which would be inconsistent with their obligations under the United Nations Charter. The treaty in no way affects the rights and obligations of the parties under the Charter of the United Nations, or the responsibility of the United Nations with respect to maintaining peace.

2. The parties agree to individually and mutually develop their ability to resist armed aggression. They further agree to consult whenever the security of either or both is endangered by "external armed attack in the Pacific."

3. The parties agree that an armed aggression on either would menace both, and that in the event of such aggression each will take appropriate action in accordance with its constitutional processes, and will so notify the Security Council of the United Nations.

Senate action.—After the committee agreed to report the security treaty favorably, the Senate on March 20, 1952, voted to approve its ratification.

<i>Dates</i>	<i>Documents</i>
Signed August 30, 1952-----	Senate Executive B, Eighty-second Congress, second session.
Transmitted to Senate, January 10, 1952.	Senate Executives A, B, C, and D, Eighty-second Congress, second session.
Public hearings, January 21-23, and 25, 1952.	Printed hearings.
Reported to the Senate, February 14, 1952.	Senate Executive Report 2, Eighty-second Congress, second session.
Approved by Senate March 20, 1952.	Congressional Record, same date.
Motion to reconsider offered March 31, 1952, by Senator Watkins.	Do.
Motion to reconsider withdrawn April 1, 1952, by Senator Watkins.	Do.
Ratified by the President April 15, 1952.	

11. NORTH PACIFIC FISHERIES CONVENTION

This convention is summarized here because it is a part of the liquidation of war in the Pacific and was taken into account by the committee during its consideration of the Japanese Peace Treaty.

One of the major prewar sources of tensions between the United States and Japan had been the activities of Japanese fishermen in the west coast North Pacific waters near the United States where United States fishing interests were making strenuous efforts at conservation. This situation was noted in the Japanese Peace Treaty, in which Japan undertook to enter into negotiations for the conclusion of agreements concerning the regulation and conservation of high seas fisheries. The International Convention for the High Seas Fisheries of the North Pacific Ocean submitted to the Senate on June 2, 1952, was the result of these negotiations. This convention is, according to the committee's report, "designed to bring about the better conservation of high seas fisheries of concern to the United States, Canada, and Japan. * * * It creates an International North Pacific Fisheries Commission of which the parties to the convention are members. The convention also specifies fish stocks which certain parties to the convention are to abstain from fishing and which are to be subject to continued conservation practices."

The committee held public hearings and reported the convention favorably to the Senate, which approved it just before adjournment.

<i>Dates</i>	<i>Documents</i>
Signed, May 9, 1952-----	
Transmitted to Senate, June 2, 1952---	Executive S, Eighty-second Congress, second session.
Public hearing, June 27, 1952-----	Printed hearings.
Reported to Senate, June 27, 1952-----	Executive Report 15, Eighty-second Congress, second session.
Approved, July 4, 1952-----	Congressional Record, same date.

D. WELFARE MATTERS

There were a number of measures before the committee which were concerned with human welfare problems. These bills and resolutions follow many precedents and demonstrate the interest of the Congress in the welfare of people in other lands beset with particular calamities.

In the Mutual Security Acts, certain programs are included which might properly be treated in this section, such as aid to Arab refugees, contributions to the United Nations Korean Reconstruction Agency, and technical assistance. These programs should be kept in mind in any evaluation of the Congress' concern with human welfare abroad.

12. INDIA EMERGENCY FOOD AID ACT OF 1951

Background.—Adverse climatic conditions in 1950 seriously threatened a famine in India. By the end of that year, India estimated that its grain prospects for 1951 would fall almost 2,000,000 tons short of minimum requirements. On December 16, 1950, the Indian Ambassador informally inquired whether the United States could make this amount available on "special and easy terms." The State Department immediately began to examine the proposition and discussed it with members of the Foreign Relations Committee's consultative Subcommittee on Near Eastern and African Affairs. On February 12, 1951, the President recommended in a message to Congress that this assistance to India be furnished, and that Congress authorize \$190,000,000 (half to be appropriated immediately and half later when the situation had further clarified) for the purchase of the needed grain on a grant basis.

Legislative action.—On February 15, 1951, Senator Smith of New Jersey, for himself and a number of other Senators, introduced S. 872 on which hearings were held in executive session on April 16, 17, and 18. Representatives of the executive branch and of certain private groups testified. Before reporting the bill to the Senate on April 20, 1951, the committee approved a number of amendments. (1) It divided the amount into half credit and half grant, with half the credit and half the grant being extended at once and half later. The first \$95,000,000 (half credit and half grant) was authorized to come out of unexpended ECA funds, the second \$95,000,000 to be appropriated. (2) The committee provided that counterpart funds should be used for the benefit of the people of India in projects designed to increase food production, to develop industrial and mineral resources, and to develop projects in the mutual interest of the United States and India. (3) The committee incorporated the 50-50 shipping provision of the ECA Act of 1948, as amended, requiring 50 percent of shipments to be in American ships.

On the floor, a number of other amendments were offered and debated. The major one adopted was an amendment by Senators Ferguson, McCarran, and Bridges, which provided that all the funds authorized be on a loan basis and come out of previous ECA appropriations, and that repayment might be made in certain materials in which the United States was or might become deficient. This amendment was supported by some members of the Foreign Relations Committee because of certain pronouncements in India which indicated that the Indian Government might prefer assistance in the form of a loan rather than a grant with the resultant conditions on it. The amendment was adopted in the Senate by a vote of 52 to 32. Other amendments agreed to on the Senate floor included a provision to direct the ECA Administrator to pay the ocean freight charges for relief parcels to India; a provision to apply the interest payments by India before 1957 to educational exchange activities; a provision

making the grain shipments contingent upon a finding by the Secretary of Agriculture that they would not impair the vital needs of the United States; a provision directing India to effect the transfer of certain strategic materials, including manganese and monazite sands, in repayment of the loan. House amendments to the Senate bill necessitated a conference at which the areas in disagreement were resolved. These areas of disagreement, readily reconciled, concerned methods of financing the loan, the description of critical and strategic materials to be used in repayment of the loan, certification by the Secretary of Agriculture of grain availability, use of the interest repayments for educational exchange activities, certain shipping provisions, etc.

Provisions of the bill.—The act directed the ECA Administrator to provide emergency food relief assistance to India on credit terms, including payment by transfer to the United States of materials in which the United States is deficient. It authorized the President to utilize in making the loan not in excess of \$190,000,000 during fiscal year 1952, \$100,000,000 out of funds appropriated for ECA and \$90,000,000 out of unobligated balances of ECA if any were available as of June 30, 1951. Provision was made for certification by the Secretary of Agriculture that the procurement of any agricultural product for shipment did not impair the vital needs of the United States. To the extent that the President might find, after consultation with Government and private officials, that private shipping was unavailable on reasonable terms, the RFC was authorized to advance up to \$20,000,000 to the Department of Commerce for reactivation and operation of surplus vessels to transport such supplies. Repayments of interest by India up to the amount of \$5,000,000 were to be applied to cultural exchange activities between the two Governments.

<i>Dates</i>	<i>Documents</i>
Message from the President, February 12, 1951.	House Document 56.
H. R. 3071 reported to House, March 5, 1951.	House Report 185.
S. 872 reported to Senate, April 26, 1951.	Senate Report 297.
Passed Senate with amendments, May 16, 1951.	Congressional Record, May 14–16, 1951.
H. R. 3791 reported to House, April 24, 1951.	House Report 373.
S. 872 passed House, May 24, 1951----	Congressional Record, May 22, 23, and 24, 1951.
Conference report agreed to in House, June 6, 1951.	House Report 540, Congressional Record, same date.
Conference report agreed to in Senate, June 11, 1951.	Congressional Record, same date.
Signed by President, June 15, 1951----	Public Law 48.

13. UNITED NATIONS INTERNATIONAL CHILDREN'S EMERGENCY FUND

The Children's Fund has had continuous and substantial support from the United States Congress for its 4 years of operations. Noting that the General Assembly of the United Nations, December 1950, had extended the life of the Children's Fund for another 3 years, the President, in a message to Congress, requested the authorization of \$12,000,000 for United States contributions during fiscal year 1952. The committee decided to report an original bill on August 22, 1951, approving the full amount requested. The bill (S. 2079) also pro-

vided that the President might contribute these funds in such a manner as he deemed to be in the interest of the United States to support international children's welfare work. Although the Senate passed the bill promptly, no final action was taken by the House on this bill.

On February 20, 1952, the President sent another message to the Congress, requesting that action be completed on the authorization of \$12,000,000 for fiscal year 1952 and that an additional \$12,000,000 be authorized for fiscal year 1953.

The committee considered this combined request in connection with the Mutual Security Act of 1952. The total of \$24,000,000 requested for the two fiscal years was reduced by the committee to \$20,962,000 and made a part of the Mutual Security Act of 1952. The House took similar action but limited the authorization to \$12,000,000.

In conference, the sum of \$16,481,000 was agreed on, of which \$6,666,667 was subsequently appropriated.

<i>Dates</i>	<i>Documents</i>
Message from President, August 9, 1951.	House Document 225.
Reported to Senate, August 30, 1951----	Senate Report 723.
Passed Senate, October 1, 1951-----	Congressional Record, same date.
Message from the President, February 29, 1952.	House Document 373.

For further proceedings, see page 17, legislative history of Mutual Security Act of 1952.

14. AMERICAN RELIEF FOR KOREA

This resolution (H. J. Res. 281), authorizes the President to set aside a special period for an intensive clothing collection appeal of American Relief for Korea, Inc. It grew out of the desperate plight of South Korean refugees and the request of the Department of Defense to American voluntary relief agencies for much-needed clothing, blankets, and other such goods before winter. Prompt endorsement was given to this humanitarian enterprise by the Senate and the House after the committees took favorable action.

<i>Dates</i>	<i>Documents</i>
Reported to House, July 16, 1951-----	House Report 702.
Passed House, August 6, 1951-----	Congressional Record, same day.
Reported to Senate, August 22, 1951---	Senate Report 699.
Passed Senate, August 23, 1951-----	Congressional Record, same day.
Signed by President, August 31, 1951--	Public Law 138.

E. FREEDOM OF INFORMATION

During this Congress, the committee took note of the increasing interference by the Government of the Soviet Union or its satellites with the free exchange of news between peoples on either side of the iron curtain. This interference, which was present in the past, has been stepped up as world tensions have increased. The outstanding incident during 1951 and 1952 was the imprisonment of William N. Oatis, an Associated Press reporter in Czechoslovakia on espionage charges based on his activities as a reporter. This action inflamed sentiment in the United States and was denounced by the congressional resolution described below.

The committee and both Houses of Congress also passed a resolution reaffirming United States friendship for all peoples of the world,

including the people of the Soviet Union, in an unusual and partially successful attempt to penetrate the iron curtain and acquaint the Russian people with the real motives and desires of the American people.

15. WILLIAM N. OATIS

In spring of 1951, American public opinion was aroused by the outrageous treatment of William N. Oatis by the Czechoslovakian Government. Oatis, the head of the Associated Press Bureau in Prague, was arrested, imprisoned, tried, and convicted by the Czech Government on charges of espionage, while he was carrying out his duties as a newspaper reporter. As these events were taking place and all official attempts to secure the release of Oatis failed, American indignation mounted and demands for congressional action multiplied. Of the number of resolutions introduced, the House, by a vote 363 to 1, and Senate, by a vote of 81 to 0, passed House Concurrent Resolution 140, which expressed Congress' indignation over the arrest and trial of Mr. Oatis; requested the executive agencies to take all possible action to bring about his release; requested that the sense of the resolution be reported to the United Nations and Czechoslovakian officials; and suggested the executive terminate United States commercial relations with Czechoslovakia until Oatis is given his freedom. Pursuant to this resolution, the administration began in September 1951 to abrogate trade concessions with Czechoslovakia, after having previously restricted the travel of private American citizens to that country and the flights of Czech planes over the western zones of Germany.

<i>Dates</i>	<i>Documents</i>
Reported to House, August 2, 1951----	House Report 783.
Passed House, August 14, 1951-----	Congressional Record, August 2, 9, and 14, 1951.
Reported to Senate, August 21, 1951---	Senate Report 696.
Passed Senate, August 23, 1951-----	Congressional Record, same date.

16. THE MCMAHON RESOLUTION REAFFIRMING FRIENDSHIP FOR ALL PEOPLES OF THE WORLD, INCLUDING THE SOVIET UNION

Background.—The Committee on Foreign Relations, dealing constantly with problems arising out of the increasingly severe tensions between the free world and the countries behind the iron curtain, is conscious at all times of its responsibilities to try every reasonable method to lessen these tensions. One of the most important reasons tensions cannot be relieved is the existence of the iron curtain itself, which permits no free exchange of information, visitors, and news. The Oatis incident described above shows the great lengths to which the Kremlin will go to stop honest reporting. The Kremlin has been able to distort, falsify, and suppress America's peaceful motives. As the committee stated in its report on the McMahon resolution (S. Rept. 298):

if action speaks louder than words, then there could be no doubt that people the world over would know the lengths to which the people of the United States are willing to go to build a world in which man can live in friendship and peace with his fellow man.

