

defer reporting the gain from such sale until the following taxable year; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ROBSON:

H. R. 4619. A bill to revise, codify, and enact into law title 46 of the United States Code, entitled "Shipping"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 4620. A bill to codify and enact into positive law title 3 of the United States Code, entitled "The President"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McDONOUGH:

H. R. 4621. A bill to amend the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, as amended, to provide homes for veterans, through veterans' homestead associations, and the public facilities essential therefor; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. ROSS:

H. R. 4622. A bill to amend Public Law 368, Eightieth Congress, first session, approved August 5, 1947, so as to provide for a \$200 allowance for private interment of repatriated war dead of World War II, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. SIKES:

H. R. 4623. A bill to increase the maximum duration of veterans' on-the-job training programs from 2 to 4 years; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mrs. ST. GEORGE:

H. R. 4624. A bill to provide temporary additional cost-of-living compensation for officers and employees of the Federal Government and of the government of the District of Columbia; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. THOMPSON:

H. R. 4625. A bill providing for a survey of the area at and in the vicinity of Texas City, Tex.; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. WALTER:

H. R. 4626. A bill to amend the Second Decontrol Act of 1947; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WELCH:

H. R. 4627. A bill to authorize an appropriation for the immediate relief of the Navajo and Hopi Indians, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. NORBLAD:

H. J. Res. 268. Joint resolution to provide that information shall be made available to the public relating to the nature and extent of foreign property holdings within the United States; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. CRAWFORD:

H. Res. 384. Resolution providing for the appointment of a select committee to investigate Government policies which have been the cause of cheapening the currency of the United States and to study to what extent such policies have increased prices of goods, services, and commodities; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts:

H. Res. 385. Resolution requesting the Secretary of the Interior to furnish the House of Representatives full information in his possession concerning the amount of fuel oil, gasoline, petroleum products, and coal now available in the United States and what steps the Government should take to make the proper and necessary supply available; to the Committee on Public Lands.

#### PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. BATES of Massachusetts:

H. R. 4628. A bill for the relief of John Philip Spanos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GORDON:

H. R. 4629. A bill for the relief of Polish soldiers; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HAVENNER:

H. R. 4630. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Virginia Dalla Rosa Prati and her minor son, Rolando Dalla Rosa Prati; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SCOBLOCK:

H. R. 4631. A bill for the relief of Antonio Villani; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

#### PETITIONS, ETC.

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

822. By the SPEAKER: Petition of Dixie County Chamber of Commerce, Cross City, Fla., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to appropriations in the amount sufficient to give proper water control of the Everglades; to the Committee on Appropriations.

823. By Mr. HOPE: Petition of E. C. Binford and 107 other residents of Haviland, Kans., and vicinity, against H. R. 4278, a bill to enact the National Security Training Act of 1947; to the Committee on Armed Services.

824. By Mr. RICH: Petition of Hughesville, Pa., Woman's Christian Temperance Union, in opposition to H. R. 4278 and to recommit the bill; to the Committee on Armed Services.

825. By Mr. ROHRBOUGH: Petition signed by Rev. H. L. Koontz and 38 members of the Broad Street Evangelical United Brethren in Christ Church of Weston, W. Va., urging legislation prohibiting the advertising of liquor over the radio and in magazines and newspapers; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

826. By the SPEAKER: Petition of members of the Yale law faculty, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to urging the House of Representatives immediately to abolish its Committee on Un-American Activities and that the President and Secretary of State revise their present policy with regard to governmental employees suspected as disloyal or as security risks; to the Committee on Rules.

827. Also, petition of S. F. Matthews, Homestead, Fla., and others, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to endorsement of the Townsend plan, H. R. 16; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

828. Also, petition of Mrs. O. L. Williams, Tampa, Fla., and others, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to endorsement of the Townsend plan, H. R. 16; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

829. Also, petition of J. P. Fleming, Plymouth, Fla., and others, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to endorsement of the Townsend plan, H. R. 16; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

830. Also, petition of Mrs. J. B. Jones, West Palm Beach, Fla., and others, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to endorsement of the Townsend plan, H. R. 16; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

831. Also, petition of F. B. Turner and others, of Miami, Fla., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to enactment of the Townsend plan, H. R. 16; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

832. Also, petition of Buddy Hayes and others, of Orlando, Fla., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to enactment of the Townsend plan, H. R. 16, to the Committee on Ways and Means.

833. Also, petition of J. C. Michael and others, of Orlando, Fla., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to enactment of the Townsend plan, H. R. 16; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

834. Also, petition of Carl Sirkin and others, of West Palm Beach, Fla., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to enactment of the Townsend plan, H. R. 16; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

835. Also, petition of Mrs. Emma Mackay and others, of Boynton Beach, Fla., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to enactment of the Townsend plan, H. R. 16; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

836. Also, petition of Miss E. E. Harris and others, of Enterprise, Fla., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to enactment of the Townsend plan, H. R. 16; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

## SENATE

THURSDAY, DECEMBER 4, 1947

Rev. Frank G. Smith, D. D., pastor emeritus, First Central Congregational Church, Omaha, Nebr., offered the following prayer:

Dear Lord and Father of mankind, before entering fully upon the duties and responsibilities of this day, we pause for a moment in Thy presence to invoke Thy guidance.

Help us to understand that he spoke an eternal truth who said:

"Prayer is the soul's sincere desire,  
Uttered or unexpressed;  
The motion of a hidden fire,  
That trembles in the breast."

It is our sincere desire that in this moment of communion with Thee we may have a clearer consciousness than ever before of the divine truth, that every human being who dwells upon this planet which we call our home is by nature a child of God; no matter how underprivileged his environment, or how primitive his heritage, there is enfolded within him the embryonic potential of becoming a strong son of God, a gracious daughter of the Most High. We are all sparks from the eternal flame, thoughts from the infinite mind.

Here in these legislative Halls we are faced with great problems, weighty decisions, and challenging opportunities that concern all mankind; we do not always see eye to eye; but grant that we may live and act in the tolerant spirit of him who said:

"There is so much that is good in the worst of us,  
And so much that is bad in the best of us,  
That it behooves all of us  
To say nothing ill of the rest of us."

So as steel sharpens steel, and as one chemical reacting upon another produces a compound of larger value and greater efficiency, so may our cross-currents of honest thought and endeavor finally jell into a remedial balm that will ease every troubled mind and heal every wounded heart, both at home and in the remotest areas of this troubled world.

Guide us by Thy wisdom, undergird us with Thy strength, brood over us with

Thy love, that we may have that victorious faith, here and now, that will enable us to pray in the words of him who set the throbs of his patriotic heart to the music of verse when he prayed:

"Our father's God from out whose hand  
The centuries fall like grains of sand,  
We meet today, united free,  
And loyal to our land and Thee,  
To thank Thee for the era gone  
And trust Thee for the coming one.

"O keep Thou us through centuries long,  
In peace secure, in justice strong;  
Around our gift of freedom draw  
The safeguard of Thy righteous law,  
And, cast in some diviner mold,  
Let each new era shame the old."

All this we ask in Thy dear name and  
in the name of our Lord and Master.  
Amen.

#### THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. WHITE, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Monday, December 1, 1947, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

#### MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

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

#### HARRY W. BETTINGHAUS

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. President, if I may take a few precious minutes of the time of the Senate, I should like to avail myself of the opportunity of paying a well-deserved tribute.

I think every Senator will agree that one of the most important persons in the office and life of every Member of the Senate is the one who occupies the very vital position of administrative assistant. Yesterday I had the sad honor of participating in the burial of the earthly remains of my late and devoted administrative assistant, Harry W. Bettinghaus. His death came suddenly and quietly as the result of a cerebral hemorrhage.

Harry was a big man in every respect, physically as well as in character and capacity. He loved his opportunity to serve his State, his country, and his fellow man. He was born, educated, and spent his early life in Springfield, Ill., the capital of our State. It was from there, during the First World War, that he enlisted in 1918 as a private. He was quickly elevated to the rank of regimental sergeant major, a rank which he held until he was honorably discharged in 1919.

More than 12 years ago he became associated with me. He soon became not only my secretary, but my close confidant and intimate friend. He came with me as my confidential secretary when I took office as United States Senator in 1940, a capacity in which he served until after the Reorganization Act became effective, when he became my administrative assistant. A few days before his death we celebrated our seventh anniversary of service together in the United States Senate.

He is survived by his beloved wife, Mazie, and three devoted children, each of whom served our country with distinction in World War II. His daughter, Georgia Ann, served as an ensign in the United States Navy. Knox, his oldest son, enlisted as a private and was discharged as a flight officer in the Glider Corps. Hunter, his youngest son, enlisted as a seaman and was promoted to the rank of petty officer, third class, while serving in the waters of the Pacific. All of them carried on in the true tradition of their father.

When the sudden news of Harry's death reached the Capitol, the spontaneous response of sympathy and sorrow that reached me, members of his family, and the remaining members of my staff was truly great. These sentiments came from elected officials and countless others in the State of Illinois. They came from distinguished Members of both the Senate and the House serving on both sides of the aisle. They came from the beloved Chaplain of the Senate, other officers of the Senate, employees in Senators' offices, the Senate Office Building, and the Capitol as well. They came from the Senate Press and Radio Galleries, and from members high and low of the various armed services. These tributes and expressions are eloquent testimony of the high esteem in which Harry Bettinghaus was held by all those who came in contact with him and those who knew him well.

To Harry Bettinghaus, devotion to duty was a religion, complete submersion of his own personality a pleasure, and unselfish sacrifice a matter of quiet pride.

He truly loved his fellow man. He truly loved to serve them. There was no task too great; there was no request too trivial to receive his equally energetic and enthusiastic effort.

During the dread and trying years of the late war, when the State of Illinois, which we represent, had more than 900,000 sons and daughters away from home facing both danger and death, he had great sympathy and understanding for the problems of the sons and daughters, as well as the anxiety of their parents. As a former service man, as a devoted father, he labored long and hard to alleviate the fears and meet the tragic realities of the citizens of Illinois.

Recently he and I returned from a trip through western Europe, where we viewed first hand the tragic results of the ruthlessness of all-out war. He was in the full bloom of taking up his continuing service to the people we represented in this great body, when he was stricken and his labor of love was ended.

Starting his service in Springfield, Ill., the capital of our State, it was abruptly ended in Washington, D. C., the Capital of our Nation. He was appropriately buried in Arlington, our national cemetery, where he took his rightful place among the other heroes of our Nation who served their States and Nation honorably and well, both in war and in peace.

Illinois has lost a devoted servant. I have lost a most valuable, conscientious, and trusted personal friend.

#### LEAVES OF ABSENCE

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to be absent from the Senate on Monday next.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the leave is granted.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the junior Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND] be excused from attendance at sessions of the Senate from today through next Monday, inasmuch as he is participating in the dedicatory ceremonies of the Everglades National Park in the State of Florida.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the request is granted.

#### EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

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

#### REPORT ON CONTROL AND ERADICATION OF FOOT-AND-MOUTH DISEASE

A letter from the Under Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on cooperation of the United States with Mexico in the control and eradication of foot-and-mouth disease, for the month ended October 31, 1947 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

#### REPORTS OF RENTAL COLLECTIONS FROM FEDERAL UNDEVELOPED BUILDING SITES

A letter from the Administrator of the Federal Works Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, reports of funds received for the rental of buildings and lands acquired as sites for the future construction of public buildings, fiscal year 1947 (with accompanying reports); to the Committee on Public Works.