But the iron curtain has prevented a great number of people from seeing the actions and hearing the words of the United States. In an effort to present the truth to the peoples of Russia, Senator Mc-

Mahon, for himself and 20 other Senators, introduced Senate Concurrent Resolution 11.

Provisions.—The purpose of the resolution was to convey to the Russian people the historic and abiding friendship of the American people and their regret at the artificial barriers which separate them from the Russian people. Although the United States and the American people neither want war nor the consequences of one, the resolution continues, they are determined to defend their freedom, but will welcome any honorable efforts to settle the difficulties between their peoples. Lastly, the resolution requested the President to call upon the Government of the Soviet Union to acquaint the Russian people with the contents of the resolution.

Legislative action.—The committee reported the resolution with a few minor perfecting amendments, and the Senate passed it on the call of the calendar on May 4, 1951. The House amended and passed the resolution by a vote of 36 to 7 a month later. The Senate requested a conference, not because of outstanding differences in the versions of the resolution, but for the purpose of bringing the resolution before the House again and securing another recorded vote. The conference report was adopted in the House by a vote of 349 to 6.

Presidential action.—In accordance with the request of Congress, the President transmitted the resolution along with a letter adding his earnest hope "that these expressions may help form a better understanding of the aims and purposes of the United States." The letter, dated July 7, 1951, was addressed to Nicholai M. Shvernik, the President of the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics. The Voice of America beamed the message and the resolution repeatedly to the iron curtain. Demands mounted for a Russian reply and for evidence that the resolution had been publicized in the Soviet Union. Finally, on August 6, 1951, the President received a reply from Mr. Shvernik, enclosing a resolution of the Supreme Presidium and a request that the reply and resolution be made known to the American people, which was done. These communications asserted that the Soviet Union desires peace and that the United States is the only roadblock to the achievement of that desire. The following day Senate Concurrent Resolution 11 and the letter from the President were printed in all Soviet papers and read over the radio along with the Soviet replies.

In spite of the fact that publication of the McMahon resolution was accompanied by hostile rebuttal, it was a significant step forward in the penetration of the iron curtain. For the first time in years, the Soviet Government broadcast to its peoples a message from another Government which contradicted its own propaganda. On August 20, 1951, the President reported to Congress in a message on his actions and replies thereto.

<i>Dates</i>	<i>Documents</i>
Reported to Senate, April 26, 1951-----	Senate Report 298.
Passed Senate, May 4, 1951-----	Congressional Record, same date.
Reported to House, May 15, 1951-----	House Report 466.
Passed House, June 4, 1951-----	Congressional Record, same date.
Conference report adopted in Senate, June 18, 1951.	Do.
Conference report adopted in House, June 26, 1951.	House Report 632, Congressional Record, same date.
Message from President transmitting a report on action August 20, 1951.	House Document 229.

F. INTERNATIONAL FAIRS AND CONFERENCES

Besides these efforts to secure greater freedom of information between nations, the committee and the Congress took many positive steps to strengthen the bonds between the peoples of the world by endorsing international conferences and fairs, in line with many such endorsements in the past. The committee itself participated in meetings with members of other parliamentary bodies, such as the Council of Europe and the Commonwealth Parliamentary Association.

17. CHICAGO INTERNATIONAL TRADE FAIR

The committee was called upon to endorse and invite foreign nations to international trade fairs. The first of these was the Chicago International Trade Fair, originally planned to be held at Chicago, from March 22 to April 6, 1952. House Joint Resolution 331, authorizing the President to invite the States of the Union and foreign nations to this fair was passed by the House in October 1951 and by the Senate, in accordance with a long line of precedents, in January 1952. Before the President approved the resolution, however, the Congress was advised that the trade fair was postponed (and subsequently canceled) and requested the return of the resolution by the President, which request was complied with.

<i>Dates</i>	<i>Documents</i>
Reported to House, October 9, 1951----	House Report 1115.
Passed House, October 11, 1951-----	Congressional Record, same date.
Reported to Senate January 14, 1952--	Senate Report 1059.
Passed Senate, January 14, 1952-----	Congressional Record, same date.
Return requested (H. Con. Res. 186),	See Congressional Record, January 23,
in House, January 23, 1952; in	24, 1952.
Senate, January 24, 1952.	

18. NEW ORLEANS INTERNATIONAL TRADE FAIR AND INTER-AMERICAN CULTURAL AND TRADE CENTER

The second trade fair to which the Congress gave its endorsement and official backing will be held in New Orleans in 1953, in observance of the sesquicentennial anniversary of the Louisiana Purchase. As usual, the resolution introduced (S. J. Res. 22) granted recognition to the fair and trade center, called upon officials and agencies of the Government to assist and cooperate with such center, and invited the participation of foreign nations. In addition, however, the resolution permitted the duty-free entry of exhibits to the fair and trade center. The latter provision was struck by the committee during its consideration because the matter of waiving tariffs has usually been covered by separate legislation handled by the Finance Committee. The House companion resolution, House Joint Resolution 108, passed the House with the duty-free clause, however, and the Senate concurred in this action.

<i>Dates</i>	<i>Documents</i>
House Joint Resolution 108, reported to House February 19, 1952.	House Report 1379.
Senate Joint Resolution 22, reported to Senate, February 27, 1952, with an amendment.	Senate Report 1221.
House Joint Resolution 108 passed House, March 17, 1952.	Congressional Record, same date.
House Joint Resolution 108, passed Senate, March 24, 1952	Do.
Signed by President, April. 3, 1952----	Public Law 290.

19. WORLD METALLURGICAL CONGRESS

Similarly recognized by joint resolution (H. J. Res. 290) was the meeting of the World Metallurgical Congress in Detroit, October 14-19, 1951. Called by the American Society for Metals, this gathering was the first of its kind by metal scientists and was given special acknowledgment because of the importance of minerals, their supply and efficient utilization in our civilization and its defense.

House Joint Resolution 290, welcoming the scientists to the United States, requesting the President to grant the World Metallurgical Congress suitable recognition, and calling on agencies and officials of the Government to assist and cooperate, was passed without opposition.

<i>Dates</i>	<i>Documents</i>
Reported to House, August 14, 1951---	House Report 868.
Passed House, August 20, 1951-----	Congressional Record, same date.
Reported to Senate, September 21, 1951-	Senate Report 795.
Passed Senate, October 1, 1951-----	Congressional Record, same date.
Signed by President, October 10, 1951--	Public Law 164.

20. INVITATION OF THE COUNCIL OF EUROPE

The Council of Europe, established in 1949 to achieve "greater unity between its members," was of great interest to Congress because of its continuing concern in the problem of European integration. The Council, an organization with a Consultative Assembly made up of legislative bodies of 14 European countries, an Executive Council, and a Secretariat, has no legislative power but does serve as a strong force in welding free Europe together. The Committee on Foreign Relations, therefore, considered with interest an invitation issued on May 12, 1951, by the Consultative Assembly of the Council of Europe to explore the possibility of arranging a public discussion of problems of common interest by delegations of the Council of Europe and the United States Congress. This exploration took place on September 13, 1951, between Paul-Henri Spaak, president of the Consultative Assembly, Lord Layton, vice president, and members of subcommittees of the Foreign Relations and Foreign Affairs Committees. The questions of time, place, size of delegation and agenda were decided at that time. Subsequent to this, the committee voted to report Senate Concurrent Resolution 36 by Senator Gillette and Senate Resolution 215 by Senator Wiley, both of which authorized the appointment of a delegation to participate in the discussions and money for their expenses. Senate Concurrent Resolution 36 pro-

vided for a delegation from both houses, seven Members from each, while Senate Resolution 215 provided for a Senate delegation of seven. The purpose in two resolutions was to assure Senate participation in the discussions, should the House fail to pass the concurrent resolution. The concurrent resolution passed both houses, however, and the following were appointed to the committee: Senators Green (chairman of Senate group), Wiley, McMahon, Hicklenlooper, Humphrey, Benton, and Hendrickson; and Representatives Cox (chairman of the House group), Smith of Virginia, O'Toole, Reams, Judd, Ellsworth, and Keating.

The discussions took place November 19-23, 1951 at Strasbourg, France. According to the delegation's report (S. Doc. 90), they marked—

the first occasion when an official delegation from the United States Congress has participated in discussions of this kind with representatives of an organization like the Council of Europe.

The report also stated that—

the exchange of views which took place in Strasbourg proved extremely helpful to members of the delegation.

Members of the same delegation also visited Germany and Austria at the invitation of the German Bundestag and the Austrian Government. Some of the group continued on a brief survey trip to Italy, North Africa, Portugal, and Luxembourg. On its return, the delegation reported to the Senate on its discussions with the Council of Europe. Among its conclusions were the following:

1. There is general confusion among the nations and peoples of Western Europe as to the respective roles of the Council of Europe, the NATO, and the proposed Atlantic Union, particularly with respect to the part each should play in building economic and defensive military strength in free Europe. To some extent this confusion may be attributable to lack of clarity as to the policies of both the United States and Great Britain.

2. Members of the Consultative Assembly of the Council of Europe are not agreed as to whether that organization should take immediate steps resulting in some degree of federation or proceed toward that ultimate goal on a project by project basis.

3. While it seems clear that as of the present time the United Kingdom does not expect to participate fully in any truly political federation which may be developed in Western Europe, there is considerable doubt also as to the nature and extent of British participation in organizations that may be established to deal with such specific suggestions as the Pleven plan, the Schuman plan, and the proposals for a European agricultural market.

4. Regardless of the attitude of the United Kingdom and certain other countries, the American delegation felt that those Western European countries willing to move closer toward economic and political federation should do so as rapidly as possible.

5. The failure of Western Europe to make more realistic progress toward European unification results in large part, in the opinion of the delegation, from a tendency to overemphasize the difficulties of unification and to underestimate the dangers that will inevitably flow from failure to unify.

6. While economic and military assistance for Western Europe is provided because a majority in Congress believe that it is in the best interests of the United States to provide such aid, it does not follow that assistance must be given without attaching conditions to that aid. Thus far Congress has not sought to make its aid conditional upon the achievement of some specific degree of economic or political federation in Western Europe. Whether such conditions should be attached is a matter upon which the delegation does not express a conclusion; it notes for the record, however, that past legislative references to economic and political integration have not brought forth the positive achievements which many Members of Congress expected to flow from such references and other means may need to be chosen to achieve those results.

<i>Dates</i>	<i>Documents</i>
Senate Concurrent Resolution 36 and Senate Resolution 215, reported to Senate, October 4, 1951.	Senate Report 889.
Reported by Rules and Administration to Senate, October 11, 1951.	Senate Report 938.
Passed Senate, October 11, 1951-----	Congressional Record, same date.
Senate Concurrent Resolution 36, reported to House, October 17, 1951.	House Report 1202.
Passed House, October 18, 1951-----	Congressional Record, same date.
Report on discussions made to Senate, January 21, 1952.	Senate Document 90.

21. COMMONWEALTH PARLIAMENTARY ASSOCIATION

Anticipating the biennial meeting of the Commonwealth Parliamentary Association, attended by Senators in 1946, 1948, and 1950, at the invitation of the association, the committee on June 27, 1952, and the Senate on June 30, approved two resolutions authorizing the participation of Members of Congress in the 1952 meeting to be held in Canada. The first resolution, Senate Concurrent Resolution 86 authorized four Members of each House to attend and specified their expenses. The second, Senate Resolution 341, approved in case the House did not concur in Senate Concurrent Resolution 86, provided for the attendance of four Senators only and for their expenses. As in the case of the Council of Europe meeting, however, the House passed the concurrent resolution. Members appointed under the resolution were: Senators Theodore Francis Green (chairman), John C. Stennis, Leverett Saltonstall, and Ralph E. Flanders, and Representatives James P. Richards, Brooks Hays, Robert B. Chiperfield, and John M. Vorys.

<i>Dates</i>	<i>Documents</i>
Introduced June 26, 1952-----	Senate Resolution 341, Senate Concurrent Resolution 86.
Reported to Senate, June 28, 1952-----	Senate Report 1985.
Passed Senate, June 30, 1952-----	Congressional Record, same date.
Senate Concurrent Resolution 86 passed House, July 2, 1952.	Do.