#### REPORT OF COMMISSION ON LICENSURE, DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

A letter from the President of the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report showing the activities of the Commission on Licensure, under the Healing Arts Practice Act, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1947 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

#### PETITIONS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate by the President pro tempore and referred as indicated:

Petitions of sundry citizens of the United States, praying for the enactment of legislation to restore price controls; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Petitions of sundry citizens of the State of Florida, praying for the enactment of the so-called Townsend plan, providing old-age assistance; to the Committee on Finance.

A resolution adopted by the Juneau (Alaska) Chamber of Commerce, favoring the enactment of legislation to repeal section 2 of the Act of May 1, 1936 (49 Stat. L. 1250), relating to a reservation for Indians at Hyda-burg, Alaska (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Public Lands.

#### AGRICULTURAL POLICY

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I present for appropriate reference a resolution adopted by the Delta Council of Mississippi, setting forth their views on a policy for agriculture, and I ask unanimous consent that it may be printed in the RECORD.

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

#### AGRICULTURAL POLICY

Delta Council, representing over half a million people and some four million-plus acres of land devoted mainly to high per-acre production of fiber, feed, and food, supports the following agricultural program:

1. Cotton seeks no preferential treatment, but as a nonperishable, profitable commodity to the Government itself, it should be afforded some protection as a world trade item in an economy favorable to industry and labor by present tariff and protective legislation policies.

2. Parity should continue to reflect a fair balance and equity between agriculture, industry, labor, and other segments of society.

3. Liberal support prices for basic agricultural commodities, and hand in hand with this support, adequate acreage control.

4. Continuation and strengthening of the Soil Conservation Service.

5. Abolition of present limitation of payments for soil conservation and improved land-use practices; price adjustment payments, and enactment of legislation for payment based on land involved, not ownership.

6. Adequate facilities for the export of surplus commodities.

7. Import quotas, particularly applied to those countries needing dollar exchange, to prohibit flooding and adversely affecting domestic markets for farm products.

8. Maintenance and rapid expansion of the farm research program.

9. Abolition of discrimination against oleomargarine.

10. Continuance of crop goals and crop guidance.

11. Long-range planning toward better diversion and more efficient marketing of agricultural products, ultimate objective of which would be an encouraged and unrestricted world trade.

12. Recognition of the fact many of the problems of agriculture arise without the industry itself and increased per capita farm income can come from the absorption of surplus and/or marginal population in more productive employ by industry and service.

13. Full recognition to the tremendous agricultural production efforts of this country, taking full cognizance of the small percent cost of the raw agricultural commodity in the present high retail price to consumers. Unanimously adopted, Clarksdale, Miss., November 18, 1947.

ELLIS T. WOOLFOLK, Jr.,  
President, Board of Directors.

#### TRAINING FOR DEMOCRACY—EDITORIAL IN THE WASHINGTON POST

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, I send to the desk and ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Training for Democracy," from the November 15, 1947, issue of the Washington Post. I heartily approve the sentiments expressed in the editorial.

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

#### TRAINING FOR DEMOCRACY

The twelfth annual convention of the National Council of Negro Women, just completed in Washington, has afforded a heartening example of democracy in action. From some 24 States of the Union, delegates representing the 850,000 Negro women members of the organization assembled here for study and inspiration in dealing with the current problems of citizenship and of leadership in their home communities. The

theme of the convention was: "Building a bridge to universal peace through understanding." And in the discussion understanding of issues was stressed no less than understanding of peoples. Four workshops were in session—on health, education and child welfare, on employment, on housing, and on legislative strategy.

These women will go home with knowledge of the Marshall plan, with a sense of the urgency of food conservation, with something of the know-how of mobilizing opinion and organizing for community action. This is the way things get done in a free country. We offer our congratulations to the National Council on their awareness of responsibility. And we offer them congratulations, too, on their perennially younger, more dynamic founder-president, Mary McLeod Bethune, one of the great women of America.

#### BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS INTRODUCED

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

By Mr. CAPEHART:

S. 1827. A bill to encourage increased production, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. BUSHFIELD:

S. 1828. A bill for expenditure of funds for cooperating with the public-school board at Sisseton, S. Dak., for the extension of public-school facilities to be available to all Indian children in the district; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. WILEY (by request):

S. 1829. A bill for the relief of John Cameron Henry; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(Mr. FLANDERS introduced Senate bill 1830, to extend the period of validity of the act to facilitate the admission into the United States of the alien fiancées or fiancés of members of the armed forces of the United States, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. YOUNG:

S. 1831. A bill for the relief of E. H. Charnholm and Leroy Charnholm; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LANGER:

S. 1832. A bill for the relief of Elizabeth Kahn Greenberg; and

S. 1833. A bill for the relief of John (Jewan) Mohammed; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(Mr. BUTLER introduced Senate bill 1834, to amend sec. 8 of the act of June 17, 1886, as amended (46 U. S. C., sec. 289), and sec. 27 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1920, as amended (46 U. S. C., sec. 883), which was referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, and appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. HOEY:

S. 1835. A bill for the relief of Harry Daniels; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BALDWIN:

S. 1836. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to provide for the evacuation and return of the remains of certain persons who died and are buried outside the continental limits of the United States," as amended, so as to provide a \$200 allowance to the next of kin for private interment of individual identified remains; to the Committee on Armed Services.

S. 1837. A bill for the relief of Giuseppe Pompeo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TOBEY:

S. 1838. A bill for the relief of Arthur C. Jones; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PEPPER:

S. 1839. A bill for the relief of Eleni Sacalrides; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McMAHON:

S. 1840. A bill relating to the disposition of permanent housing acquired or constructed by the United States; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. KILGORE:

S. 1841. A bill to increase the mileage allowances of civilian officers and employees for use of privately owned vehicles and to increase the per diem allowances of civilian officers and employees while traveling on official business; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

By Mr. KILGORE (for himself and Mr. AIKEN):

S. 1842. A bill to amend the Second Decontrol Act of 1947; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(Mr. WILEY introduced Senate Joint Resolution 161, proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to the filling of vacancies in the House of Representatives, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. BUTLER (for himself and Mr. WATKINS):

S. J. Res. 162. Joint resolution to rescind certain orders of the Secretary of the Interior establishing Indian reservations in the Territory of Alaska; to the Committee on Public Lands.

#### ADMISSION INTO UNITED STATES OF CERTAIN ALIEN FIANCÉES

Mr. FLANDERS. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to extend the period of validity of the act to facilitate the admission into the United States of the alien fiancées or fiancés of members of the armed forces of the United States.

I might state parenthetically that the bill may be known as the sweetheart bill.

The bill (S. 1830) to extend the period of validity of the act to facilitate the admission into the United States of the alien fiancées or fiancés of members of the armed forces of the United States, introduced by Mr. FLANDERS, was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

#### ADEQUATE TRANSPORTATION FOR THE PEOPLE OF ALASKA

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill providing adequate transportation for the people of Alaska.

During my recent trip to Alaska, on which I was accompanied by three other members of the Senate Public Lands Committee, we discovered that one of the greatest obstacles to the development of this vast Territory is the extremely inadequate transportation facilities available between different points within Alaska, and from Alaska to the outside world. Within Alaska itself, there is only one railroad, and there are very few highways. The situation is particularly bad for the cities of southeastern Alaska where most of the population is located, and which are not even reached by the railroad. As a practical matter, such communities as Juneau, Ketchikan, and Wrangell have to depend almost exclusively on either steamships or airplanes for their communications with the outside world, or with each other.

Furthermore, all of Alaska must depend on surface transportation from the United States by water for virtually all

of its consumer supplies. Under these circumstances, adequate steamship service is absolutely necessary to the development of the Territory.

Unfortunately, Alaska does not now have adequate steamship service, or anything like it. The principal reason is the restrictive effect of our various acts which restrict all steamer traffic to ships under American registry.

I realize fully the reasons for our coastwise shipping laws which require, in general, the traffic between two American ports be conducted in vessels of American registry. In fact, I am in general sympathy with these laws insofar as they apply to movement of passengers or goods between, for example, New York and New Orleans, or the east coast and the west coast. I can see that without such laws it would be extremely difficult to maintain an adequate merchant marine.

However, it seems to me the situation in Alaska is radically different from that of the rest of the country. Between any two ports in the continental United States, there are generally adequate rail and highway facilities to offer a competitive alternative to the shipper. He is not forced to use water transportation on American lines. In other words, he is not solely dependent on water transportation and on the American shipping laws. In Alaska, the traveler or shipper is solely dependent on water transportation, even though the charges may be high and the service inadequate. It happens that the American coastwise shipping laws have effectively reduced the water transportation available to Alaskans to two American lines under the same ownership, plus a third small operator, whose few small vessels carry freight primarily. As a natural result, the service available for travel and transportation in the Territory has been poor, uncertain, expensive, and infrequent.

My proposal is that the present law be relaxed to the extent of permitting Canadian vessels to transport passengers and/or freight between two Alaskan cities. In other words, my bill will not affect the coastwise laws if they apply to transportation between the mainland and Alaska. It proposes merely to permit transportation of passengers and freight from one part of Alaska to another by Canadian vessels.

It is obviously an inefficient system which requires a businessman who may have traveled from Juneau to Ketchikan, to wait in Ketchikan for days for an American vessel to pick him up for the return trip, when a Canadian vessel has to bypass him because of the laws now in effect. The same applies to a movement of freight.

Canadian steamship lines have long rendered efficient service through 500 miles of American water in Alaska to Skagway and thence into the Yukon Territory. These same lines have built up an important tourist industry in that area. By giving them the right to transport American citizens or freight between southeastern Alaska ports, we would be contributing toward development of Alaska.

The second section of the bill I have introduced should not be controversial

as it would simply remove a discrimination against Alaska. The act of June 5, 1920, known as the Jones Act, provides that no merchandise may be transported in the coastwise trade in foreign vessels, but it makes one important exception to this general rule. The exception permits such transportation between points in the continental United States over routes in part over Canadian rail lines and their own or connecting water facilities. The exception, however, is expressly stated not to apply to Alaska.

In other words, goods may be shipped from Chicago, for example, over American and Canadian rail lines to Vancouver, Canada, and from there by Canadian steamer to Seattle and other west coast points. The same shipment could not be taken by Canadian steamer from Vancouver to any point in Alaska. Alaska is, in this respect, denied a privilege given to the States. Since Alaska is absolutely dependent on water transportation to an extent that we who live down here can hardly realize, this discrimination is all the more burdensome. The second section of my proposed bill would eliminate this discrimination and place the Territory on a basis of equality with the rest of the Union.

Mr. President, during the last few years we have heard a great deal of the importance of Alaska as a strategic outpost of the United States. I believe the armed services are now fully convinced of the urgency of developing their defenses in that area. The greatest obstacles to effective defense have been the small population and the inadequate transportation facilities. I believe it is time that we make a start toward correcting these serious conditions, and I hope the committee to which this measure is referred will study my bill with those general objectives in view.

The bill (S. 1834) to amend section 8 of the act of June 17, 1886, as amended (46 U. S. C., sec. 289), and section 27 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1920, as amended (46 U. S. C., sec. 883), introduced by Mr. BUTLER, was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

#### AMENDMENT OF CONSTITUTION RELATING TO FILLING OF VACANCIES IN HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States. This amendment provides for temporary appointment by our State governors to fill vacancies in the House of Representatives. This new power would be useful principally in the event of atomic attack on our country, with resulting vacancies in the Congress. I ask unanimous consent that the joint resolution together with a statement which I have prepared on this subject be printed in the body of the RECORD.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The joint resolution will be received and appropriately referred, and, without objection, the joint resolution together with the statement by the Senator from Wisconsin will be printed in the RECORD.

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 161) proposing an amendment to the Con-

stitution of the United States relating to the filling of vacancies in the House of Representatives, introduced by Mr. WILEY, was read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

*Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled (two-thirds of each House concurring therein), That the following article is hereby proposed as an amendment to the Constitution of the United States, which shall be valid to all intents and purposes as part of the Constitution when ratified by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States:*

#### "ARTICLE —

"SECTION 1. When vacancies happen in the representation of any State in the House of Representatives, the executive authority of such State shall issue writs of election to fill such vacancies: *Provided*, That the legislature of any State may empower the executive thereof to make temporary appointments until the people fill the vacancies by election as the legislature may direct.

"SEC. 2. This article shall be inoperative unless it shall have been ratified as an amendment to the Constitution by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States within — years from the date of its submission to the States by the Congress."

STATEMENT BY HON. ALEXANDER WILEY, OF WISCONSIN, IN UNITED STATES SENATE, DECEMBER 4, 1947

#### INTRODUCTION OF PROPOSED AMENDMENT TO THE CONSTITUTION FOR TEMPORARY APPOINTMENT OF REPRESENTATIVES

Mr. President, I am introducing today a proposed amendment to the Constitution of the United States. This is a Senate joint resolution whereby the legislature of any State could empower the executive thereof to make temporary appointments to the House of Representatives until the people could fill vacancies by an election.

Mr. President, the reason for this is made obvious when we consider these facts:

1. At present there is no provision in the Constitution for interim appointment by State governors to the House of Representatives.

#### POSSIBILITY OF MASS VACANCIES IN ATOMIC WAR

2. If, unfortunately, America should ever be confronted with a national military emergency, in which we were under atomic or other attack, it would obviously be completely impossible for the people of the separate States to assemble to elect Members of Congress to fill vacancies.

3. If you consider the further possibility that an atomic bomb might well smash Washington and cause mass vacancies in the House of Representatives, as well as the Senate, you will see that there would be no possibility of elections to fill those vacancies, and, as a result, no functioning Congress.

The aim of my joint resolution is, therefore, to enable interim appointments of Members of Congress.

#### APPOINTMENT OF SENATORS

As my colleagues know, under the United States Constitution, the State governors are empowered to make interim appointments of Senators where vacancies exist. There is provision in every one of the State constitutions except one, in my own State of Wisconsin, whereby the governors can appoint Senators to fill interim vacancies. Therefore, a few days ago, I wrote to the Honorable Oscar Rennebohm, Governor of Wisconsin, respectfully inviting his attention to this situation and asking his judgment on the possibility of initiating legislation in Madison to amend our own State constitution.

## SECURITY AGAINST ATOMIC ATTACK

This matter of filling vacancies in the Congress is but one means whereby I hope to offer a relatively complete program of security measures against the possibility of atomic attack. One of the vital elements in such a program is, of course, complete decentralization of the Federal Government and of private industry. I have accordingly written to numerous business leaders and numerous members of government, urging decentralization—a project in which I have been interested for many years for purposes of national defense.

## PRESERVATION OF THE FRIGATE "CONSTELLATION"—AMENDMENT

Mr. GREEN (for himself and Mr. McGrath) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by them, jointly, to the bill (S. 1796) to provide for the preservation of the frigate *Constellation* and to authorize the disposition of certain replaced parts of such vessel as souvenirs, and for other purposes, which was referred to the Committee on Armed Services, and ordered to be printed.

## MAZIE KNOX BETTINGHAUS

Mr. BROOKS submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 173), which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration:

*Resolved*, That the Secretary of the Senate hereby is authorized and directed to pay from the contingent fund of the Senate to Mazie Knox Bettinghaus, widow of Harry W. Bettinghaus, late an employee of the Senate, a sum equal to 6 months' compensation at the rate he was receiving by law at the time of his death, said sum to be considered inclusive of funeral expenses and all other allowances.

## NOTICE OF POSTPONEMENT OF HEARING BEFORE JUDICIARY COMMITTEE

Mr. MOORE. Mr. President, as chairman of a subcommittee of the Senate Committee on the Judiciary appointed to consider Senate bill 1567, to provide the venue in actions brought in United States district courts or in State courts against interstate commerce carriers by railroad for damages for wrongful death or personal injuries, I desire to give notice that the public hearings scheduled for Wednesday and Thursday, December 10 and 11, 1947, at 10 a. m. in the Senate Judiciary Committee room, room 424, Senate Office Building, have been postponed. Hearings will be held beginning January 7, 1948, at 10 a. m. in room 424, Senate Office Building. The companion bill is House bill 1639. On the date beginning January 7, 1948, at the time and place indicated above, all persons interested in Senate bill 1567 may make such representations as they desire. The subcommittee consists of myself, chairman; the Senator from Missouri [Mr. DONNELL]; and the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. McGRATH].

## BIRTHDAY FELICITATIONS TO JUDGE OSCAR E. BLAND BY SENATOR WILEY

[Mr. WILEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD felicitations by him to Judge Oscar E. Bland on his seventieth birthday, at a dinner at the Raleigh Hotel, Washington, D. C., December 3, 1947, which appears in the Appendix.]

## REPORT TO THE PEOPLE, PART 2—ADDRESS BY SENATOR O'DANIEL

[Mr. O'DANIEL asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a report to the

people, part 2, an address by him, broadcast from radio station WBAP, September 11, 1947, which appears in the Appendix.]

## THE IRRIGATOR LOOKS AT EROSION—ADDRESS BY WILLIAM E. WARNE, ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR

[Mr. McFARLAND asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address entitled "The Irrigator Looks at Erosion," delivered by Hon. William E. Warne, Assistant Secretary of the Interior, before the National Reclamation Association, at Phoenix, Ariz., on October 29, 1947, which appears in the Appendix.]

## PRICES AND FOREIGN RELIEF—ADDRESS BY ALF M. LANDON

[Mr. CAPPER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address entitled "Prices and Foreign Relief," delivered by Alf M. Landon, before the South Central Business Association, Inc., Kansas City, Mo., November 18, 1947, which appears in the Appendix.]

## THE FORGOTTEN PRODUCTION—ADDRESS BY HENRY J. KAISER

[Mr. CAPEHART asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a radio address entitled "The Forgotten Production," delivered by Henry J. Kaiser on November 23, 1947, which appears in the Appendix.]

## THE REGISTERED NURSE AND CANCER—ADDRESS BY GEORGE E. STRINGFELLOW

[Mr. REVERCOMB asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address entitled "The Registered Nurse and Cancer," delivered by George E. Stringfellow, president of the New Jersey Division of the American Cancer Society, potentate of Salaam Temple, and vice president of Thomas A. Edison, Inc., over radio station WAAT, Newark, N. J., November 14, 1947, which appears in the Appendix.]

## INFLATION: ITS CAUSES AND CURES

[Mr. CAPEHART asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a radio discussion entitled "Inflation: Its Causes and Cures," held over the American Forum of the Air on November 18, 1947, which appears in the Appendix.]

## THE LAWYER'S VERSION OF THE TWENTY-THIRD PSALM

[Mr. MURRAY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD The Lawyer's Version of the Twenty-third Psalm, written by Louis Lande, of Washington, D. C., and published in the October 1947 issue of Case and Comment, which appears in the Appendix.]

## THE GAMBLER—ARTICLE BY FRANK C. WALDROP

[Mr. McCARTHY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "The Gambler," by Frank C. Waldrop, from the Washington Times-Herald of December 4, 1947, which appears in the Appendix.]

## INTER-AMERICAN TREATY OF RECIPROCAL ASSISTANCE

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. As in executive session, the Chair lays before the Senate a message from the President of the United States, transmitting the Inter-American Treaty of Reciprocal Assistance, which is known as the Rio Treaty, which will be read by the clerk, and the message, together with the accompanying papers, will be referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

The clerk read the message, as follows:

*To the Senate of the United States:*

With a view to receiving the advice and consent of the Senate to ratification, I

transmit herewith a certified copy of the Inter-American Treaty of Reciprocal Assistance, formulated at the Inter-American Conference for the Maintenance of Continental Peace and Security and signed at Rio de Janeiro, Brazil, in the English, French, Portuguese, and Spanish languages on September 2, 1947, by the plenipotentiaries of the United States of America and by the plenipotentiaries of other American Republics.

I transmit also, for the information of the Senate, the report which the Acting Secretary of State has addressed to me in regard to the treaty above-mentioned.

The principles, purposes, and provisions of the treaty have my complete and wholehearted approval, and I am happy to recommend the treaty to the favorable consideration of the Senate.

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

THE WHITE HOUSE, December 1, 1947.

(Enclosures: (1) Report by the Acting Secretary of State; (2) Inter-American Treaty of Reciprocal Assistance, Rio de Janeiro, September 2, 1947—certified copy; (3) final act, Inter-American Conference for the Maintenance of Peace and Security, Rio de Janeiro, September 2, 1947—certified copy.)

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the injunction of secrecy will be removed from the treaty, and the letter from the Secretary of State to the President, together with the text of the treaty, will be printed in the RECORD for the information of Senators.

With the indulgence of the Senate, the Chair would like to suggest that there is great value in immediate ratification of the treaty, concerning which I am sure there is no controversy, because it is highly desirable that the hemispherical solidarity started at Rio be completed before the next pan-American conference in Bogotá, in January.

Therefore, the Senate will be asked, as in executive session, on Monday, to take up the treaty.

There being no objection, the letter from the Secretary of State, together with the text of the treaty, was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,

Washington, D. C., December 1, 1947.

The PRESIDENT,

*The White House:*

The undersigned, the Acting Secretary of State, has the honor to lay before the President, with a view to its transmission to the Senate to receive the advice and consent of that body to ratification, if his judgment approve thereof, a certified copy of the inter-American treaty of reciprocal assistance, formulated at the Inter-American Conference for the Maintenance of Continental Peace and Security and signed at Rio de Janeiro in the English, French, Portuguese, and Spanish languages on September 2, 1947, by the plenipotentiaries of the United States of America and by the plenipotentiaries of other American Republics.

There is included in the same volume with the text of the treaty above mentioned the text of the final act of the conference, which contains information regarding the organization of the conference and the texts of the various resolutions approved by the conference. The texts of the treaty and final act have been certified by the secretary-general of the conference. The final act does not require ratification.

The Inter-American Conference for the Maintenance of Continental Peace and Security met in Petropolis, State of Rio de Janeiro, Brazil, from August 15 to September 2, 1947. The United States delegation to the conference, under the chairmanship of the Secretary of State, included the following delegates: The Honorable William D. Pawley, United States Ambassador to Brazil; the Honorable ARTHUR H. VANDENBERG, President of the United States Senate and chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations; the Honorable TOM CONNALLY, United States Senator and a member of the Committee on Foreign Relations; the Honorable SOL BLOOM, Member of the House of Representatives and of the Committee on Foreign Affairs; and the Honorable Warren R. Austin, ambassador, United States representative to the United Nations.