Another parliamentary meeting attended by a congressional delegation was the forty-first session of the Interparliamentary Union at Berne, August 28 to September 2, 1952. The delegation, for which no congressional authorization was required because members of the Congress are members of the Interparliamentary Union, consisted of Senators Tom Connally, Theodore Francis Green, A. Willis Robertson, Paul H. Douglas, Estes Kefauver, Willis Smith, Thomas R. Underwood, Alexander Wiley, and Owen Brewster, and Representatives Harold D. Cooley, Daniel A. Reed, W. Robert Poage, Henry O. Talle, Hale Boggs, Albert Gore, and Wingate Lucas.

G. THE DEPARTMENT OF STATE

In connection with its legislative responsibilities the committee is deeply interested in the organization and operation of the State Department and the Foreign Service, and during the Eighty-second Congress gave close attention to their activities. The committee considered and approved a number of bills relating to Foreign Service officers, their widows, their housing accommodations and authorized an investigation of the foreign information program. All these measures, while in the nature of "housekeeping" functions, demonstrate the committee's continuing interest in and concern with smooth operations of the Department of State.

22. FOREIGN SERVICE ANNUITIES

Background.—Under most Government retirement systems, the annuities of retired personnel are based upon the salaries that annuitants received during the last few years of their employment and upon their contributions to the system. In the period of postwar inflation, the salaries of most Federal employees were raised to enable them to meet the increased cost of living. This meant that individuals retiring after a period of service under the new and higher salaries would have those higher salaries reflected in their retirement annuities. In 1948 and 1949 upward adjustments were made in the annuities of retired civil servants and military personnel so that individuals who had retired prior to the salary increases would receive increases in their annuities of up to \$300 per year. Foreign Service officers were not covered by this earlier legislation. The Secretary of State in 1949, and again in 1951, requested legislation to remedy this situation.

Provisions.—Legislation which was passed provides an increase of 25 percent or \$300, whichever is the lesser, for Foreign Service officers who retired before November 13, 1946, the effective date of the Foreign Service Act of 1946 which increased the salaries of Foreign Service officers. Smaller increases in annuities were given to officers who have retired since 1946. This legislation gives retired Foreign Service officers the same increase in annuities as that given to civil servants by the Langer-Chavez-Stevenson Act of 1948.

Legislative action.—The Secretary's request of 1949 led to the passage of H. R. 9002 by the House and to its consideration in executive session by the Foreign Relations Committee during the closing days of the Eighty-first Congress. The pressure of time and business, however, precluded action at that time. On February 8, 1951, the Secretary of State again proposed this legislation. The House reported and passed H. R. 3401 during the first session of the Eighty-second Congress and the Senate approved the bill in 1952.

*Dates**Documents*

Letter from the Secretary of State, Not printed.

February 8, 1951.

Reported to House, April 13, 1951----- House Report 323.

Passed House, May 1, 1951----- Congressional Record, same date.

Reported to Senate, February 27, 1952----- Senate Report 1222.

Passed Senate, May 12, 1952----- Congressional Record, same date.

Signed by President, May 21, 1952----- Public Law 348.

(For history of H. R. 9002, see Survey of Activities of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, Eighty-first Congress, p. 68.)

23. ANNUITIES FOR FOREIGN SERVICE WIDOWS

Another group whose special problems were considered by the committee was that of the widows of Foreign Service officers who died prior to the effective date of the Foreign Service Act of 1946, and whose families did not therefore share in the benefits of that act. Inasmuch as most of these women were over 60 and many of them were in straitened circumstances, the committee reported an original bill, S. 3413, which would authorize and direct the Secretary of State to make grants or loans not exceeding \$100 per month to any widow of a Foreign Service officer who died before 1946 if the Secretary found her to be in actual need and without other adequate means of support. The committee felt "that the passage of this bill will be a step toward

ameliorating the condition of these needy women, many of whom spent long, hard years abroad in the service of their country." This bill was not considered by the Senate.

*Dates**Documents*

Introduced and reported to the Senate, S. 3413, Senate Report 1986.
June 28, 1952.

24. AMENDING THE FOREIGN SERVICE BUILDINGS ACT OF 1926

Background.—In the course of the conduct of United States foreign relations, the Department of State has found it necessary to provide space for offices and living quarters for United States diplomatic and consular representatives abroad.

By the Foreign Service Buildings Act of 1926, the Congress authorized the Secretary of State to acquire sites and buildings abroad for our diplomatic missions and personnel. There was an initial appropriation of \$10,000,000, which was increased with subsequent appropriations. In 1946, Congress authorized an additional \$15,000,000 and \$110,000,000 in foreign currency credits accumulated by the United States abroad through postwar settlement of war accounts, notably lend-lease and sales of surplus property. By June 1, 1952, all but \$1,500,000 of the previously authorized foreign currency credits would have been expended for the building program and the State Department requested authority to spend additional foreign currency credits which might lose their value through inflation unless they were used.

Legislative action.—This legislation was proposed by the Secretary of State in a letter of May 15, 1951. The House took action first and sent H. R. 6661 to the Senate early in the second session. On May 13 1952, the committee heard State Department officials in executive session and voted to report the bill. It passed on the following calendar call with one minor amendment, subsequently accepted by the House.

Provisions.—Besides authorizing \$90,000,000 to be appropriated for payments to the Treasury, representing the value of foreign currency credits utilized for the building program, the bill also incorporates for the sake of administrative orderliness the President's Reorganization Plan No. II of 1939 relating to the Foreign Service Buildings Commission. Other changes made in existing legislation included authority (1) to supervise, preserve, maintain, and operate the Foreign Service properties abroad and to insure them whenever necessary; (2) to rent and insure objects of art; (3) to obtain architectural and other expert technical services as may be necessary and pay for them in accordance with local authority, custom, or law; (4) to purchase articles not manufactured in the United States as previously provided; and (5) to make short-term leases.

*Dates**Documents*

Letter from the Secretary of State, Not printed.

May 15, 1951.

Reported in House, February 20, 1952. House Report 1396.

Passed House, March 31, 1952.----- Congressional Record, same date.

Reported in Senate, May 21, 1952.----- Senate Report 1586.

Passed Senate with amendment, June 2, 1952. Congressional Record, same date.

House agreed to Senate amendment, Do.

June 9, 1952.

Signed by President, June 19, 1952.---- Public Law 399.

25. FOREIGN INFORMATION PROGRAMS

As one of the drafters of the Smith-Mundt Act, the Committee on Foreign Relations has maintained a continuing interest in the activities of this Government in information and educational exchange activities. It held hearings and investigations in 1948 and 1950 relating to certain aspects of these programs. After 4 years of operations of these programs, the committee in 1952 took the opportunity presented by the introduction of a resolution by Senators Benton and Wiley and decided that it was time for an over-all evaluation of present operations and a determination by what means, if any, they could be improved. As stated in the committee's report,

In order that this Government may have an effective information program it is important that these programs be subjected from time to time to the careful scrutiny of the representatives of the people.

In this spirit, the committee and the Senate approved Senate Resolution 74, which provides for a full and complete study and investigation by the Foreign Relations Committee or a subcommittee thereof, of the operations and effectiveness of existing foreign information programs conducted by the Government and the development of techniques to make these operations more effective. The resolution also authorizes the expenditure of not more than \$50,000 for this investigation. Appointed to carry out the investigation were Senators Fulbright (chairman), Gillette, Wiley, and Hickenlooper from the Foreign Relations Committee and Senators Benton and Mundt from the Senate at large.

<i>Dates</i>	<i>Documents</i>
Introduced, February 19, 1951.....	Senate Resolution 74.
Reported to Senate, June 28, 1952.....	Senate Report 1984.
Passed Senate, June 30, 1952.....	Congressional Record, same date.

26. CONTINUANCE OF FOREIGN SERVICE OFFICER AS CHIEF OF VISA DIVISION

Four years ago, Herve J. L'Heureux was appointed Chief of the Visa Division in the Department of State under a section of the Foreign Service Act of 1946 which permits such appointments for a period not to exceed 4 years. Mr. L'Heureux's assignment would have had to be terminated in September 1951 but for H. R. 4674 which authorized the Secretary of State to continue his assignment for an additional year. This action permitted the retention of an experienced and able officer in a position of increasing responsibilities under the Displaced Persons Act of 1948 and the Internal Security Act of 1950.

<i>Dates</i>	<i>Documents</i>
Reported to House, July 16, 1951.....	House Report 701.
Passed House, August 8, 1951.....	Congressional Record, same day.
Reported to Senate, August 22, 1951..	Senate Report 700.
Passed Senate, August 27, 1951.....	Congressional Record, same day.
Signed by President, September 13, 1951.	Private Law 255.

H. COMMERCIAL AND FINANCIAL MATTERS: BILATERAL TREATIES

Most civilized nations regulate their normal commercial relations with each other by bilateral treaties and conventions covering various types of activities. The United States, for instance, has treaties of friendship, commerce and navigation, and consular conventions, with

practically all states of the world. Some of these treaties date back to the early days of the Republic. The Department of State is constantly revising the old conventions, negotiating new ones with states newly emerging or previously not covered, and devising solutions to new problems arising out of modern conditions, such as double taxation. The Eighty-second Congress had an unusual number of such treaties before it: 18 double-taxation conventions, all but one of which were approved; 3 consular conventions, which were approved; and 6 commercial treaties on which no final action was taken.

27. DOUBLE-TAXATION CONVENTIONS

Background.—Double taxation arises, in the absence of reciprocal conventions, from the fact that the various governments assume and exercise broad and frequently overlapping taxing jurisdictions. Several years ago, the United States embarked on a program of negotiating conventions to eliminate double taxation on its citizens residing, deriving an income, or inheriting an estate in a foreign state.

Senate action.—(1) The 14 conventions: In January 1951, a subcommittee with Senator George as chairman and Senators Gillette, Smith of New Jersey, and Hickenlooper as members was appointed to consider the 13 double-taxation conventions then pending before the committee and 1 other transmitted to the Senate during the course of the subcommittee's deliberations. The subcommittee held 2 days of public hearings in April and on June 1, 1951, the subcommittee agreed to report the 14 conventions favorably to the full committee with certain reservations to several of them. The full committee promptly endorsed the subcommittee's recommendations and the Senate ratified them in due course. These were the conventions ratified and the reservations thereto:

1. Convention with the Union of South Africa relating to income taxes, signed at Pretoria, December 13, 1946 (Executive O, 80th Cong., 1st sess.): Approved with an understanding relative to the collection provisions of article XV.
2. Convention with the Union of South Africa relating to estate taxes, signed at Capetown, April 10, 1947 (Executive FF, 80th Cong., 1st sess.): Approved with an understanding relative to the collection provisions of article VIII.
3. Convention with New Zealand relating to income taxes, signed at Washington, March 16, 1948 (Executive J, 80th Cong., 2d sess.): Approved subject to a reservation relative to taxes collectible from public entertainers.
4. Convention with Norway relating to income taxes, signed at Washington, June 13, 1949 (Executive Q, 81st Cong., 1st sess.): Approved subject to an understanding relative to the collection provisions of article XVII.
5. Convention with Norway relating to estate taxes, signed at Washington, June 13, 1949 (Executive R, 81st Cong., 1st sess.): Approved subject to a reservation respecting the collection provisions of article IX.
6. Convention with Ireland relating to estate taxes, signed at Dublin, September 13, 1949 (Executive E, 81st Cong., 2d sess.): Approved subject to no reservations or understandings.

7. Convention with Ireland relating to income taxes, signed at Dublin, September 13, 1949 (Executive F, 81st Cong., 2d sess.): Approved subject to reservations relative to the capital-gains provisions of article XIV and the accumulated-earnings provisions of article XVI.
 8. Convention with Greece relating to estate taxes, signed at Athens, February 20, 1950 (Executive K, 81st Cong., 2d sess.): Approved subject to a reservation regarding the collection provisions of article IX.
 9. Convention with Greece relating to income taxes, signed at Athens, February 20, 1950 (Executive L, 81st Cong., 2d sess.): Approved subject to an understanding with respect to the collection provisions of article XIX.
 10. Convention with Canada relating to income taxes, signed at Ottawa, June 12, 1950 (Executive R, 81st Cong., 2d sess.): Approved subject to a reservation relating to the professional earnings of public entertainers.
 11. Convention with Canada relating to estate taxes, signed at Ottawa, June 12, 1950 (Executive S, 81st Cong., 2d sess.): Approved subject to no reservations or understandings.
 12. Protocol with the Union of South Africa, relating to estate taxes, signed at Pretoria, July 14, 1950 (Executive T, 81st Cong., 2d sess.): Approved subject to an understanding relative to the collection provision referred to above under Executive FF.
 13. Protocol with the Union of South Africa, relating to income taxes, signed at Pretoria, July 14, 1950 (Executive U, 81st Cong., 2d sess.): Approved subject to a reservation relating to the profits of public entertainers and the understanding referred to under Executive O above.
 14. Convention with Switzerland, relating to income taxes, signed at Washington, May 24, 1951 (Executive N, 82d Cong., 1st sess.): Approved subject to reservation regarding profits of public entertainers.
- (2) The three conventions: Toward the close of the second session, three additional conventions on double taxation, referred to the committee since its consideration of the previous 14, were considered by Senator George as a subcommittee of 1. His recommendation for approval was accepted by the full committee on June 23, 1952 and by the Senate a few days later. The conventions, ratified without reservations, were the following:
1. Convention with Finland relating to estate taxes, signed at Washington, March 3, 1952 (Executive K, 82d Cong., 2d sess.).
 2. Convention with Finland relating to income taxes, signed at Washington, March 3, 1952 (Executive L, 82d Cong., 2d sess.).
 3. Convention with Switzerland relating to estate taxes, signed at Washington, July 9, 1951 (Executive P, 82d Cong., 1st sess.).