The conference was convened for the special purpose of formulating the treaty to which reference had been made in the Act of Chapultepec, embodied in the final act of the Inter-American Conference on Problems of War and Peace which met in Mexico City from February 21 to March 8, 1945. In part I of the Act of Chapultepec it was declared in part:

"That every attack of a state against the integrity or the inviolability of the territory, or against the sovereignty or political independence of an American State, shall, conformably to part III hereof, be considered as an act of aggression against the other States which sign this act. \* \* \*

"That in case acts of aggression occur or there are reasons to believe that an aggression is being prepared by any other State against the integrity or inviolability of the territory, or against the sovereignty or political independence of an American State, the States signatory to this act will consult among themselves in order to agree upon the measures it may be advisable to take."

In part II of the Act of Chapultepec it was recommended that "the governments of the American Republics consider the conclusion, in accordance with their constitutional processes, of a treaty establishing procedures whereby such threats or acts may be met by the use, by all or some of the signatories of the said treaty, of any one or more" of certain measures. In anticipation of the establishment of the United Nations, it was stipulated in part III of the Act of Chapultepec that the pertinent activities and procedures "shall be consistent with the purposes and principles of the general international organization, when established."

The Inter-American treaty of reciprocal assistance was drawn up in accordance with the recommendation in the Act of Chapultepec and within the framework of the United Nations Charter. As stated in the preamble, the treaty deals with "those matters relating to the maintenance of international peace and security which are appropriate for regional action." This regional arrangement is thus of a type contemplated in chapter VIII of the United Nations Charter. It is entirely consistent with the purposes and principles of the United Nations and will facilitate and supplement the effective functioning of the United Nations. The authority of the Security Council with regard to the application of enforcement measures, and its general powers with respect to maintenance of international peace and security are fully recognized in the treaty, and article 10 contains the stipulation that none of the provisions of the treaty "shall be construed as impairing the rights and obligations of the high contracting parties under the Charter of the United Nations."

The principal features of the treaty include (a) references to certain basic considerations and precedents (preamble); (b) a reaffirmation of basic principles with re-

spect to the pacific settlement of disputes (arts. 1 and 2); (c) the stipulation of specific obligations in the event of an armed attack against an American State, with a definition of the areas within which an armed attack would invoke the maximum obligations of the treaty (arts. 3 and 4); (d) provisions for consultation and collective measures in the event of certain other dangers to continental peace (art. 6); (e) provisions specifying the types of measures which may be taken in either event and specifying certain acts of aggression (arts. 7, 8, and 9); (f) provisions assuring consistency with and fulfillment of the obligations under the United Nations Charter (art. 3, pars. 3 and 4, and arts. 5, 10, and 24); and (g) procedural matters affecting consultation regarding, and execution of, measures, voting and the binding effect of decisions (arts. 11 to 21, inclusive).

The basic principle underlying the Act of Chapultepec is restated and extended in the treaty and concomitant obligations set forth in article 3, as follows:

"1. The high contracting parties agree that an armed attack by any state against an American State shall be considered as an attack against all the American States and, consequently, each one of the said contracting parties undertakes to assist in meeting the attack in the exercise of the inherent right of individual or collective self-defense recognized by article 51 of the Charter of the United Nations.

"2. On the request of the state or states directly attacked and until the decision of the Organ of Consultation of the Inter-American System, each one of the contracting parties may determine the immediate measures which it may individually take in fulfillment of the obligation contained in the preceding paragraph and in accordance with the principle of continental solidarity. The Organ of Consultation shall meet without delay for the purpose of examining those measures and agreeing upon the measures of a collective character that should be taken."

Thus, apart from such collective measures as may be agreed upon in consultation, each of the parties obligates itself to take affirmative action to assist in meeting an armed attack. This important provision converts the right of individual and collective self-defense, as recognized in the United Nations Charter, into an obligation under this treaty. The provision for immediate assistance is applicable to all cases of armed attack taking place within the territory of an American state or anywhere within the region delimited in article 4. This region embraces the American Continents and Greenland, adjacent waters, and polar regions immediately to the north and south of the American Continents.

Regardless of where the armed attack may take place, the parties are obligated to consult immediately with one another to agree upon appropriate collective measures.

The conference decided that no attempt should be made to define aggression in general terms, but two recognized types of aggression are specified in article 9.

In the event of an aggression which is not an armed attack or in the event of the occurrence of other possible dangers to the peace, the parties similarly obligate themselves in article 6 to consult to determine the measures to be taken to aid the victim of the aggression or to restore peace and security.

The recommendation in the Act of Chapultepec with respect to the measures which might be taken to meet threats to Inter-American peace and security or acts of aggression against any American state is restated in article 8 of the treaty, as follows:

"For the purposes of this treaty, the measures on which the Organ of Consultation may agree will comprise one or more of the

following: recall of chiefs of diplomatic missions; breaking of diplomatic relations; breaking of consular relations; partial or complete interruption of economic relations or of rail, sea, air, postal, telegraphic, telephonic, and radiotelephonic or radiotelegraphic communications; and use of armed force."

Article 7 provides that in the event of a conflict between two or more American states, the initial collective action to be taken by the parties shall be to call upon the contending states to suspend hostilities and restore the situation to the status quo ante bellum.

It is provided in article 20 that decisions which require the application of the measures specified in article 8 shall be binding upon all the signatory states which have ratified the treaty, with the sole exception that no state shall be required to use armed force without its consent. In article 17 it is provided that the Organ of Consultation shall take its decisions by a vote of two-thirds of the signatory states which have ratified the treaty. This arrangement, whereby the measures specified in article 8, with the one exception, become obligatory for all parties upon a two-thirds vote of the states parties to the treaty, represents a significant advance in international relations.

Article 22 provides that the treaty shall come into effect between the states which ratify it as soon as the ratifications of two-thirds of the signatory states have been deposited. Article 23 contains additional procedural provisions relating to signature and ratification.

Article 24 determines the procedure for the registration of the treaty, when it has entered into force, with the Secretariat of the United Nations. Such registration is to be effected through the Pan American Union.

Article 25 provides that the treaty shall remain in force indefinitely, but that any state party thereto may denounce it by a notification in writing to the Pan American Union, such denunciation to become effective for that state 2 years from the date of the receipt of such notification by the Pan American Union.

Article 26, the final article, provides that the principles and fundamental provisions of the treaty shall be incorporated in the organic pact of the inter-American system. This has reference to an instrument in the nature of a basic constitution or charter for the reorganization of the system, which it is contemplated will be considered and adopted at the forthcoming Ninth International Conference of American States to be held at Bogota, Colombia, early in 1948.

This treaty represents a significant advance in international cooperation for the maintenance of peace and security. Its provisions commit the other parties promptly to assist the United States in the event of an armed attack by any country on our territory or anywhere in the region defined by the treaty, and the United States similarly pledges its assistance to the other parties in case any of them is subjected to such an attack. In determining collective measures, the parties guarantee in advance to observe important decisions reached by two-thirds of them, reserving for their individual consent among the listed measures only the vital decision as to their participation in the use of armed force. The obligatory character of decisions by a two-thirds majority assures that the general collective will of the community can be made effective, and avoids the possibility that the operation of the treaty might be paralyzed through the nonconcurrence of a small minority.

The vital spirit of pan-American solidarity is implicit in the provisions of the treaty and there is every reason to believe that the treaty affords an adequate guaranty of

the peace and security of this hemisphere, thereby assuring so far as possible a necessary condition to the continued advancement of the economic, political, and social ideals of the peoples of the American states.

Respectfully submitted.

ROBERT A. LOVETT.

(Enclosures: (1) Inter-American Treaty of Reciprocal Assistance, Rio de Janeiro, September 2, 1947—certified copy; (2) Final act, Inter-American Conference for the Maintenance of Peace and Security, Rio de Janeiro, September 2, 1947—certified copy.)

#### INTER-AMERICAN TREATY OF RECIPROCAL ASSISTANCE

In the name of their Peoples, the Governments represented at the Inter-American Conference for the Maintenance of Continental Peace and Security, desirous of consolidating and strengthening their relations of friendship and good neighborliness, and considering:

That Resolution VIII of the Inter-American Conference on Problems of War and Peace, which met in Mexico City, recommended the conclusion of a treaty to prevent and repel threats and acts of aggression against any of the countries of America;

That the High Contracting Parties reiterate their will to remain united in an inter-American system consistent with the purposes and principles of the United Nations, and reaffirm the existence of the agreement which they have concluded concerning those matters relating to the maintenance of international peace and security which are appropriate for regional action;

That the High Contracting Parties reaffirm their adherence to the principles of inter-American solidarity and cooperation, and especially to those set forth in the preamble and declarations of the Act of Chapultepec, all of which should be understood to be accepted as standards of their mutual relations and as the juridical basis of the Inter-American System;

That the American States propose, in order to improve the procedures for the pacific settlement of their controversies, to conclude the treaty concerning the "Inter-American Peace System" envisaged in Resolutions IX and XXXIX of the Inter-American Conference on Problems of War and Peace.

That the obligation of mutual assistance and common defense of the American Republics is essentially related to their democratic ideals and to their will to cooperate permanently in the fulfillment of the principles and purposes of a policy of peace;

That the American regional community affirms as a manifest truth that juridical organization is a necessary prerequisite of security and peace, and that peace is founded on justice and moral order and, consequently, on the international recognition and protection of human rights and freedoms, on the indispensable well-being of the people, and on the effectiveness of democracy for the international realization of justice and security,

Have resolved, in conformity with the objectives stated above, to conclude the following Treaty, in order to assure peace, through adequate means, to provide for effective reciprocal assistance to meet armed attacks against any American State, and in order to deal with threats of aggression against any of them:

#### ARTICLE 1

The High Contracting Parties formally condemn war and undertake in their international relations not to resort to the threat or the use of force in any manner inconsistent with the provisions of the Charter of the United Nations or of this Treaty.

#### ARTICLE 2

As a consequence of the principle set forth in the preceding Article, the High Contracting Parties undertake to submit every controversy which may arise between them to methods of peaceful settlement and to endeavor to settle any such controversy among themselves by means of the procedures in force in the Inter-American System before referring it to the General Assembly or the Security Council of the United Nations.

#### ARTICLE 3

1. The High Contracting Parties agree that an armed attack by any State against an American State shall be considered as an attack against all the American States and, consequently, each one of the said Contracting Parties undertakes to assist in meeting the attack in the exercise of the inherent right of individual or collective self-defense recognized by Article 51 of the Charter of the United Nations.

2. On the request of the State or States directly attacked and until the decision of the Organ of Consultation of the Inter-American System, each one of the Contracting Parties may determine the immediate measures which it may individually take in fulfillment of the obligation contained in the preceding paragraph and in accordance with the principle of continental solidarity. The Organ of Consultation shall meet without delay for the purpose of examining those measures and agreeing upon the measures of a collective character that should be taken.

3. The provisions of this Article shall be applied in case of any armed attack which takes place within the region described in Article 4 or within the territory of an American State. When the attack takes place outside of the said areas, the provisions of Article 6 shall be applied.

4. Measures of self-defense provided for under this Article may be taken until the Security Council of the United Nations has taken the measures necessary to maintain international peace and security.

#### ARTICLE 4

The region to which this Treaty refers is bounded as follows: beginning at the North Pole; thence due south to a point 74 degrees north latitude, 10 degrees west longitude; thence by a rhumb line to a point 47 degrees 30 minutes north latitude, 50 degrees west longitude; thence by a rhumb line to a point 35 degrees north latitude, 60 degrees west longitude; thence due south to a point in 20 degrees north latitude; thence by a rhumb line to a point 5 degrees north latitude, 24 degrees west longitude; thence due south to the South Pole; thence due north to a point 30 degrees south latitude, 90 degrees west longitude; thence by a rhumb line to a point on the Equator at 97 degrees west longitude; thence by a rhumb line to a point 15 degrees north latitude, 120 degrees west longitude; thence by a rhumb line to a point 50 degrees north latitude, 170 degrees east longitude; thence due north to a point in 54 degrees north latitude; thence by a rhumb line to a point 65 degrees 30 minutes north latitude, 168 degrees 58 minutes 5 seconds west longitude; thence due north to the North Pole.

#### ARTICLE 5

The High Contracting Parties shall immediately send to the Security Council of the United Nations, in conformity with Articles 51 and 54 of the Charter of the United Nations, complete information concerning the activities undertaken or in contemplation in the exercise of the right of self-defense or for the purpose of maintaining inter-American peace and security.

#### ARTICLE 6

If the inviolability or the integrity of the territory or the sovereignty or political independence of any American State should be

affected by an aggression which is not an armed attack or by an extra-continental or intra-continental conflict, or by any other fact or situation that might endanger the peace of America, the Organ of Consultation shall meet immediately in order to agree on the measures which must be taken in case of aggression to assist the victim of the aggression or, in any case, the measures which should be taken for the common defense and for the maintenance of the peace and security of the Continent.

#### ARTICLE 7

In the case of a conflict between two or more American States, without prejudice to the right of self-defense in conformity with Article 51 of the Charter of the United Nations, the High Contracting Parties, meeting in consultation shall call upon the contending States to suspend hostilities and restore matters to the *status quo ante bellum*, and shall take in addition all other necessary measures to reestablish or maintain inter-American peace and security and for the solution of the conflict by peaceful means. The rejection of the pacifying action will be considered in the determination of the aggressor and in the application of the measures which the consultative meeting may agree upon.

#### ARTICLE 8

For the purposes of this Treaty, the measures on which the Organ of Consultation may agree will comprise one or more of the following: recall of chiefs of diplomatic missions; breaking of diplomatic relations; breaking of consular relations; partial or complete interruption of economic relations or of rail, sea, air, postal, telegraphic, telephonic, and radiotelephonic or radiotelegraphic communications; and use of armed force.

#### ARTICLE 9

In addition to other acts which the Organ of Consultation may characterize as aggression, the following shall be considered as such:

a. Unprovoked armed attack by a State against the territory, the people, or the land, sea or air forces of another State;

b. Invasion, by the armed forces of a State, of the territory of an American State, through the trespassing of boundaries demarcated in accordance with a treaty, judicial decision, or arbitral award, or, in the absence of frontiers thus demarcated, invasion affecting a region which is under the effective jurisdiction of another State.

#### ARTICLE 10

None of the provisions of this Treaty shall be construed as impairing the rights and obligations of the High Contracting Parties under the Charter of the United Nations.

#### ARTICLE 11

The consultations to which this Treaty refers shall be carried out by means of the Meetings of Ministers of Foreign Affairs of the American Republics which have ratified the Treaty, or in the manner or by the organ which in the future may be agreed upon.

#### ARTICLE 12

The Governing Board of the Pan American Union may act provisionally as an organ of consultation until the meeting of the Organ of Consultation referred to in the preceding Article takes place.

#### ARTICLE 13

The consultations shall be initiated at the request addressed to the Governing Board of the Pan American Union by any of the Signatory States which has ratified the Treaty.

#### ARTICLE 14

In the voting referred to in this Treaty only the representatives of the Signatory States which have ratified the Treaty may take part.

## ARTICLE 15

The Governing Board of the Pan American Union shall act in all matters concerning this Treaty as an organ of liaison among the Signatory States which have ratified this Treaty and between these States and the United Nations.

## ARTICLE 16

The decisions of the Governing Board of the Pan American Union referred to in Articles 13 and 15 above shall be taken by an absolute majority of the Members entitled to vote.

## ARTICLE 17

The Organ of Consultation shall take its decisions by a vote of two-thirds of the Signatory States which have ratified the Treaty.

## ARTICLE 18

In the case of a situation or dispute between American States, the parties directly interested shall be excluded from the voting referred to in two preceding Articles.

## ARTICLE 19

To constitute a quorum in all the meetings referred to in the previous Articles, it shall be necessary that the number of States represented shall be at least equal to the number of votes necessary for the taking of the decision.

## ARTICLE 20

Decisions which require the application of the measures specified in Article 8 shall be binding upon all the Signatory States which have ratified this Treaty, with the sole exception that no State shall be required to use armed force without its consent.

## ARTICLE 21

The measures agreed upon by the Organ of Consultation shall be executed through the procedures and agencies now existing or those which may in the future be established.

## ARTICLE 22

This Treaty shall come into effect between the States which ratify it as soon as the ratifications of two-thirds of the Signatory States have been deposited.

## ARTICLE 23

This Treaty is open for signature by the American States at the city of Rio de Janeiro, and shall be ratified by the Signatory States as soon as possible in accordance with their respective constitutional processes. The ratifications shall be deposited with the Pan American Union, which shall notify the Signatory States of each deposit. Such notification shall be considered as an exchange of ratifications.

## ARTICLE 24

The present Treaty shall be registered with the Secretariat of the United Nations through the Pan American Union, when two-thirds of the Signatory States have deposited their ratifications.

## ARTICLE 25

This Treaty shall remain in force indefinitely, but may be denounced by any High Contracting Party by a notification in writing to the Pan American Union, which shall inform all the other High Contracting Parties of each notification of denunciation received. After the expiration of two years from the date of the receipt by the Pan American Union of a notification of denunciation by any High Contracting Party, the present Treaty shall cease to be in force and with respect to such State, but shall remain in full force and effect with respect to all the other High Contracting Parties.

## ARTICLE 26

The principles and fundamental provisions of this Treaty shall be incorporated in the Organic Pact of the Inter-American System. In witness whereof, the undersigned Plenipotentiaries, having deposited their full powers found to be in due and proper form, sign

this Treaty on behalf of their respective Governments, on the dates appearing opposite their signatures.

Done in the city of Rio de Janeiro, in four texts respectively in the English, French, Portuguese and Spanish languages, on the second of September nineteen hundred forty-seven.

*Reservation of Honduras*

The Delegation of Honduras, in signing the present Treaty and in connection with Article 9, section (b), does so with the reservation that the boundary between Honduras and Nicaragua is definitively demarcated by the Joint Boundary Commission of nineteen hundred and nineteen hundred and one, starting from a point in the Gulf of Fonseca, in the Pacific Ocean, to Portillo de Teotecacinte and, from this point to the Atlantic, by the line that His Majesty the King of Spain's arbitral award established on the twenty third of December of nineteen hundred and six.

## Por la Republica Dominicana:

A. DESPRADEL  
DR. L. F. THOMEN  
TULLIO M. CESTERO  
R. PÉREZ ALFONSECA  
ROBERTO DESPRADEL  
PORFIRIO HERRERA BÁEZ  
E. RODRÍGUEZ DEMORIZI  
JOAQUÍN BALAGUER

SEPTEMBER 2, 1947

## Por Guatemala:

C LEONIDAS ACEVEDO  
I GONZÁLEZ ARÉVALO  
FRANCISCO GUERRA MORALES  
M. GALICH

SEPTEMBER 2, 1947

## Por Costa Rica:

LUIS ANDERSON  
MÁXIMO QUESADA P.

SEPTEMBER 2, 1947

## Por Perú:

E. GARCÍA SAYÁN  
MANUEL G. GALLACHER  
V. A. BELLAÜNDE  
LUIS FERNÁN CISNEROS  
H. C. BELLIDO

SEPTEMBER 2, 1947

## Por El Salvador:

ERNESTO A. NÚÑEZ  
C A ALFARO  
M. A. ESPINO  
G. TRIQUEROS H.

SEPTEMBER 2, 1947

## Por Panamá:

R. J. ALFARO  
J E LEFEVRE

SEPTEMBER 2, 1947

## Por Paraguay:

FEDERICO CHAVEZ  
RAÚL SAPENA PASTOR  
JOSÉ A MORENO GONZÁLES  
R. ROLÓN  
JOSÉ ZACARIAS ARZA

SEPTEMBER 2, 1947

## Por Venezuela:

CARLOS MORALES  
MA PÉREZ GUEVARA  
D GÓMEZ MORA  
E. ARROYO LAMEDA  
EDUARDO PLAZA A  
SANTIAGO PÉREZ P.  
A OTÁÑEZ  
L. P. LLOVERA PAÉZ  
RAÚL CASTRO GOMEZ

SEPTEMBER 2, 1947

## Por Chile:

GERMÁN VERGARA D.  
ENRIQUE CAÑAS F  
EMILIO EDWARDS  
E. E. GUZMÁN F  
A M PINTO  
E. BERNSTEIN

SEPTEMBER 2, 1947

## Por Honduras:

JULIÁN R. CÁCERES  
ANGEL C. HERNÁNDEZ  
M. A. BATRES

SEPTEMBER 2, 1947

## Por Cuba:

GMO BELT  
GAB LANDA

SEPTEMBER 2, 1947

## Por Bolivia:

LUIS GUACHALLA  
JOSÉ GIL S  
DAVID ALVÉSTEGUI  
A VIRREIRA PACCIERI

SEPTEMBER 2, 1947.

## Por Colombia:

DOMINGO ESGUERRA  
GONZALO RESTREPO JARAMILLO  
ANTONIO ROCHA  
EDUARDO ZULETA  
JUAN URIBE CUALLA  
FRANCISCO UMAÑA BERNAL  
JULIO ROBERTO SALAZAR FERRO  
AUGUSTO RAMÍREZ MORENO  
JOSÉ JOAQUÍN CAICEDO CASTILLA

SEPTEMBER 2, 1947

## Por Mexico:

J. TORRES BODET  
A. VILLALOBOS  
R. CORDOVA  
F CAMPOS ORTÍZ  
D MIRANDA  
JOSÉ GOROSTIZA  
JOSE LÓPEZ B

SEPTEMBER 2, 1947.

## Pour L'Haïti:

EDME TH. MANIGAT  
C KERNISAN  
A. LEVELT  
JACQUES LÉGER

SEPTEMBER 2, 1947.

## Por Uruguay:

MATEO MARQUES CASTRO  
DARDO REGULES  
E. E. BUERO  
ALBERTO DOMÍNGUEZ CÁMPORA  
CYRO GIAMBRUNO  
ANTONIO GUSTAVO FUSCO  
JOSÉ A. MORA OTERO  
JUAN F. GUICHÓN  
GABRIEL TERRA

SEPTEMBER 2, 1947

## For the United States of America:

G C MARSHALL  
ARTHUR H. VANDENBERG.  
TOM CONNALLY  
WARREN R. AUSTIN.  
SOL BLOOM  
WILLIAM D. PAWLEY

SEPTEMBER 2, 1947

## Por Argentina:

JUAN ATILIO BRAMUGLIA  
O. IVANISSEVICH  
ENRIQUE COROMINAS  
R A ARES  
P. LA ROSA  
NICOLAS C ACCAME.

SEPTEMBER 2, 1947.