Provisions. The conventions and protocols listed above fall into two groups, nine dealing with taxes on income and eight dealing with taxes on the estates of deceased persons. In general they follow the postwar pattern of the conventions with the United Kingdom, France, the Netherlands, and Denmark.

The income tax conventions are designed to eliminate double taxation with respect to income, either by exemption in one of the countries or by granting appropriate credit for taxes paid, or both. They also establish a system of reciprocal administrative assistance between the tax authorities of the signatories. They contain provisions relating to business income, dividends and interest, compensation for personal services, government salaries, private pensions and annuities, professors, teachers, students and business apprentices, religious, charitable and similar organizations, ships and aircraft, rentals and royalties, capital gains, accumulated earnings and profits, etc.

The conventions on estate taxes seek to eliminate double taxation, principally by a credit system with respect to the estates inherited by nationals of one country in the territory of the other. They also set up a system for exchange of information and administrative assistance. The provisions are essentially the same as those of previous conventions.

The reservations adopted by the Senate on the estate tax conventions apply to provisions on mutual assistance in the collection of taxes. The committee felt that these were too broad and recommended that they be omitted entirely. This reservation was adopted by the Senate.

The reservations adopted by the Senate to the various income tax conventions all relate to the same provision, which exempted public entertainers from the tax relief for personal services extended to residents of one State temporarily within the taxing State. This was deemed by the committee and the Senate to discriminate unfairly against a particular occupational group, and reservations were adopted withholding Senate advice and consent from that provision.

*Dates**Documents*

(1) THE FOURTEEN CONVENTIONS

Subcommittee appointed, January 22, 1951.

Subcommittee hearings, April 12 and 13, 1951. Printed hearings.

Subcommittee report, June 29, 1951 --- Executive transcript.

Reported to Senate, August 6, 1951 --- Senate Executive Report 1, Eighty-first Congress, first session.

Approved, September 17, 1951 --- Congressional Record, same date.

(2) THE THREE CONVENTIONS

Subcommittee appointed, May 19, 1952.

Reported to full committee and Senate, June 23, 1952. Executive Report 13, Eighty-second Congress, second session.

Approved, July 4, 1952 --- Congressional Record, same date.

28. CONSULAR CONVENTIONS

The United States has consular conventions with most nations of the world. The general nature of these treaties has been described by the committee as follows:

Consular conventions are bilateral agreements whereby the parties agree that they will reciprocally grant consular establishments and consular officers and employees certain privileges and rights within each country. These privileges and rights are given in order to enable the countries party to the conventions to assist and protect their nationals while in the territory of the other party to the convention.

In recent years, the Department of State has negotiated consular conventions to complete this network. The President in 1950 sent to

the Senate consular conventions with Ireland and the United Kingdom. An article in these two conventions relating to the appointment of administrators of decedent's estates, however, raised certain questions which persuaded the Department of State to withdraw the United Kingdom convention and submit a new one, and to negotiate a protocol to the Irish convention. A subcommittee of Senators Sparkman (chairman), Fulbright, and Hickenlooper held public hearings on these three conventions—the new United Kingdom convention, the Irish convention, and the protocol thereto—and reported them favorably to the committee. Both the full committee and the Senate approved them.

The conventions with Ireland and the United Kingdom are the first such instruments signed between the United States and those two nations. They follow closely the pattern of the only other postwar consular conventions entered into by the United States—those with the Philippines (1947) and Costa Rica (1948). They concern—

the status of consular establishments, the rights, privileges, and immunities of consular officers, and the duties and functions of consular officers stationed in the territories of the parties to the convention (Ex. Rept. 8, 82d Cong., 2d sess.).

<i>Dates</i>	<i>Documents</i>
First United Kingdom convention signed, February 16, 1949.	
Transmitted to Senate, January 9, 1950.	Executive A, Eighty-First Congress, second session.
Withdrawn, October 16, 1951.	Congressional Record, same date.
Second United Kingdom convention signed June 6, 1951.	
Transmitted to Senate, June 20, 1951.	Executive O, Eighty-second Congress, first session.
Irish convention signed, May 1, 1950.	
Transmitted to Senate, June 7, 1950.	Executive P, Eighty-first Congress, second session.
Protocol to Irish convention signed, March 3, 1952.	
Transmitted to Senate, March 28, 1952.	Executive N, Eighty-second Congress, second session.
Public hearings, May 9, 1952.	Printed as appendix to Executive Report 8, Eighty-second Congress, second session.
Reported to Senate, May 21, 1952.	Executive Report 8, Eighty-second Congress, second session.
Approved, June 13, 1952.	Congressional Record, same date.

29. COMMERCIAL TREATIES

Although the commercial treaties were not reported by the committee, they deserve mention because they were considered at some length by the same subcommittee that considered the consular conventions. The six commercial treaties studied were those between the United States on the one hand and Colombia, Israel, Ethiopia, Italy, Denmark, and Greece. In most respects these treaties followed the general pattern of previous treaties although there were many improvements in language. The treaties covered such matters as the protection of nationals and their property in the territory of the contracting parties, the promotion of trade, the reduction of discrimination based on nationality, and similar matters. One provision relating to the extension of national treatment to nationals of contracting parties engaged in the professions raised several questions

which were still under consideration when the Eighty-second Congress ended and it was not possible to conclude the subcommittee's study of the conventions.

<i>Dates</i>	<i>Documents</i>
Signed:	
Colombia, April 26, 1951-----	
Israel, August 23, 1951-----	
Ethiopia, September 7, 1951-----	
Italy, September 26, 1951-----	
Denmark, October 1, 1951-----	
Greece, August 3, 1951-----	
Transmitted:	
Colombia, June 13, 1951-----	Executive M, Eighty-second Congress, first session.
Israel, October 18, 1951-----	Executive R, Eighty-second Congress, first session.
Ethiopia, January 14, 1952-----	Executive F, Eighty-second Congress, second session.
Italy, January 29, 1952-----	Executive H, Eighty-second Congress, second session.
Denmark, January 29, 1952-----	Executive I, Eighty-second Congress, second session.
Greece, January 30, 1952-----	Executive J, Eighty-second Congress, second session.
Public hearings, May 9, 1952-----	Printed hearings.

I. COMMERCIAL AND FINANCIAL MATTERS: INTERNATIONAL CONVENTIONS

Certain problems by their nature cannot be solved on a bilateral basis, as those discussed above, but must be settled for greater effectiveness on a multilateral basis. Among these are international commodity, conservation, transportation, and communications problems. The committee during this Congress had before it several such multilateral conventions designed to eliminate specific problems, two protocols to the international agreement on the regulation of production and marketing of sugar, a number of international labor conventions, and an amendment to the International Load Line Convention. These are described below.

30. PROTOCOLS TO THE INTERNATIONAL CONVENTION ON THE REGULATION OF PRODUCTION AND MARKETING OF SUGAR

Since 1944, the Senate has each year extended, by means of approving a protocol, the international agreement regarding the regulation of production and marketing of sugar of 1937. Such extension has served to keep alive the framework, but not the operative chapters, of that agreement for possible future revision. The 1951 protocol was approved along with the 1952 protocol toward the end of the 1952 session.

<i>Dates</i>	<i>Documents</i>
Signed August 31, 1950, and August 31, 1951.	
Transmitted to the Senate, June 7, 1951, and April 1, 1952.	Executives I, Eighty-second Congress, first session, and O, Eighty-second Congress, second session.
Reported to Senate, May 19, 1952-----	Executive Report 7, Eighty-second Congress, second session.
Approved, July 4, 1952-----	Congressional Record, same date.

31. INTERNATIONAL LABOR CONVENTIONS

The United States has been a member of the ILO since 1934 and has taken a very active part in the organization. ILO conventions and recommendations, however, have not been particularly applicable in the United States because labor standards on the whole in the United States are higher than those advocated in these instruments. Senate action has not been pressed on a number of conventions and recommendations referred to it over the course of the years. During this Congress a special effort was made to secure action on some of these instruments.

The conventions acted upon by the committee were four (Nos. 68, 69, 73, and 74) adopted at Seattle in 1946, all relating to minimum working standards for seamen. ILO Convention No. 68 concerns food and catering for crews on seagoing vessels, No. 69 concerns ships' cooks, No. 73 medical examination of seafarers, and No. 74 the certification of able-bodied seamen. These four conventions deal with conditions of work for maritime employees. The committee report states that the adherence of the United States to the four conventions—

will serve to protect the standards of the most advanced countries, such as the United States, from the lower standards of countries that lag behind.

A subcommittee of Senators Green (chairman), Sparkman, and Tobey held hearings on the four conventions and reported them favorably with several understandings. The purpose of these understandings was to make the conventions—as was intended by the framers—apply only to vessels plying the high seas and to exclude them from application to inland, coastal, or Great Lakes waters. The full committee adopted the subcommittee's recommendations and report, which in turn were adopted by the Senate.

<i>Dates</i>	<i>Documents</i>
Signed, June 29, 1946-----	
Transmitted to Senate, June 23, 1947--	Executives R, S, Y, and Z, Eightieth Congress, first session.
Public hearings, January 21 and 23, 1952.	Typed transcript.
Reported to Senate, June 9, 1952-----	Executive Report 11, Eighty-second Congress, second session.
Approved, July 4, 1952-----	Congressional Record, same date.

32. AMENDMENT TO INTERNATIONAL LOAD LINE CONVENTION

Background.—In its report on this convention, the committee stated the background of the International Load Line Convention as follows:

The International Load Line Convention, which was negotiated in 1930, approved by the Senate on February 27, 1931, and proclaimed by the President on January 5, 1933, prescribes the depths to which ships engaged in international commerce may be loaded. It requires that ships of participating nations engaged in international voyages shall be surveyed and marked with load lines in accordance with the convention's terms. Load lines are placed on ships to mark the point beyond which a vessel may not be safely submerged by reason of the load it carries. The convention recognizes that the load line may with full regard to safety differ at varying seasons of the year and in different parts of the oceans of the world and therefore fixes zones and seasons in which and during which different rules for fixing the load lines apply.

Both Australia and Canada proposed modifications to the original conventions, which were approved by the interested authorities and

shipping concerns in the United States. The Canadian modification consisted of including the port of Prince Rupert, British Columbia, in the "summer" zone instead of the "winter seasonal" zone, thereby permitting more deeply laden vessels to operate there. The Australian modification proposed to permit ships to remain in the "summer" zone on voyages between the Indian Ocean and ports of southern and eastern Australia, thereby again facilitating the carriage of heavier loads. Since both modifications involved no lowering of safety standards and were supported by all interested parties, the committee and Senate took favorable action.

<i>Dates</i>	<i>Documents</i>
Submitted to the Senate, October 3, 1951.	Senate Executive Q, Eighty-second Congress, first session.
Reported, March 7, 1952-----	Senate Executive Report 4, Eighty-second Congress, second session.
Approved, April 1, 1952-----	Congressional Record, same date.

J. WESTERN HEMISPHERE PROBLEMS

The strengthening of inter-American bonds through cooperation in the Pan American Union, now the Organization of American States, (OAS) and through bilateral settlements of specific problems has long been a major concern of the committee. The committee continued these efforts to maintain friendly relations in the Western Hemisphere during the Eighty-second Congress, by giving its approval to a bill extending privileges and immunities to the Council of the OAS and to a variety of measures solving problems arising out of the long land and river boundaries of the United States, which because of their international character require congressional action.

33. PRIVILEGES AND IMMUNITIES FOR THE COUNCIL OF THE ORGANIZATION OF AMERICAN STATES (COAS)

The simple purpose of this bill (S. 2042) was to enable the President to grant diplomatic privileges and immunities to representatives to the Council of the Organization of American States similar to those granted to representatives to the United Nations in 1945. This action had been unnecessary so long as the American Republics had been represented on the Governing Board of the Pan-American Union by their Ambassadors in Washington. When some of the countries appointed permanent representatives to the Governing Board's successor, the Council of the Organization of American States, it was considered desirable to give these representatives the same status enjoyed by Ambassadors. The committee concurred in this proposal because of the official character of the organization and because of its desire to continue to promote cordial relations among the nations of the New World.

<i>Dates</i>	<i>Documents</i>
Reported to Senate, October 4, 1951---	Senate Report 888.
Passed Senate, October 11, 1951-----	Congressional Record, same date.
Reported to House, May 29, 1952-----	House Report 2009.
Passed House, July 2, 1952-----	Congressional Record, same date.
Signed by President, July 10, 1952-----	Public Law 486.

34. NORTHEASTERN FOREST FIRE COMPACT

As a result of the disastrous forest fires in Maine in 1947, the six New England States and New York joined together in an interstate compact for the purpose of preventing and suppressing forest fires in the area. This compact was approved by Congress in Public Law 129, Eighty-first Congress, June 25, 1949. The act provided that "subject to the consent of the Congress of the United States any Province of the Dominion of Canada which is contiguous with any member State may become a party to this compact by taking such action as its laws and the laws of the Dominion of Canada may prescribe for ratification." In 1951, New Brunswick petitioned to participate in the compact.

S. 1835 was introduced by Senator Aiken on behalf of himself and other New England Senators on July 11, 1951, to approve the participation in the Northeastern Interstate Forest Fire Protection Compact of any Province of Canada which is contiguous to any State that is a party to the compact. It also authorizes the Secretary of the Treasury, the Attorney General, and the Surgeon General to establish regulations and procedures relating to import, immigration, and public health laws so that men and equipment can freely cross the border to join in fire-fighting activities in adjoining States or Provinces. The committee considered the bill on February 19 and March 11, 1952, at which time it was reported unanimously. Since the House passed a companion bill before action was taken on S. 1835 in the Senate, the House measure rather than the Senate bill was acted upon by the Senate.

<i>Dates</i>	<i>Documents</i>
Introduced in Senate, July 11, 1951----	S. 1835.
H. R. 4764 reported to House, April 2, 1952.	House Report 1683.
Passed House, April 7, 1952-----	Congressional Record, same date.
S. 1835 reported to Senate, April 8, 1952--	Senate Report 1405.
H. R. 4764 passed Senate, May 1, 1952--	Congressional Record, same date.
Signed by President, May 13, 1952----	Public Law 340.

35. RADIO CONVENTION WITH CANADA

The need for this convention arose out of an increasing number of incidents wherein citizens of one country who operate certain types of radio equipment in that country were precluded by the laws of the other country from operating similar equipment there in the line of their work. This prohibition has affected various classes of people who cross the United States-Canadian border in the course of their work—such as doctors, the United States Park Service, Interior Department personnel on surveys, and power companies—all of whom may operate mobile radio equipment on one side of the boundary but not on the other.

This radio convention was negotiated and signed to eliminate these difficulties. From now on, three classes of persons will be able to use their radio equipment under proper safeguards, such as registration, issuance of permits, and compliance with local laws and regulations, in either the United States or Canada. These are: (1) pilots who are qualified radio operators in either country; (2) mobile radio transmitter operators who are engaged in public service or commercial

activities, and individuals who have radio telephone installations in their cars; and (3) amateur wireless operators.

Inasmuch as the convention had the backing of all interested parties and was noncontroversial, it received rapid committee and Senate approval.

<i>Dates</i>	<i>Documents</i>
Signed at Ottawa, February 8, 1951.	
Transmitted to Senate, March 27, 1951.	Executive C, Eighty-second Congress, first session.
Reported in Senate, February 27, 1952.	Senate Executive Report 3, Eighty-second Congress, first session.
Approved by Senate, April 1, 1952-----	Congressional Record, same date.

36. ST. LAWRENCE SEAWAY AND POWER PROJECT

The St. Lawrence seaway and power project has been before the committee for a number of years, but it has not been actively considered since 1948, when the matter was reported favorably to the Senate, but was recommitted to the Committee on Foreign Relations for further study. During the second session of the Eighty-second Congress, efforts were again made to have the matter acted on favorably when Canada announced that she was preparing to start construction within a certain time if the United States did not join in the enterprise. Because the House Public Works Committee had already held extensive hearings during the first session of the Eighty-second Congress and because voluminous testimony had already been taken over the years on this controversial subject, the committee voted early in the second session to confine its public hearings on the measure to 1 week. After the hearings the committee on April 22, 1952, voted 9 to 4 to report the resolution to the Senate calendar without recommendation after the failure by a vote of 6 to 6 of a motion to report it favorably. The Senate debated the resolution from June 12 to June 18, and on the latter date voted 43 to 40 again to recommit the resolution to the Foreign Relations Committee. No further action was taken by the committee during the remainder of the Congress.

<i>Dates</i>	<i>Documents</i>
Introduced, February 1, 1951-----	Senate Joint Resolution 27.
Public hearings in Senate, February 25-29, 1952.	Printed hearings.
Reported to Senate, April 28, 1952-----	Senate Report 1489.
Considered and recommitted by a vote of 43 to 40, June 18, 1952.	Congressional Record, June 12-18, 1952.

37. SUPPLEMENTARY EXTRADITION TREATY WITH CANADA

Background.—The need for revising the United States extradition treaty of 1900 with Canada arose from the inadequate provisions of that treaty for dealing with illicit stock promotions by operators in Canada. The committee's report outlines the difficulties encountered by the Securities and Exchange Commission in preventing the fraudulent sale of worthless stock to American investors by unscrupulous operators.

In several cases when fraudulent stock operators have been apprehended in the United States, they have posted substantial bonds and then have elected to forfeit their bonds in order not to stand trial in

the United States. The SEC has, with the cooperation of the Post Office Department, sought to use postal-fraud orders as a device to prevent fraudulent stock operators from reaching potential investors, but according to Commissioner McEntire these orders tend to be ineffective because of the tremendous job of trying to police mail arriving here from Canada.

Besides defrauding American citizens, such operations by a small group of Canadians hurt friendly United States-Canadian relations by making American investors skeptical of investing in legitimate enterprises to develop Canada's resources.

Provisions.—The supplementary treaty amends the list of crimes which the United States and Canada have reciprocally agreed would be honored in requests for extradition by changing the language of the 1900 treaty through substitution of a paragraph. Paragraph 11 of the old treaty listed as an extraditable crime "obtaining money, valuable securities or other property by false pretenses." By the supplementary treaty this language is changed to:

- 11A "Obtaining property, money, or valuable securities by false pretenses or by defrauding the public or any person by deceit or falsehood or other fraudulent means, whether such deceit or falsehood or any fraudulent means would or would not amount to a false pretense.
- 11B "Making use of the mails in connection with schemes devised or intended to deceive or defraud the public or for the purpose of obtaining money under false pretenses."

The committee received the opinion of administration witnesses that this change in language will be helpful in efforts being made to close the loopholes which now permit these fraudulent practices.

This will provide a method of implementation of those efforts which will be helpful and make a marked contribution—

the committee stated in its report on the treaty.

Committee and Senate action.—The convention was referred to the committee on January 17, 1952. Shortly thereafter the committee received a letter from the chairman of the Senate Banking and Currency Committee, saying that a subcommittee of that committee dealing with securities was particularly interested in the treaty. Accordingly hearings were arranged on March 3, 1952, before a subcommittee of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee consisting of Senators Sparkman (chairman), Gillette, and Tobey. The Banking and Currency Subcommittee consisting of Senators Frear (chairman), Maybank, Sparkman, Moody, Schoepfel, and Dirksen was invited to attend the hearings. The two subcommittees separately agreed that the convention was suitable to their respective full committees, and on March 4, 1952, Senator Connally received a letter from Senator Maybank stating that the Banking and Currency Committee had voted unanimously to urge approval of the convention, and so reported. The Foreign Relations Committee agreed to report the convention favorably on March 11, 1951, and the convention was approved April 1, 1952.

Dates

Documents

Signed at Ottawa, October 26, 1951.

Transmitted to Senate, January 17, 1952.

Public hearings March 3, 1952-----

Reported to Senate, March 11, 1952-----

Approved by Senate, April 1, 1952-----

Senate Executive G, Eighty-second Congress, second session.

Appendix, Senate Executive Report 5.

Senate Executive Report 5, Eighty-second Congress, second session.

Congressional Record, same date.

38. PROMOTION OF SAFETY ON THE GREAT LAKES BY MEANS OF RADIO

Prior to the adoption of this convention, only steam-propelled vessels on the Great Lakes were required to carry equipment permitting communication from ship to ship and from ship to shore. Since almost all Great Lakes vessels are motor-propelled, the old law was an anachronism.

Since 1937 the radio requirements necessary or desirable for safety purposes on ships on the Great Lakes have been under study. Accordingly the Department of State negotiated a convention with Canada for promotion of safety on the Great Lakes by means of radio. The purpose of this convention is stated in the committee report as follows:

The purpose of the agreement, and its attached technical regulations, is to promote safety on the Great Lakes by requiring that authorized radiotelephone equipment be installed on all Great Lakes shipping of 500 gross tons and over and on all passenger-carrying vessels over 65 feet in length in those waters; and to require that all such vessels and shore stations maintain constant listening watch on the distress-calling frequency (2182 kilocycles). The agreement is effective on the Great Lakes and their navigable connecting tributary waters as far east as Montreal.

The obvious and long-standing need for such a convention led the committee and the Senate to approve it.

<i>Dates</i>	<i>Documents</i>
Signed, February 21, 1952.	
Transmitted to Senate, March 24, 1952	Executive M, Eighty-second Congress, second session.
Reported to Senate, June 9, 1952-----	Senate Executive Report 12, Eighty-second Congress, second session.
Approved, July 4, 1952-----	Congressional Record, same date.

39. HIGHWAY CONVENTION WITH PANAMA

The only trans-isthmian highway in Panama parallels the Canal Zone and was built by the United States during the war years. Moreover it was maintained by the United States until 1949 under the terms of an Executive agreement, in exchange for the rights to use other Panamanian roads for the routine movement of troops and other personnel and equipment and the obligation to pay one-third of the maintenance cost of all such roads frequently or periodically used by the United States. Since 1949 the Republic of Panama has maintained the road and the United States ceased the frequent and regular use of Panamanian roads. The state of bad repair of the highway, however, and the renewed need to use Panamanian roads for maneuvers in connection with the defense of the Panama Canal led the United States to negotiate a new agreement with Panama concerning roads. Under this highway convention, the United States assumes the obligation of maintaining the trans-isthmian highway at an estimated cost of about \$200,000 a year in return for which the United States is granted the full and unimpeded use of all highways under Panamanian jurisdiction free of charge. The obvious advantages of this arrangement furthering the defense of the Panama Canal impressed the committee and the Senate and the convention was approved.

<i>Dates</i>	<i>Documents</i>
Signed, September 14, 1950.	
Transmitted to the Senate, December 22, 1950.	Executive W, Eighty-first Congress, second session.
Reported to Senate, June 2, 1952-----	Executive Report 10, Eighty-second Congress, second session.
Approved, July 4, 1952-----	Congressional Record, same date.

40. NOGALES SANITATION PROJECT

The Eighty-first Congress approved two sanitation projects along the United States-Mexico boundary at Douglas, Ariz., and Calexico, Calif. The need for these projects arose out of unusual sewage-disposal problems in communities split by the boundary and the inability of localities to handle such international problems. In the case of both cities, the International Boundary and Water Commission, United States and Mexico, was authorized to construct, operate, and maintain sanitation projects in the interest of efficiency and economy. When a similar problem was anticipated at the city of Nogales, Ariz., where a sanitation project was nearing completion, the committee approved and the Senate passed S. 960 providing that subject to an agreement between the United States and Mexico, the International Boundary and Water Commission should operate and maintain the new sanitation facilities at the city of Nogales, the expenses for such an operation to be shared with Mexico and the city of Nogales. The bill did not become law due to the failure of the House to take action.

*Dates**Documents*

Introduced, Feb. 26, 1952-----	S. 960.
Reported to Senate, June 28, 1952-----	Senate Report 1983.
Passed Senate, July 3, 1952-----	Congressional Record, same date.
No action in House.	

K. INVESTIGATION OF THE MILITARY AND POLITICAL SITUATION IN THE FAR EAST

Background.—The far-eastern policy of the administration has been a subject of considerable criticism and dispute in the past few years. The committee at various times has given attention to our relations with China and the Far East generally in connection with specific legislative proposals affecting that area. But since 1945, no thorough over-all investigation of our far-eastern policy had been undertaken by Congress. Such an inquiry was touched off in the spring of 1951 when the President recalled General MacArthur from his various commands in the Far East. The relief of General MacArthur on April 11, 1951, focused the undivided attention of the United States for several weeks on the Korean conflict and our far-eastern policy of the past and present. Hard on the heels of the dismissal came demands in Congress for an investigation of the circumstances leading up to it.