## Pelo Brasil:

RAUL FERNANDES  
P. GOÉS MONTEIRO  
HILDEBRANDO ACCIOLY  
A. PENNA JR.  
JOSÉ EDUARDO DO PRADO KELLY  
EDMUNDO DA LUZ PINTO  
LEVI CARNEIRO.

SEPTEMBER 2, 1947.

## AUTHORIZATION TO FILE A REPORT OF A COMMITTEE DURING THE RECESS

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Committee on Foreign Relations desires authority to file a report during the recess in connection with the Inter-Amer-



ican Treaty of Reciprocal Assistance. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the order is made.

#### UNITED STATES NEWSPAPER PUBLICITY OVERSEAS

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, while I was in Europe, I was struck with the meagerness of American publicity, and the fact that we are falling down in the war of ideas. As a result, I should like to offer two suggestions today for appropriate consideration by those who are deeply interested in getting across to the European peoples information on America.

To the question, "What is the best organ of publicity about America overseas?" the answer is, of course, the daily newspaper. But anyone who has been abroad knows that in the big cities of Europe he cannot possibly buy relatively recent issues of the big cosmopolitan papers of America, and must content himself, where he can get them, with very old issues of several weeks back.

#### AIRPLANE TRANSPORT OF PAPERS

I should like to suggest, therefore, that provision be made so that every American passenger transport plane traveling to foreign parts carry the latest issues of American papers. Thus, copies could be furnished at the very minimum of delay to our Ambassadors, Ministers, Consuls General, and other officials. Then, too, copies could be placed on the reading desks of the main hotels of the big cities. Obviously by carrying the papers by plane we would reap tremendous time-saving over transportation by steamship.

I ask, therefore, that the Civil Aeronautics Board, the Senate Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, the overseas plane companies, and other interested individuals and organizations, get together on this matter, to determine what legislative or administrative plans should be arranged, so that the planes will carry late newspaper issues.

#### A UNITED STATES PAGE IN FOREIGN PAPERS

The second brief suggestion I should like to make is that we try to get American publicity into the major foreign newspapers of London, Amsterdam, Brussels, and other cities. While relatively only a few people listen to the radio in foreign countries, copies of the newspapers are read almost universally. Copies go out to the farmsteads, and are read and reread for weeks. If we are to keep the Voice of America vibrant and continuous, we should make sure in connection with our foreign-aid program that there is at least one page devoted to American news in the papers of each of the countries which receive our aid, as well as in other countries, virtually all of whom have benefited in the past in some way from American contributions.

What sort of publicity about America should get into this special page? I do not want any twisted Government propaganda to be included on that page. I believe, therefore, that our Government should arrange for payment to private news-gathering agencies, that is, those utilizing our great wire services, and our principal American newspapers having correspondents abroad, so that a daily page of newspaper publicity, perhaps like

the boilerplate here at home, could be reproduced in European papers. How much would this cost? Well, it would cost far less than much of wasteful and extravagant activities in which we have indulged abroad.

I make these suggestions, and ask for their earnest consideration by the appropriate authorities.

Mr. President, the idea I am stressing is the important matter, and how to get the idea across is the problem. I have suggested two means which came to my mind as the result of my observations during the 6 weeks I was traveling in Europe the past summer. I recall that in Frankfurt there is an American newspaper with a circulation of a million, and that paper reflects American thought, concepts, and ideas. But wherever I went elsewhere there was a total blank, a total lack, of American news. One might go to a newsstand in southern Italy, as I did, where people were fighting for the latest edition of the New York Herald Tribune, published in Paris, and even that was a week old. It cost me a quarter in American money to get a copy of the paper.

Mr. President, we preach and preach and talk and talk, but we fail to act. I am here suggesting two simple ways which it seems to me it is imperative should be followed, and it could be done at a minimum of expense.

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

Mr. WILEY. I am glad to yield to the Senator from New Jersey.

Mr. SMITH. I am very happy the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin has raised this point, but I remind him that a special committee of the Senate and the House was appointed to study this very matter the past summer, and it is now working on its report. Every point raised by the Senator is being considered by the committee in preparing the report we propose to make as to the Voice of America program.

Mr. WILEY. I am very happy to get that reaction from the distinguished Senator from New Jersey. If the committee has had the experience I have had, it can and will reach the conclusion that the best agency for disseminating information about America is the newspapers. If one goes into some of the embassies or some of the offices of the consuls general and asks for a newspaper, he will be handed one a week or 10 days old, which went over on shipboard.

The newspaper is the vehicle for giving the foreigner information as to our viewpoint, and I, for one, feel that at a very minimum of expense we could get a sheet of information into some of the large city newspapers in the big cities in Europe, which could be edited under American supervision at a minimum of expense, and which would reflect our thinking and our concepts, and disclose some of the information regarding the United States which it is important the people of Europe should have.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator from New Jersey a question, if I may, in the Senator's time,

in line with what the Senator from Wisconsin is now discussing.

Mr. WILEY. I am very glad to yield to the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. LUCAS. May I inquire of the able Senator from New Jersey as to the progress that is being made with respect to obtaining consideration of the Mundt bill? It is now on the calendar, and in my judgment it would accomplish what the Senator from Wisconsin is seeking to have done.

Mr. SMITH. I may say to the distinguished Senator that I am in consultation now with our committee concerning the program for the remainder of the special session. It is my hope to bring up the Mundt bill next week, if the decks can be cleared so that it will not interfere with any other program that is before the Senate. That is my hope and expectation.

Mr. LUCAS. I sincerely hope the Senator will press the suggestion that is being made with respect to the Mundt bill. I certainly do not want to interfere with any of the emergency legislation, but we are now having days, and we shall continue to have days, between now and Christmas when the Senate will not be doing anything else. It seems to me, in view of all the remarks that have been made by those who have visited Europe and have returned, that the Mundt bill is the answer with respect to the total lack of information in foreign countries regarding what America is doing and should do. It certainly dovetails, in my judgment, with the interim aid program.

Without the Mundt bill or some other means of properly disseminating information to other countries that are obtaining help from America, we shall be unable to assist in the way we should. I hope the able Senator will continue to press on the majority side for action on the Mundt bill.

Mr. SMITH. I am glad the distinguished Senator raised the point. I agree with him entirely that the Mundt bill, which contains the legislative authorization for effectuating the Voice of America program, is entirely relevant. It is really a part of the purpose for which the special session was called. I think it could properly be considered without violating the general principle that we do not want to open the door too wide for matters that might interfere with the interim aid legislation. I thank the Senator for his suggestion.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, if I may proceed for a few moments more, there are two other vital and dynamic methods by which America can be sold to Europe instead of constantly being sold short. One is in the control of Americans who go to Europe. They do not have to be afraid to talk up America; they do not have to be afraid to tell the facts. They do not have to hang their heads for the bill of goods here to be sold, but how many undertake to sell them?

Mr. President, one other item. The great magazines of America are having considerable trouble getting into European circulation their great mediums of publicity, with their constructive thinking, their reflection or mirroring of the American way of life. I bring to the

attention of the committee that there is an obligation, and I bring to the attention of the State Department the fact that there is an obligation on that Department. There is a general tendency in Europe, so far as American concepts are concerned, to create a fog. Let us blow away that fog. Let us bring the light by disseminating the truth, the facts.

Through the four means I have outlined, we can lighten the load of those who have been fed on misrepresentation. We can stop the spread of communism by giving the people of Europe the truth that makes free.

#### PROBLEMS WITH RESPECT TO GREECE AND TURKEY

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. If there be no further bills or joint resolutions, there is a resolution coming over from a previous day, Senate Resolution 101, which, without objection, will be passed over.

Morning business is closed.

#### PROCUREMENT OF TEMPORARY OR INTERMITTENT SERVICES OF EXPERTS OR CONSULTANTS

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to consideration of the unfinished business.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will state the unfinished business for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H. R. 4469) to amend the act of July 7, 1947, so as to authorize the Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government to procure the temporary or intermittent services of experts or consultants or organizations thereof.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The motion is not debatable.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate resumed the consideration of the bill.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, when the Congress approved the act of July 7, 1947, authorizing the Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government, there were two rather vital omissions. First, the House has taken recognition of that fact and has unanimously approved a bill which would correct those omissions. The first proviso of House bill 4469 would exempt temporary and intermittent employees of the Commission from civil-service classification laws. It reads as follows:

*Provided*, That the Commission also may procure, without regard to the civil-service laws and classification laws, temporary and intermittent services to the same extent as is authorized for the departments by section 15 of the act of August 2, 1946 (Public Law 600, 79th Cong., 60 Stat. 810), but at rates not to exceed \$50 per diem for individuals.

This is a privilege which all department heads of the Government now have, enabling them to hire experts and consultants on a short-time basis without running through the civil-service mill.

This section also permits the Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government to pay up to \$50 per diem for such expert help and for consultants. This is in excess of the

maximum of \$29.78 allowable under the Classification Act.

The House bill also provides for the addition of a subsection (b) to section (7), which reads as follows:

(b) That nothing contained in sections 109 and 113 of the Criminal Code (U. S. C., title 18, secs. 198 and 203) shall be deemed to apply to any member of, or to any person heretofore or hereafter employed by, the Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government pursuant to Public Law 162 approved July 7, 1947.

I have offered an amendment in the nature of a substitute for subsection (b) of the House bill. The proposed amendment would substitute for subsection (b) as now worded the following wording:

(b) Service of an individual as a member of the Commission or employment of an individual by the Commission as an attorney or expert in any business or professional field, on a part-time or full-time basis, with or without compensation, shall not be considered as service or employment bringing such individual within the provisions of sections 109 or 113 of the Criminal Code (U. S. C., 1940 ed., title 18, secs. 198 and 203), or of section 19 (e) of the Contract Settlement Act of 1944, or of any other Federal law imposing restrictions, requirements, or penalties in relation to the employment of persons, the performance of services, or the payment or receipt of compensation in connection with any claim, proceeding, or matter involving the United States.

It will be seen that the proposed amendment, which has been unanimously approved by the Commission, clarifies and broadens slightly, by reference to other acts, the provisions of subsection (b) now contained in the bill. It narrows the scope of the subsection in that its application is limited to attorneys and experts.

In other words, the House proposal extends to all employees of the Commission. The general proposal which I have offered would exempt only attorneys and experts. This is not an innovation. Congress has exempted counsel several times in recent years from these provisions of the law. In addition, all persons serving without compensation in certain capacities under the Selective Service Act and in the Office of Price Administration under the price control legislation, and all persons serving the National War Labor Board in certain capacities without compensation, or in per diem employment, not in excess of 90 days per year, were exempted from these prohibitory statutes.

The members of the Commission believe that it will be extremely difficult, if not impossible, to get personnel of the necessary high caliber to serve as experts and consultants unless they can be freed from the requirements of the civil-service and classification laws, and can be relieved of the prohibitions against appearing in opposition to the Government, which apply not only to the individuals employed but to the firms of which they are members as well.

It is also felt that much of the work of the Commission can best be done through engaging the services of firms or organizations of various types such as research organizations, and accounting and management consultant firms, rather than by employment of individual

experts, and rather than to undertake to set up a new group of personnel within the Commission itself, particularly if the work happens to be of a very technical nature or promises to be of short duration. We realize that an accounting firm would be very reluctant to do work for the Commission if all its members had to stop work on Government business or stop work for firms that were engaged in doing business with the Government at the time they happened to be doing temporary work for the Commission.