Committee action.—On April 11, 1951, the late Senator Wherry introduced a resolution praising MacArthur and inviting the general to address a joint session of the House and the Senate. The resolution was tabled in favor of a unanimous-consent agreement to meet with the House to hear the returning soldier. General MacArthur made his historic speech to Congress on April 19, 1951. Previously the Senate Armed Services Committee, on April 13, had voted unanimously to conduct an inquiry into the circumstances of the dismissal. Four days later, Chairman Connally asked Chairman Russell that the Senate Foreign Relations Committee be associated with the Senate Armed Services Committee in the inquiry. At the same time, Senator Ferguson introduced a concurrent resolution to set up a joint bipartisan committee consisting of 12 Members of the Senate and the House, drawn from the Armed Services, Appropriations, and Foreign Relations and Foreign Affairs Committees to make a study and

evaluation of United States policies in the Far East. Although Senator Ferguson pressed for the adoption of his resolution, the Senate on April 25, 1951, authorized the Senate Armed Services and Foreign Relations Committees to conduct hearings on this matter. The joint committee was headed by Senator Russell.

On April 30, 1951, the question of whether to hold the hearings in public or in executive session was decided by the joint committee by a vote of 16 to 6 in favor of closed hearings. Nevertheless a controversy developed on the floor of the Senate, led by a group of Senators who sought to have the hearings open to the public. This move was defeated by three votes on May 4, 1951. The joint committee, however, aware of the intense public interest and of its obligation to the people of the United States, devised a method to keep the press and public informed and still protect the security interests of the United States by having the testimony screened and edited for security purposes, then mimeographed and released within 2 hours after the testimony had been given. In this manner, the timely news coverage of the hearings was possible. The joint committee, as the hearings started, invited all Members of the Senate to sit with the committee as observers.

The hearings began on May 3 with 3 days of testimony by General MacArthur. He was followed on the stand by Secretary of Defense Marshall who testified for 7 days. General Bradley was the witness for the next 4 days, followed by the other members of the Joint Chiefs of Staff in this order: Gen. J. Lawton Collins, Army; Gen. Hoyt S. Vandenberg, Air Force; and Admiral Forrest P. Sherman, Navy. The longest on the witness stand, for 8 days, was Secretary of State Dean Acheson who reviewed American postwar foreign policy in the Far East, especially toward China. Concluding the review of United States far-eastern policy were Lt. Gen. Albert C. Wedemeyer, United States Army, former Chief of Staff to Chiang Kai-shek; the Honorable Louis Johnson, former Secretary of Defense; Vice Adm. Oscar Badger; Maj. Gen. Patrick J. Hurley, retired; Maj. Gen. David C. Barr, United States Army, commander of the United States military mission in China in 1948; and Maj. Gen. Emmett O'Donnell, Jr., United States Air Force.

The hearings lasted almost 8 weeks. Over 2,000,000 words of testimony were taken, one of the longest records in recent congressional history. The printed proceedings, including appendixes and index, covered 5 volumes and almost 3,700 pages.

The hearings were conducted as a sincere effort to obtain the facts. After the conclusion of the hearings, on June 27, 1951, Chairman Russell presented a statement to the committee which was adopted, not as a report on the issues but in the nature of a statement to the American people.

Our Government is one which depends for existence upon the conclusions of an enlightened people—

the statement read in part.

The exhaustive record of our proceedings bears testimony to our faith in the democratic system. This hearing sprang from this concept, which we hold to be inherent in our very form of government.

The inquiry has pushed to its very limits a principle to which the American people jealously cling—the right of every man to say what he thinks * * *

On the content and disclosures of the record, the statement had this to say:

We do not deny that the record compiled is replete with discord and disagreement. We could not conceal this fact and we would scorn to do so if we could. Those who have appeared before us have spoken in forceful terms. Out of their words have appeared disagreements as to policies and a division of opinion as to the course which should have been followed. Some of their criticisms have been harsh and they have spared no one, including themselves. These men spoke strongly because they felt strongly. They differed because they saw things differently and had the courage to say so.

These differences, the joint committee asserted—

in nowise alter the fact that our great objective is still to live within the family of nations as a free people * * *. We will not all be together on those conclusions. We may differ on the proper policy to be applied in the Far East * * *. But we will be united in our devotion to liberty and justice, be single-minded in our will to preserve our institutions.

The joint committee concluded that—

these hearings have increased our faith in our strength and in our ability.

Decision as to whether the joint committee should issue a report was not made until several weeks after the last witness had been heard. The inquiry had kept two of the more important committees of the Senate in almost continuous session for 2 months. Urgent legislative matters, long postponed, had to be acted upon. Accordingly, it was not until August 17, 1951, that the joint committee was able to meet to make a decision on the report. The question was thoroughly discussed at that time. The majority of the committee felt that the record of the hearings disclosed a number of fundamental differences of opinion; that a unanimous report would not be possible and that a majority report followed by a minority report would only accentuate the differences and the confusion. This feeling was reflected when the joint committee voted 18 to 5 against issuing a report. The committee then voted 20 to 3 that—

the committee transmit and report to the Senate for its information the hearings and the records with their appendixes; that the committee file no further report; that no views or conclusion be denominated as the majority and minority views or conclusions, but that members be permitted before September 1 to file their views and conclusions with the chairman, and that said views be printed in the appendix.

Under that motion, a number of individual and collective statements of views were filed with the chairman: (1) Individual views of certain members of the joint committee, signed by Senators Bridges, Wiley, Smith of New Jersey, Hickenlooper, Knowland, Cain, Brewster, and Flanders; (2) a statement by Senator Saltonstall, setting forth his own views and commenting on the views of the eight Senators above; (3) individual views of Senator Lodge; and (4) individual views of Senator Morse.

On September 1, 1951, the inquiry was officially closed with the transmittal to the Senate of the hearings and records of the joint committee's investigation.

<i>Dates</i>	<i>Documents</i>
Address of General MacArthur to Congress, April 19, 1951.	Congressional Record, same date.
Hearings in Senate; May 3-5, 7-12, 14-17, 21-26, 28-31, June 1, 2, 4-9, 11-15, 18-22, 25, 27 and August 17, 1951.	Printed hearings, five volumes.
	Miscellaneous:
	Report to the President submitted by Lt. Gen. A. C. Wedemeyer, September 1947 (Korea) (committee print).
	Compilation of certain published information on the military situation in the Far East (committee print).
	Substance of statements made at Wake Island Conference on October 15, 1950, compiled by General of the Army Omar N. Bradley (committee print).
	Individual views of certain members of Joint Committee on Armed Services and Foreign Relations of the United States Senate, relating to the hearings held on the dismissal of General MacArthur and the military situation in the Far East, May 3-June 27, 1951 (Senate Document 69).

L. CONSULTATION WITH THE EXECUTIVE BRANCH

Traditionally the Foreign Relations Committee has devoted a very large proportion of its working time to a consideration of specific items on its calendar—treaties and conventions, bills, resolutions, and nominations. In the past few years there has been a marked tendency to increase the amount of time devoted to consultation on foreign policy generally with top officials from the State Department and other agencies of the executive branch. During the Eighty-second Congress such consultations were again on the increase, both in number of meetings and effectiveness. The issues involved were varied in nature, and included such topics as the emergency grain situation in India, the Communist threat in Latin America, the crisis in Iran, the peace settlements in Germany and Japan, the nonrecognition of Communist China, the Korean truce talks, the revision of the Italian Peace Treaty, the economic development program of the United Nations, and various aspects of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization.

In order to facilitate more effective consultation with the Department of State, the committee, during the Eighty-first Congress, created a series of subcommittees corresponding roughly to the functional and geographic organization of the Department. Included were Subcommittees on the Far East, Europe, Latin America, the Middle East and Africa, the United Nations, Economic and Social Affairs, and Public Affairs. These subcommittees were not designed primarily to handle legislative matters. Rather, it was contemplated that they would meet from time to time with appropriate officials

from the Department in order to exchange views on current policy problems. In this way some degree of specialization could be developed among the committee members and the committee as a whole could be kept posted on major developments in various parts of the world. At the same time the executive branch, through these continuing contacts, could profit considerably from the ideas and suggestions coming from congressional quarters.

When the subcommittee machinery was established, the committee expressed the view that it would in no way diminish the need for top-level consultation between the Secretary of State and the full committee. In this respect the situation has developed in a satisfactory manner. During the Eighty-second Congress, Secretary Acheson appeared before the committee on 22 occasions, 14 times in a consultative capacity, and 8 times as a witness in connection with specific legislation or treaties pending before the committee. Normally, before attending an important international conference, the Secretary conferred with the committee with respect to the major issues involved, and then reported to the committee on the results of the conference on his return to Washington. In addition to these more formal appearances, from time to time as the current international political situation demanded, the Secretary met with the chairman and ranking members of the committee, soliciting their advice and counsel with respect to particular problems. This was true also of the Under Secretary of State, who on occasion briefed committee members during the Secretary's absences from the country.

Other top-ranking officials of the executive branch who appeared before the committee for consultation purposes included Ambassador John Foster Dulles, High Commissioner John J. McCloy, General of the Army Omar Bradley, and other members of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, Secretary of Defense Robert A. Lovett, Director for Mutual Security W. Averell Harriman, Ambassador Charles M. Spofford, United States deputy to the North Atlantic Council in Europe; Gen. Dwight D. Eisenhower and his deputy, Gen. Alfred M. Gruenther; Secretary of Defense George C. Marshall; Gen. Matthew B. Ridgway, United Nations commander in Korea and General Eisenhower's successor in Europe; Ambassador Chester Bowles; and Ambassador David Bruce.

As in the Eighty-first Congress, the seven subcommittees have met during the past 2 years on an irregular basis. Their schedules have depended in part on the need for consultation in the various areas, and in part on the pressure of other committee business.

One example of effective legislative-executive relations was the teamwork that prevailed in connection with the conclusion of the Japanese Peace Treaty and the three related security pacts for the Pacific area. John Foster Dulles, who was appointed by the President as his special representative with the personal rank of Ambassador, conducted the negotiations for our Government and, at a series of nine meetings, kept the Far Eastern Subcommittee fully informed on all phases of the negotiations. Moreover, on four occasions, Ambassador Dulles met with and apprised the full committee of specific problems that arose during the evolution of the treaties. In the fall of 1951, the chairman, Senator Sparkman, and ranking minority member, Senator Smith of New Jersey, of the Subcommittee on Far Eastern Affairs accompanied Ambassador Dulles to the Far

East to examine on the spot the background of the four treaties. It will also be recalled that the four members of the subcommittee, together with four other members of the Senate, were appointed by the President to serve as members of the United States delegation to the Japanese Peace Conference held in San Francisco. As a result of this bipartisan cooperation between the two branches of Government, there was very little opposition to the treaties, and the Senate consented to ratification by large votes.

The committee believes the consultations which have taken place during the Eighty-second Congress have been extremely helpful in the execution and formulation of our foreign policy during two very critical years. Further efforts on both ends of Pennsylvania Avenue, to develop and improve the consultative machinery which now exists will be most helpful to the Nation as it faces the big problems that lie ahead.

The composition of the subcommittees has varied somewhat depending upon the make-up of the Foreign Relations Committee itself. During the Eighty-second Congress the membership was as follows:

1. *United Nations Affairs*: Senator Connally (chairman), Senator Gillette, Senator Wiley, and Senator Smith of New Jersey. Committee staff member, Mr. Wilcox.

2. *Economic and Social Policy Affairs*: Senator George (chairman), Senator McMahon, and Senator Tobey. Committee staff member, Mr. Kalijarvi.

3. *American Republics Affairs*: Senator Green (chairman), Senator Sparkman, and Senator Hickenlooper. Committee staff member, Mr. Kalijarvi.

4. *Public Affairs and State Department Organization*: Senator McMahon (chairman), Senator Green, Senator Fulbright, Senator Lodge, and Senator Brewster. Committee staff member, Mr. Marcy.

5. *European Affairs*: Senator Fulbright (chairman), Senator Connally, Senator Wiley, and Senator Lodge. Committee staff members, Mr. Wilcox and Mr. Kalijarvi.

6. *Far Eastern Affairs*: Senator Sparkman (chairman), Senator George, Senator Smith of New Jersey, and Senator Hickenlooper. Committee staff member, Mr. Wilcox.

7. *Near Eastern and African Affairs*: Senator Gillette (chairman), Senator Fulbright, Senator Tobey, and Senator Brewster. Committee staff member, Mr. Marcy.

M. NOMINATIONS

In addition to the legislative program another important function of the committee is the consideration of certain nominations to positions in the executive branch.

The Constitution provides that the President—

shall nominate, and by and with the Advice and Consent of the Senate, shall appoint ambassadors, other public Ministers and Consuls * * * and all other Officers of the United States, whose Appointments are not herein otherwise provided for, and which shall be established by Law. * * *

The Committee on Foreign Relations has referred to it for consideration and appropriate action, nominations in the Department of State and the Mutual Security Agency, appointments of ambassadors, ministers, and other envoys, assignments in the United Nations and

related organizations, and other nominations in the Diplomatic and Foreign Service.

The committee exercises much the same vigilance over nominations as over legislation. The nominee to a high position in the Department of State or to an important ambassadorship is often interviewed personally by the committee in executive session before action is taken on his appointment. Of 1,061 nominations submitted by the President during 1951 and 1952 and referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, it approved 1,059 and took no action on the other two. It should be noted in this connection, however, that during the Eighty-second Congress, the committee's examinations of nominees was more searching than before.

AMBASSADORS, MINISTERS, ENVOYS

There were 49 nominations in this group, representing such important assignments as that of James C. Dunn to be Ambassador to France, Ellsworth Bunker to Italy, Stanton Griffis and later Lincoln MacVeagh to Spain, Walter J. Donnelly to Austria, Myron W. Cowen to Belgium, George F. Kennan to Russia, Robert D. Murphy to Japan, R. A. Spruance to the Philippines, Albert F. Nufer to Argentina, Chester Bowles to India, William H. Draper as special representative to Europe under the Mutual Security Act of 1951, and Frederick L. Anderson, as his deputy.

The nomination of Chester Bowles raised certain questions which were referred to a subcommittee for consideration. This subcommittee of Senator Sparkman as chairman and Senators Fulbright, Gillette, Smith of New Jersey, and Brewster held hearings on September 20, 22, and 24 in order to hear the nominee and Assistant Secretary of State for the Near East and Africa, George McGhee. Following the hearings the nomination was approved by the subcommittee 3 to 2, the full committee by voice vote, and the Senate 43 to 33 on October 9, 1951.

One nomination which aroused some controversy was that of Gen. Mark W. Clark of the United States Army to be Ambassador to the Vatican. This nomination was submitted on the last day of the first session, October 20, 1951, and expired when the Senate adjourned without acting on it. His name was not resubmitted to Congress in the second session and the committee consequently took no action on the matter.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE, MUTUAL SECURITY AGENCY, AND ADVISORY BOARDS

During this Congress the committee considered and approved ten appointments in the Department of State, including those of David K. Bruce, former Ambassador to France as Under Secretary; John M. Allison as Assistant Secretary for Far Eastern Affairs; Henry A. Byroade as Assistant Secretary for Near Eastern, South Asian, and African Affairs; and Howland H. Sargeant as Assistant Secretary for Public Affairs. In the case of Mr. Sargeant, a subcommittee was appointed to consider the nomination. After a brief hearing it was approved by the subcommittee and the full committee and confirmed by the Senate. Stanley Andrews and Jonathan B. Bingham were

also endorsed as Administrator and Deputy Administrator for Technical Cooperation.

The establishment of the Mutual Security Agency in 1951 gave rise to several nominations which required confirmation by the Senate. These were the appointments of W. Averell Harriman as Director for Mutual Security; Richard M. Bissell, Jr., as Deputy Director; C. Tyler Wood as Associate Deputy Director; and Theodore Tannenwald, Jr., as Assistant Director.

The name of Eric A. Johnston came up twice for appointments to the International Development Advisory Board and the Public Advisory Board established under the Economic Cooperation Act of 1948, and was approved. The appointments of James L. Morill to the United States Advisory Commission on Educational Exchange and Edwin D. Lanham and Philip D. Reed to the United States Advisory Commission on Information were likewise approved, bringing to five the total number of nominations in this category.

UNITED NATIONS AND RELATED ORGANIZATIONS

United States representation in the United Nations and related organizations resulted in committee action upon 24 nominations, mainly for delegates to the meetings of the United Nations General Assembly and the specialized agencies. Most of these nominations were noncontroversial. The exception was the list of 10 delegates and alternate delegates to the sixth session of the United Nations General Assembly, submitted on September 13, 1951. This list contained the names of Philip C. Jessup and Channing H. Tobias and, since some question had been raised about these two nominations, the whole list was referred to the same subcommittee which considered the nomination of Mr. Bowles. Dr. Tobias' appointment, after a brief public hearing on October 18, was approved by the subcommittee without objection.

Dr. Jessup's nomination was thoroughly examined in 9 days of public hearings from September 27 to October 18, after which the subcommittee voted against confirmation by a vote of 2 to 3. The other delegates were reported favorably to the full committee.

Since the record of the hearings could not be printed in time for study by the full committee and the Senate, Senator Sparkman, the subcommittee chairman, moved in the Senate, on October 19, 1951, that Dr. Jessup's name be left without prejudice before the Foreign Relations Committee; that the full committee be discharged from further consideration of the other nine delegates; and that those be approved inasmuch as no objection was raised against them. This motion was adopted by unanimous consent and the Senate confirmed the delegation with the exception of Dr. Jessup, whose nomination expired with the sine die adjournment of the Senate the next day. Dr. Jessup subsequently served as a delegate to the Assembly under a recess appointment. The Assembly adjourned shortly after the second session of the Eighty-second Congress convened.

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

Nominations in the diplomatic and consular service were those of career ministers, consular appointments, and promotions of Foreign Service officers of various classes, which totaled 968.

APPENDIXES

APPENDIX I

List of bills and resolutions enacted into law

Public Law	Date approved by President	Number of bill	Title of bill
43	June 15, 1951	S. 872	To furnish emergency food aid to India.
138	Aug. 31, 1951	H. J. Res. 281	To authorize the President to proclaim a special period for intensified voluntary contributions of clothing and kindred supplies in connection with the collection effort of American Relief for Korea, Inc.
164	Oct. 10, 1951	H. J. Res. 290	Providing for the recognition and endorsement of the World Metallurgical Congress.
165	-----do-----	H. R. 5113	To maintain the security and promote the foreign policy and provide for the general welfare of the United States by furnishing assistance to friendly nations in the interest of international peace and security.
181	Oct. 19, 1951	H. J. Res. 289	To terminate the state of war between the United States and the Government of Germany.
213	Oct. 26, 1951	H. R. 4550	To provide for the control by the United States and cooperating foreign nations of exports to any nation or combination of nations threatening the security of the United States, including the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and all countries under its combination, and for other purposes.
255	Sept. 13, 1951	H. R. 4674	Authorizing the Secretary of State to continue Herve J. L'Heureux to serve as Chief of the Visa Division for an additional year commencing Sept. 1, 1951.
290	Apr. 3, 1952	S. J. Res. 22	Providing for recognition and endorsement of the International Trade Fair and Inter-American Cultural and Trade Center in New Orleans, La.
340	May 13, 1952	S. 1835	Granting the consent and approval of Congress to the participation of certain Provinces of the Dominion of Canada in the Northeastern Interstate Forest Fire Protection Compact, and for other purposes.
348	May 21, 1952	H. R. 3401	To make certain increases in the annuities of annuitants under the Foreign Service retirement and disability system.
399	June 19, 1952	H. R. 6661	To amend the Foreign Service Buildings Act, 1926.
400	June 20, 1952	H. R. 7005	To amend the Mutual Security Act of 1951, and for other purposes.
486	July 10, 1952	S. 2042	To extend certain privileges to representatives of member states on the Council of the Organization of American States.

APPENDIX II

Measures reported and passed by Senate but not finally acted upon in House

	Title	Action
S. 960	To authorize an agreement between the United States and Mexico for the joint operation and maintenance by the International Boundary and Water Commission, United States and Mexico, of the Nogales sanitation project and for other purposes.	Passed Senate, July 3, 1952.
S. Con. Res. 18	Approving the action of the President of the United States in cooperating in the common defense effort of the North Atlantic Treaty nations.	Passed Senate, Apr. 5, 1951.
S. 2079	To authorize the contribution of \$12,000,000 to the United Nations International Children's Emergency Fund (subsequently partially incorporated in the Mutual Security Act of 1952).	Passed Senate, Oct. 1, 1951.

APPENDIX III

Measures reported and passed by House but not finally acted upon in Senate

	Title	Action
H. R. 3299-----	To extend the times for commencing and completing the construction of a free bridge across the Rio Grande at or near Del Rio, Tex.	Passed House, Aug. 20, 1951.
H. R. 1511-----	Granting the consent of Congress to the Mid Valley Bridge Co., Hidalgo, Tex., its successors and assigns, to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across the Rio Grande.	Passed House, Mar. 17, 1952.

APPENDIX IV

Action on treaties

Summary.—During the Eighty-second Congress, the Senate received 39 treaties, which in addition to the 34 still pending from previous sessions made a total of 73 treaties before the committee. Of these 4 were withdrawn at the request of the President of the United States and 39 were approved by the Senate for ratification.

Document	Title	Date approved by Senate
Ex. O, 80th, 1st-----	Convention between the United States of America and the Union of South Africa, signed at Pretoria on Dec. 13, 1946, in the English and Afrikaans languages, for the avoidance of double taxation for establishing rules of reciprocal administrative assistance with respect to taxes on income.	Sept. 7, 1951
Ex. R, S, Y, and Z, 80th, 1st.	4 conventions, formulated at the twenty-eighth (maritime) session of the International Labor Conference, held at Seattle, Wash., June 6-29, 1946, which were transmitted to the Senate by the President on June 23, 1947.	July 4, 1952
Ex. FF, 80th, 1st-----	Convention between the United States of America and the Union of South Africa, signed at Capetown on Apr. 10, 1947, in the English and Afrikaans languages, for the avoidance of double taxation and the prevention of fiscal evasion with respect to taxes on the estates of deceased persons.	Sept. 17, 1951
Ex. J, 80th, 2d-----	The convention between the United States of America and New Zealand, signed at Washington on Mar. 16, 1948, for the avoidance of double taxation and the prevention of fiscal evasion with respect to taxes on income.	Do.
Ex. Q, 81st, 1st-----	A convention between the United States of America and Norway for the avoidance of double taxation and the prevention of fiscal evasion with respect to taxes on income, signed at Washington, June 13, 1949.	Do.
Ex. R, 81st, 1st-----	A convention between the United States of America and Norway for the avoidance of double taxation and the prevention of fiscal evasion with respect to taxes on estates and inheritances, signed at Washington on June 13, 1949.	Do.
Ex. E, 81st, 2d-----	A convention between the United States of America and Ireland, signed at Dublin on Sept. 13, 1949, for the avoidance of double taxation and the prevention of fiscal evasion with respect to taxes on the estates of deceased persons.	Do.
Ex. F, 81st, 2d-----	A convention between the United States of America and Ireland, signed at Dublin on Sept. 13, 1949, for the avoidance of double taxation and the prevention of fiscal evasion with respect to taxes on income.	Do.
Ex. K, 81st, 2d-----	A convention between the United States of America and Greece, signed at Athens on Feb. 20, 1950, for the avoidance of double taxation and the prevention of fiscal evasion with respect to taxes on the estates of deceased persons.	Do.
Ex. L, 81st, 2d-----	A convention with Greece, signed at Athens on Feb. 20, 1950, for the avoidance of double taxation and the prevention of fiscal evasion with respect to taxes on income.	Do.
Ex. P, 81st, 2d-----	A consular convention between the United States of America and Ireland, signed at Dublin on May 1, 1950.	June 13, 1952
Ex. R, 81st, 2d-----	Convention between the United States of America and Canada, signed at Ottawa on June 12, 1950, modifying and supplementing in certain respects the convention and accompanying protocol for the avoidance of double taxation and the prevention of fiscal evasion in the case of income taxes, signed at Washington on Mar. 4, 1942.	Sept. 17, 1951