I have several instances in which exemption has been granted to counsel in previous years, and within comparatively recent years. If anyone is interested in having them I will offer them for the RECORD. In the meantime, I offer the amendment.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on the amendment submitted by the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN], which will be considered as having been read.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, the amendment which has been submitted by the Senator from Vermont is a distinct improvement upon the section in the House bill for which it was offered as a substitute, but I feel it will be setting a precedent which may easily rise to better the Congress in the future.

The provisions of law from which an exemption is proposed to be granted are those sections of the United States Criminal Code which prohibit an employee of the Government from having any interest, direct or indirect, in a claim against the Government. As the bill came from the House it provided that not only the members of the Commission but all of their employees of whatever grade or character or expert qualifications should be exempted from the provisions of the Criminal Code.

The amendment now proposed narrows the exemption, as the Senator from Vermont has well said, to attorneys and experts. It should be pointed out, however, that attorneys are precisely the class who are most likely to have claims against the Government.

This Commission will be called upon to make recommendations to the Congress for legislation to reorganize the executive branch of the Government. Obviously it is quite possible that attorneys or experts having a direct personal or indirect partnership or employment interest in the form and character of Government bureaus, would be employed in determining what the powers and form of these Government bureaus should be.

So now we are confronted with the decision whether it is the opinion of the Senate of the United States that this Commission should have the delegated power to grant an exemption from the criminal law to any person whom it may employ as an attorney or as an expert. It seems to me that in the interest of the welfare of the people of the United States and in the interest of good order in the reorganization of the Government some sort of limitation should be placed upon that. My own feeling was that perhaps there might be a limitation as to the number of persons thus exempted, or perhaps, instead of having the Commission itself, by the mere operation of its

personnel policies in connection with the hiring of an attorney or an expert, grant the exemption, the authority should be vested in another and a different body.

We have before us a proposed act of Congress which will require the signature of the President of the United States. I wish to ask the Senator from Vermont whether he would be willing to accept the following amendment, which would be in addition to the amendment offered by him:

*Provided, however,* That with regard to employees no exemption from any provisions of law set forth in this subsection shall be effective until the Civil Service Commission shall certify that the employment of such person is desirable in the public interest.

The effect of this amendment which I propose would, of course, be to vest in the Civil Service Commission the power to review the cases of the attorneys and experts proposed to be hired and to be granted such an exemption.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I was discussing this matter a very short time ago with the Senator from Wyoming, and I was inclined to accept the amendment which he has offered until it was pointed out by the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON] that the amendment would, in effect, amount to giving the Civil Service Commission the right to say who should investigate the status and employment of the 2,000,000 persons who are under the civil-service laws. If this amendment would give the Civil Service Commission the right to say whom the Commission on Reorganization of the Executive Branch might employ to go over the affairs of the Civil Service Commission, then I would feel that I could not accept the amendment.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Let me say that I do not think it would have that effect, Mr. President.

Mr. AIKEN. I wish to make sure that it would not have that effect.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The effect would be that the exemption would be granted for lawyers and experts only by the review of another body than the Commission itself.

Mr. AIKEN. I am as anxious as is the Senator from Wyoming or anyone else to see that all our laws have the proper safeguards. I should like to have the advice of the Senator from Michigan for the record on this matter.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President—  
The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Wyoming yield to the Senator from Michigan?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I am very glad to yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, on almost all occasions I have objected to a modification of the law as contained in sections 109 and 113; in other words, I have objected to the granting of exemptions. However, in this particular case, I find myself compelled to approve the amendment proposed, for the reason that this Commission is set up to study and review all agencies of the executive branch of the Government in order that it may make recommendations to Congress.

The present proposal is to amend this provision further, by providing that one of the executive agencies, the Civil Serv-

ice Commission, shall have the power to say to this Commission which has been created by Congress, "You cannot hire this lawyer or that lawyer or this accountant or that expert, but you can hire only a lawyer whom we shall approve." It seems to me that that would thereby defeat the very thing we are trying to do, namely, to get an independent check and study by this Commission of the executive branch of Government.

Therefore, with all the power I have, I shall object to any modification making it possible for the Civil Service Commission to be able to say to the Commission, "You cannot hire this lawyer or that lawyer." I say that because I feel that this Commission should be independent and should have the right, without fear or favor, to study and survey in detail every agency of the executive branch of our Government, and that the Commission itself, which is responsible to the Congress and to the country, should be the sole judge of whom it employs and the consideration or amount of compensation, under the supervision of Congress, that it will pay to its employees.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I feel that the argument the distinguished Senator from Michigan has just made could be just as effectively made against the amendment itself, because the Senator from Vermont desires to limit the power of this Commission with respect to granting exemptions from the criminal code. I submit that it is not at all necessary that this Commission employ attorneys or experts who have claims against the Government in order that it may suggest to Congress how the Government should be reorganized. I have not the faintest doubt that it will be easily possible for the Commission to find all the attorneys it needs and all the experts it needs to carry on its work, without going into the offices of those who are prosecuting claims against the Government of the United States.

The amendment I suggest would not have the effect, at all—certainly I do not desire it to have that effect—of delegating to the Civil Service Commission the power to pass upon all the employees. But every employee and every applicant for appointment as an attorney or as an expert, who has a claim against the Government, knows full well whether he has such a claim. I am saying by my amendment only that before he may be granted an exemption from the criminal law which applies to every other employee of the United States Government, his case shall be certified to by the Civil Service Commission. The amendment is presented just in the desire to erect a certain safeguard against the employment of persons who might have a personal interest in promoting a certain type of reorganization.

For the life of me I cannot understand why anyone would resist a mild amendment of this kind.

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

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Certainly.

Mr. FERGUSON. Of course, we have to look at the purpose of sections 109 and 113. The purpose of these two sections is to prevent persons who come into the employ of the Government, ascertaining

of certain facts, or obtain certain information, let contracts, or do certain work, leave the Government service, and take employment with the very persons with whom they contracted or whose work under the Government they supervised.

It is not contemplated that a man who has had a claim against the Government shall be covered. The purpose is that he shall not for a period of 2 years thereafter take a claim against the Government.

As I said, the reason why I favor the particular amendment now pending is that the persons affected are not to be contracting officers. They are not to supervise contracts. They are merely to make surveys of the Government organization and make recommendations through the Commission. Therefore they are not the same as the persons about whom we have been speaking in the past, covered under sections 109 and 113.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I think the Senator is mistaken. Let me read section 109; it is now section 198 of title 18 of the United States Code Annotated:

Whoever, being an officer of the United States, or a person holding any place of trust or profit, or discharging any official function under, or in connection with any executive department of the Government of the United States, or under the Senate or House of Representatives of the United States, shall act as an agent or attorney for prosecuting any claim against the United States, or in any manner, or by any means, otherwise than in discharge of his proper official duties, shall aid or assist in the prosecution or support of any such claim, or receive any gratuity, or any share of or interest in any claim from any claimant against the United States, with intent to aid or assist, or in consideration of having aided or assisted, in the prosecution of such claim, shall be fined not more than \$5,000, or imprisoned not more than 1 year, or both.

Mr. President, that has nothing in the world to do with practicing before a Government bureau after the term of employment has expired.

Mr. FERGUSON. It is true Section 109 covers one while he is in the employ of the Government. Section 113 covers the situation for a period after a man has been in the employ of the Government.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. That may be true, but the point I am making is that we should not delegate to the Commission the right to exempt by itself these attorneys and experts from a provision of law which rests upon every other employee of the Senate and House of Representatives, and every employee of the executive branch of the Government.

Mr. FERGUSON. I reply by saying that the bill merely states:

Service of an individual as a member of the Commission or employment of an individual by the Commission as an attorney or expert in any business or professional field, on a part-time or full-time basis, with or without compensation, shall not be considered as service or employment bringing such individual within the provisions of sections 109 or 113 of the Criminal Code (U. S. C., 1940 ed., title 18, secs. 198 and 203), or of section 19 (e) of the Contract Settlement Act of 1944, or of any other Federal law imposing

restrictions, requirements, or penalties in relation to the employment of persons, the performance of services, or the payment or receipt of compensation in connection with any claim, proceeding, or matter involving the United States.

That is, the man who is employed automatically is released from the application of the section.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. In other words, the attorney employed may represent a claimant against the Government, and by reason of the provision suggested he will be exempted from liability to a \$5,000 fine.

Mr. FERGUSON. That would be correct.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I submit that is a thing we should not do, and I suggest to the Senator that the amendment I have proposed should be accepted.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Wyoming yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield to the Senator from Arkansas.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I call attention to the fact, in connection with the amendment offered by the Senator from Wyoming, that if enacted it will create in one single member of the Commission as now constituted a dual power, both in his service as a member of the Commission on Reorganization and also as a member of the Civil Service Commission, and therefore there would be set up in this one member of the Reorganization Commission a power superseding the Commission itself.

I have no objection to the amendment and the purpose of the amendment to provide supervision, but I do submit, Mr. President, that if there is to be any other agency to supervise, or any power to make final decision, it should not be the Civil Service Commission, but there should be substituted in the Senator's amendment for the Civil Service Commission the President of the United States, in my opinion.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I did not think of bringing in the President because, of course, the President has so many duties that he would have to rely upon some other group. There might be some basis of criticism of such a suggestion in that the Commission has been appointed as an independent body to survey the whole executive branch of the Government.

I was aware of the fact that Mr. Fleming, a member of the Civil Service Commission, is also a member of the Commission covered by the bill, but I have no thought that the members of the Commission would knowingly employ any person who was desiring to use his position to facilitate the prosecution of a claim against the United States. Therefore I felt that no great harm would be done by delegating the supervisory authority, when the exemption is desired, to the Civil Service Commission.

Mr. McCLELLAN. What the amendment as now proposed does is merely to take away from the Reorganization Commission, as created, the authority that was delegated to it to do an independent job of its own. Now it is proposed that we transfer part of that authority to the Civil Service Commission, to say that, notwithstanding the power the Congress has delegated to the Reor-

ganization Commission to do an independent job, the members of the Commission still cannot employ this individual or that individual, except as they go back to the Civil Service Commission and get consent from an agency of the Government which is subject to investigation and reorganization by the Commission created for that purpose as to whom the Commission shall employ to make the study and to make the investigation.

Mr. President, I am perfectly willing to see any safeguard written into the bill. I do not think anyone would assume any member of this Commission, created for reorganization of the Government, or the Commission as a whole, would desire to incur the risk of employing someone who might take advantage of the Commission or of the Government. But, charged with the duty that the Commission has, I simply cannot see that it should have to go to another agency of the Government which will come within the investigation, just as much so as any other agency, and get its consent as to whom the Commission shall employ to investigate it and to make the surveys, or to determine what shall be done.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I think the Senator is in error. The amendment would not have the effect of delegating to the Civil Service Commission the power to say whom the Commission should employ. It would merely have the effect of delegating to the Civil Service Commission the power to pass upon those to whom the exemption from the Criminal Code should be granted. I think it would have the effect of inducing the Commission, on the reorganization of the Government, by whatever name it is called, to find employees, attorneys, and experts who do not have any interest in claims against the Government.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I call attention to the amendment as worded. I submit the able Senator from Wyoming is wrong in his interpretation that the Civil Service Commission would not have final control. I quote:

*Provided, however,* That with regard to employees, no exemption shall be effective—

Mr. O'MAHONEY. "No exemption from any of the provisions."