Action on treaties—Continued

Document	Title	Date approved by Senate
Ex. S, 81st, 2d.....	Convention between the United States of America and Canada, signed at Ottawa on June 12, 1950, modifying and supplementing in certain respects the convention for the avoidance of double taxation and the prevention of fiscal evasion in the case of estate taxes and succession duties, signed at Ottawa on June 8, 1944.	Sept. 17, 1951
Ex. T, 81st, 2d.....	A protocol between the United States of America and the Union of South Africa, signed at Pretoria on July 14, 1950, supplementing the convention for the avoidance of double taxation and for establishing rules of reciprocal administrative assistance with respect to taxes on the estates of deceased persons, which was signed at Cape Town on Apr. 10, 1947.	Do.
Ex. U, 81st, 2d.....	A protocol between the United States of America and the Union of South Africa, signed at Pretoria on July 14, 1950, supplementing the convention for the avoidance of double taxation and for establishing rules of reciprocal administrative assistance with respect to taxes on income, which was signed at Pretoria on Dec. 13, 1946.	Do.
Ex. W, 81st, 2d.....	A highway convention between the United States of America and the Republic of Panama, signed at Panama on Sept. 14, 1950.	July 4, 1952
Ex. C, 82d, 1st.....	A convention between the United States of America and Canada, relating to the operation by citizens of either country of certain radio equipment or stations in the other country, signed at Ottawa, on Feb. 8, 1951.	Apr. 1, 1952
Ex. I, 82d, 1st.....	A certified copy of a protocol dated in London Aug. 31, 1950, prolonging for 1 year after Aug. 31, 1950, the international agreement regarding the regulation of production and marketing of sugar, signed at London on May 6, 1937.	July 4, 1952
Ex. N, 82d, 1st.....	A convention between the United States of America and Switzerland, signed at Washington on May 24, 1951, for the avoidance of double taxation with respect to taxes on income.	Sept. 17, 1951
Ex. O, 82d, 1st.....	A consular convention and an accompanying protocol of signature between the United States of America and the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, signed at Washington on June 6, 1951.	June 13, 1952
Ex. P, 82d, 1st.....	Convention between the United States of America and Switzerland, signed at Washington on July 9, 1951, for the avoidance of double taxation with respect to taxes on estates and inheritances.	July 4, 1952
Ex. Q, 82d, 1st.....	Texts of a proposal by the Government of Canada and a proposal by the Government of Australia relating to seasonal zones established in annex II of the international load line convention, signed at London on July 5, 1930.	Apr. 1, 1952
Ex. A, B, C, and D, 82d, 2d.....	Treaty of peace with Japan, signed at San Francisco on Sept. 8, 1951; mutual defense treaty between the United States of America and the Republic of the Philippines, signed at Washington on Aug. 30, 1951; security treaty between Australia, New Zealand, and the United States of America, signed at San Francisco on Sept. 1, 1951; security treaty between the United States of America and Japan, signed at San Francisco on Sept. 8, 1951.	Mar. 20, 1952
Ex. E, 82d, 2d.....	A protocol to the North Atlantic Treaty on the accession of Greece and Turkey, which was opened for signature at London on Oct. 17, 1951, and had been signed on behalf of the United States of America and the other parties to the North Atlantic Treaty.	Feb. 7, 1952
Ex. G, 82d, 2d.....	A supplementary extradition convention between the United States of America and Canada, signed at Ottawa on Oct. 26, 1951.	Apr. 1, 1952
Ex. K, 82d, 2d.....	A convention between the United States of America and the Republic of Finland, signed at Washington on Mar. 3, 1952, for the avoidance of double taxation and the prevention of fiscal evasion with respect to taxes on estates and inheritances.	July 4, 1952
Ex. L, 82d, 2d.....	A convention between the United States of America and the Republic of Finland, signed at Washington on Mar. 3, 1952, for the avoidance of double taxation and the prevention of fiscal evasion with respect to taxes on income.	Do.
Ex. M, 82d, 2d.....	An agreement between the United States of America and Canada, signed at Ottawa on Feb. 21, 1952, for promotion of safety on the Great Lakes by means of radio.	Do.

Action on treaties—Continued

Document	Title	Date approved by Senate
Ex. N, 82d, 2d.....	A protocol between the United States of America and Ireland, signed at Dublin on Mar. 3, 1952, supplementary to the consular convention, signed at Dublin on May 1, 1950.	June 13, 1952
Ex. O, 82d, 2d.....	A protocol dated in London Aug. 31, 1952, prolonging for 1 year after Aug. 31, 1951, the international agreement regarding the regulation of production and marketing of sugar, signed at London on May 6, 1937.	July 4, 1952
Ex. Q and R, 82d, 2d.....	Convention on relations between the Three Powers and the Federal Republic of Germany, signed at Bonn on May 26, 1952, and a protocol to the North Atlantic Treaty, signed at Paris on May 27, 1952.	July 1, 1952
Ex. S, 82d, 2d.....	An international convention for the high-seas fisheries of the North Pacific Ocean, together with a protocol relating thereto, signed at Tokyo, May 9, 1952, on behalf of the United States, Canada, and Japan.	July 4, 1952

*Appendix V**Legislative subcommittees*

The following subcommittees were created by the Foreign Relations Committee to consider particular legislation before the Eighty-second Congress.

Subject	Date appointed	Chairman	Other members
1. Double-taxation conventions, from April 1947 to June 1951.	Jan. 22, 1951	Senator George.....	Senators Gillette, Smith of New Jersey, and Hickenlooper.
2. ILO conventions.....do.....	Senator Green.....	Senators Sparkman and Tobey.
3. Cultural conventions.....do.....	Senator Fulbright.....	Senator Lodge.
4. The North American regional broadcasting agreement.	Sept. 29, 1951	Senator Green.....	Senators Sparkman and Hickenlooper.
5. Supplementary extradition convention.	Feb. 18, 1952	Senator Sparkman.....	Senators Gillette and Tobey.
6. Consular and commercial treaties.	Apr. 18, 1952do.....	Senators Fulbright and Hickenlooper.
7. Double-taxation conventions from August 1951 to Mar. 17, 1952.	May 19, 1952	Senator George.....	
8. Commission to study relations between the United States and other North Atlantic nations.	Mar. 11, 1952	Senator Gillette.....	Senators Sparkman and Wiley.
9. Investigation of existing foreign information programs.	Feb. 29, 1952	Senator McMahon.....	Senators Green, Fulbright, Lodge, and Brewster.
10. Council of Europe.....	Aug. 30, 1951	Senator Gillette.....	Senators Fulbright, Smith of New Jersey, and Lodge.
11. Executive agreements limitations.	Apr. 7, 1952	Senator George.....	Senators Green, Wiley, and Smith of New Jersey.
12. Federation of Europe.....	Feb. 19, 1952	Senator Fulbright.....	Senators Connally, Wiley, and Lodge.

APPENDIX VI

Conference committees

1951

Bill No. Date Con- } Asked ference } Agreed ence } to	Brief of title	Conferees	
		Senate	House
S. 872..... May 24 May 28	Aid to India.....	Senators Gillette, McMahon, Fulbright, Wiley, and Smith of New Jersey.	Representatives Richards, Carnahan, Ribicoff, Vorys, and Smith of Wisconsin.
S. Con. Res. 11. June 7 June 7	Reaffirming American friendship.	Senators Connally, McMahon, and Wiley.	Representatives Ribicoff, Chatham, Hays, Vorys, and Mrs. Bolton.
H. R. 5113.....	Mutual Security Act of 1951.	Senators Connally, Green, McMahon, and Wiley. From the Armed Services Committee: Senators Byrd, Bridges, Russell, and Saltonstall.	Representatives Mansfield, Richards, Morgan, Vorys, and Mrs. Bolton.

1952

H. R. 7005.... May 29 June 2	Mutual Security Act of 1952.	Senators Connally, George, Green, Wiley, and Smith of New Jersey.	Representatives Richards, Mansfield, Morgan, Chipfield, and Vorys.
------------------------------------	------------------------------	---	--

APPENDIX VII

Special committee prints and documents

Below are listed all committee prints and Senate documents printed by the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations during the Eighty-second Congress. Regular committee reports and hearings on treaties, legislation, and resolution will be found listed under the measures they accompanied.

Document number and date filed	Title of publication
Committee print, Feb. 15, 1951.	Basic Information on Implementation of the North Atlantic Treaty: Report prepared by the staffs of the two committees for the use of the joint committee made up of the Committee on Foreign Relations and the Committee on Armed Services of the Senate.
Committee print, Feb. 28, 1951.	Powers of the President to Send the Armed Forces Outside the United States: Studies prepared by the executive departments for the use of the joint committee made up of the Committee on Foreign Relations and the Committee on Armed Services of the Senate.
Committee print, April 1951..	Compilation of Certain Published Information on the Military Situation in the Far East: Prepared by the staff of the Armed Services Committee for the use of the Senate Committee on Armed Services and the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations.
Committee print, May 1951..	The Mutual Security Program for Fiscal Year 1952: Basic data supplied by the executive branch.
Committee print, May 2, 1951.	Substance of Statements Made at Wake Island Conference on October 15, 1950: Compiled by General of the Army Omar N. Bradley, Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, from notes kept by the conferees from Washington.
S. Doc. 41, May 24, 1951.....	Tensions Within the Soviet Union: Prepared, at the request of Senator Alexander Wiley, by the Legislative Reference Service of the Library of Congress.
Committee print, June 22, 1951.	Subcommittees for Consultation Purposes: Prepared for the use of the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations.
S. Doc. 56, Aug. 13, 1951.....	United States Foreign Aid Programs in Europe: Report of a subcommittee of the Committee on Foreign Relations on United States economic and military assistance to free Europe.
S. Doc. 69, Sept. 5, 1951.....	Individual Views of Certain Members of the Joint Committee on Armed Services and Foreign Relations of the United States Senate Relating to Hearings Held on the Dismissal of General MacArthur and the Military Situation in the Far East.
Committee print, Nov. 30, 1951.	Japanese Peace Treaty and Other Treaties Relating to Security in the Pacific: Reproduction of the Peace Treaty with Japan for the convenience of Members of the Senate.

APPENDIX VI

Special committee prints and documents—Continued

Document number and date filed	Title of publication
S. Doc. 90, Jan. 21, 1952.-----	The Union of Europe; Its Progress, Problems, Prospects, and Place in the Western World: Report of the meetings between a delegation appointed by the U. S. Congress as authorized by S. Con. Res. 36 and representatives appointed by the Consultative Assembly of the Council of Europe, November 1951, presented by Senator Theodore Francis Green, Chairman of the Senate delegation.
Committee print, March 1952.	Foreign Aid, 1950-53: Foreign aid authorization and appropriations, fiscal year 1950-52 and proposed authorizations for fiscal year 1953.
Do.-----	The Mutual Security Program for Fiscal Year 1953: Basic data supplied by the executive branch.
Committee print, Mar. 28, 1952.	Powers Proposed To Be Transferred to the Director for Mutual Security: Presidential communication pursuant to sec. 502 (C) of the Mutual Security Act of 1951 (Public Law 165, 82d Cong., 1st sess.).
Committee print, June 6, 1952.	Summaries of the Contractual Agreements With Germany and Supporting Documents: Texts of a protocol to the North Atlantic Treaty, and the Tripartite Declaration issued at the signing of the European Defense Community Treaty at Paris.



PUBLISHED WEEKLY

Subscription price, \$5.00 per annum in advance. Single copies, 15 cents.

Entered as Second-Class Matter, May 2, 1917. Postpaid at special rate of \$3.75 per annum authorized by Act of October 3, 1917.

Acceptance for mailing at special rate of postage provided for in Act of October 3, 1917 authorized on July 1, 1918.

Postmaster: This publication is entered as second-class matter under post office no. 384, city of Chicago, Ill., and is paid for at special rate of postage provided for in Act of October 3, 1917.

Copyright, 1918, by American Medical Association. Printed at the American Medical Association, 535 North Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill.

Published by the American Medical Association, 535 North Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill.

Subscription orders, notices of change of address, and other correspondence should be sent to the American Medical Association, 535 North Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill.

Claims for missing issues will be considered only if made immediately on receipt of following issue.

This journal is indexed and abstracted in the following publications: Index Medicus, Current Contents, and Current Awareness.

The American Medical Association is not responsible for the views or opinions expressed by its members.

The American Medical Association is not responsible for the views or opinions expressed by its members.

The American Medical Association is not responsible for the views or opinions expressed by its members.

The American Medical Association is not responsible for the views or opinions expressed by its members.

The American Medical Association is not responsible for the views or opinions expressed by its members.

The American Medical Association is not responsible for the views or opinions expressed by its members.

The American Medical Association is not responsible for the views or opinions expressed by its members.

The American Medical Association is not responsible for the views or opinions expressed by its members.

The American Medical Association is not responsible for the views or opinions expressed by its members.

The American Medical Association is not responsible for the views or opinions expressed by its members.

The American Medical Association is not responsible for the views or opinions expressed by its members.

The American Medical Association is not responsible for the views or opinions expressed by its members.

The American Medical Association is not responsible for the views or opinions expressed by its members.

The American Medical Association is not responsible for the views or opinions expressed by its members.

The American Medical Association is not responsible for the views or opinions expressed by its members.

The American Medical Association is not responsible for the views or opinions expressed by its members.

The American Medical Association is not responsible for the views or opinions expressed by its members.

The American Medical Association is not responsible for the views or opinions expressed by its members.