Mr. McCLELLAN. "From any of the provisions"—

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I had better read my own writing—

from any provision of law set forth in this subsection, shall be effective—

That is the exemption— shall be effective until the Civil Service Commission—

Mr. McCLELLAN. Very well; "until the Civil Service Commission shall certify that the employment of such person is desirable."

The amendment as now proposed not only vests in the Civil Service Commission the right to deny employment to the individual, but also vests the right to deny to the Commission the right to employ anyone.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, this particular Commission was created by the appointment of eight members by

the Congress of the United States. There are now on the Commission 12 persons, 6 of them from each party. There are upon the Commission two Senators and two Representatives. If a safeguard is desired, it is found in the bipartisan board, whose duty it is not to employ people who should not be employed. To say that the bipartisan Commission, containing two Members of the Senate and two Members of the House, must go to the Civil Service Commission, which controls in a way all employees of every other executive branch of the Government, and that it can not employ a lawyer and give him the exemption provided in the law unless consent is first obtained, is saying to the executive branch, "You can dictate every employee of the Commission." I submit that the safeguard is in the fact that it is a bipartisan commission. It is in the fact that there are on the Commission two Senators, two Representatives, and four persons named by the President of the United States.

To say that we are now going to make this a partisan matter, that we are going to give it solely into the hands of the executive branch, would be the same as wiping out the Commission and saying that the President of the United States should proceed under the power that we gave him for reorganization. That is not the purpose for which the act was created. We created the act that Congress might have an independent research of government, a review of the entire executive branch, in order that Congress could reorganize the Government of the United States. Therefore the amendment to the amendment should not be adopted.

Mr. HATCH obtained the floor.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me just a moment?

Mr. HATCH. I yield to the Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I desire to say that from the remarks of the Senator from Michigan when he first arose, when he said that it has always been his belief that exemptions from the criminal statutes should not be granted, or should be granted only sparingly, and from the remarks of the Senator from Arkansas, who has just taken his seat, that he has no objection to the adoption of a safeguard, but objects only to the fact that a member of the Civil Service Commission is also a member of the particular commission which is the subject of the pending legislation, it seems to me that it is only a matter of agreeing upon the words in which the safeguards shall be written.

The amendment which I have proposed or suggested here is one I wrote hastily since coming on the floor this morning. I make no pretense, of course, that it is perfect, but it does point out the primary issue, namely, are we going to grant blanket exemptions, or are we going to provide a safeguard? I hope the Senator from Vermont will entertain at least the possibility of a change of this language, so as to secure the objective which I am sure we all agree to. I understood the Senator from Vermont to say to me before the matter

came up that he likewise had no objection to a proper safeguard. Would the Senator be good enough to indicate whether he would be willing to cooperate to that effect?

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President—

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

Mr. HATCH. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. I wish to repeat what I said before, that I should like to see all laws enacted by Congress properly safeguarded. However, in view of the discussion by the Senator from Arkansas and the Senator from Michigan, and after considering the situation, it appears to me that the proposal of the Senator from Wyoming to have exempt employees certified by the Civil Service Commission would in itself constitute a precedent. I cannot find that that has ever been done, with all the people who have been exempted.

Mr. O'MAHOONEY. The Civil Service Commission has exempted every time it has passed upon the qualifications of an employee.

Mr. AIKEN. I do not think the Civil Service Commission passed upon the OPA employees who were exempt, or the War Labor Board employees who were exempt, or the Selective Service employees who were exempt. It is true that some of them did not draw any pay. Most of them, I think, did not draw any pay, but they did draw expenses.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, if I could regain the floor—

Mr. AIKEN. It seems to me that the wording suggested by the Senator from Wyoming in his amendment is unfortunate.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from New Mexico has the floor, and he declines to yield further at the moment.

Mr. HATCH. I decline to yield just now. I wish to suggest, in the first place, that this is a very serious amendment. It establishes a precedent. The cases in which there were exemptions, to which the Senator from Vermont has referred, were in most instances exemptions granted on account of wartime conditions, such as those granted under the Selective Service Act, of people serving without compensation, in many instances. But, Mr. President, as a former member of the Committee on the Judiciary which considered the amendments, I was always concerned that we were perhaps going too far in granting exemptions even for wartime services. I know the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON] and I, in connection with the War Investigating Committee, have observed certain things that still further cause me to feel that perhaps we went too far in granting exemptions.

Referring to the particular amendment submitted, I cannot see why any attorney employed on a full-time basis, which is what the amendment says, should be, even from the very moment of his employment, in a favored class of attorneys who may accept claims against or on behalf of the United States Government, a thing that other attorneys may not do. I think the amendment ought to be considered most carefully.

I think the suggestion of the Senator from Wyoming that a safeguard be inserted could well be given serious thought.

The suggestion that I rose to make was that I had contemplated addressing the Senate for about 10 minutes or so on another matter. I think now I shall proceed with that discussion, in the hope that Senators may get together and work out some language that will constitute a proper safeguard.

#### THE PRESENT PLIGHT OF THE NAVAJO INDIANS

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, because of the fact that for several weeks I have been receiving communications from all over the United States, and because many Members of Congress have also talked with me concerning the plight and the problem of the Navajo Indians in my State, the State of Arizona, and the State of Utah, I want to give the Congress a little factual information concerning these Indians.

First, I would remind the Congress and the people of the country as a whole that the problem of the Navajos and the problem of the Indian people everywhere is not a responsibility of the local State in which they happen to be located. I say that, Mr. President, because in some of these communications the people of New Mexico have been taken to task as though it were their responsibility and not the responsibility of people residing outside the State. The obligation and responsibility for just, fair, and proper treatment of all Indians rests with the Nation as a whole. It is a national obligation and responsibility. It is not local to any State where Indians may be located, into which they may have been transported against their will, as they were in many instances, by the Federal Government.

I might add, Mr. President, that during the emergency which now exists the people of my State have been most generous in their contributions to the Navajos. Several towns have organized committees and have gathered food, clothing, and other necessary supplies which have been and are even now being sent to the reservation. Not only in New Mexico have such supplies been collected, but persons in other States have also sent generous contributions. I wish to thank all the people who have so generously contributed.

But, Mr. President, while charitable contributions may help to relieve the immediate situation, charity from any source is not the answer to the Navajo problem, and it is unfair and unjust to the Navajo Indians to make them the recipients of charity or public bounty.

The facts which I have assembled and now give to the Senate were prepared in large part by the clerk of the Subcommittee on Indian Affairs, Mr. Grorud.

The Navajo Reservation was established by the treaty of June 1, 1868. Following that treaty, various Executive orders enlarged the area, and the present area is approximately 15,445,000 acres. Of this area 10,805,840 acres are in Arizona, 8,437,150 acres are in New Mexico, 1,194,953 acres are in Utah. In addition to the above, areas lying east of the reservation boundaries in New

Mexico have been allotted to the individual Indians, and some 700,000 acres of public domain are being used for grazing, making a gross total area of approximately 16,750,000 available for the Navajo Indians. Estimated Navajo population is between 50,000 and 60,000.

The Navajos have a tribal fund of approximately \$1,100,000 now on deposit in the Treasury, drawing 4 percent interest per annum. This fund has been accumulated out of royalties received from oil, gas, and helium operations. This tribal fund cannot be used without congressional action. In addition to the tribal fund, the Navajos have a fund of approximately \$400,000, known as the sawmill fund. This fund is not on deposit in the Treasury and no interest is being paid on it by the Treasury. This fund may be used by the Navajos without congressional action. Recently the Navajos withdrew \$150,000 from the sawmill fund. Out of this withdrawal of \$150,000, \$143,000 was earmarked for relief purposes and \$7,000 for legal expenses.

The War Assets Administration has recently furnished to the Navajos 40,000 pounds of rice; several hundred dozen cases of canned foods consisting of fruits, tomatoes, and other vegetables; 17½ tons of foodstuffs consisting of flour, sugar, coffee, spices, and so forth. The War Assets Administration is keeping the officials of the Bureau of Indian Affairs informed as to what food and supplies may become surplus and may be available for Navajo use. It is understood that the Navajos have priority in the acquisition of such surplus, which the War Assets Administration are disposing of from time to time.

Two carloads of fresh citrus fruits were recently allocated from the Friendship Train and given to the Navajos.

Twenty tons of clothing have been shipped to Gallup, N. Mex., for use of the Navajos. These shipments of clothing were shipped to the Navajo Assets, Inc., a corporation organized under, and by virtue of, the laws of the State of New Mexico, which corporation is a nonprofit organization, organized, as I understand it, for the purpose of aiding the Navajos, having its principal place of business at Gallup, N. Mex. The distribution of the clothing and food which is being sent and made available to the Navajos is made by the officials of the Bureau of Indian Affairs, by transporting these goods by automobiles and trucks to the various school houses located in the different areas within the boundaries of the reservation. The teachers and other employees at these schools make distribution to the Navajo families and individuals in the respective localities where these schools are located. These distribution points will reach every section of the Navajo country.

I am also advised that various individuals, church organizations and other welfare organizations and associations are contributing food and clothing to the Navajos, which goods and materials are being distributed among the Navajos by missionaries, individuals, the Navajo

Assets corporation, a group of individuals located at Albuquerque, N. Mex., and the officials of the Indian Bureau.

By the act of July 1, 1946, Congress appropriated for the Navajos for educational purposes at Shiprock for dormitories and utilities \$318,600; Toadlena school expansion, \$500,000, and by the act of July 25, 1947, Congress appropriated for the Navajos for educational purposes at Mexican Springs or Coyote Canyon day school conversion, \$150,000; Toadlena school development \$200,000. In previous recent years Congress has appropriated millions of dollars for the construction of school buildings, hospitals and sanitariums, and the furnishing of equipment and facilities for the use of Navajo health and education.

There are many well-equipped schools and hospital structures scattered throughout the entire Navajo country. However, roads, transportation, and other factors not necessary to discuss today have prevented the Navajos from receiving full benefits of educational, hospital, and other facilities. The plight of the Navajo is serious and requires not only emergency treatment, which is necessary now, but also it requires definite long-range programs with economic, educational and other essential features included.

General programs along the lines indicated are being worked out in the Indian Office, and various associations and committees throughout the country are seeking to find the best and final solution to the Navajo problem. Only yesterday the newspapers carried the story of Secretary Krug's report to the President and the President's favorable reaction to proper and adequate aid to the Navajos. Appropriation bills are now pending in the Congress looking toward other assistance.

In conclusion, I may say that it is my hope that the interest which has been aroused the past few weeks will not subside when the present crisis is passed. We are under a heavy responsibility and duty to the Navajos and other Indian people. If present interest is maintained it will go a long way toward helping to find the right, correct, and just solution which must be found if this Government is to carry out its obligation and responsibility to these unfortunate people.

#### PROCUREMENT OF TEMPORARY OR INTERMITTENT SERVICES OF EXPERTS OR CONSULTANTS

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 4469) to amend the act of July 7, 1947, so as to authorize the Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government to procure the temporary or intermittent services of experts or consultants or organizations thereof.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, before the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. HATCH] took the floor, the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON], and I consulted with respect to a possible alteration of the amendment which I suggested. As a result of that conference, I desire for the RECORD to offer the fol-

lowing substitute amendment to the amendment offered by the Senator from Vermont:

*Provided, however,* That with regard to employees no exemption from any provision of the laws cited in this subsection shall be effective until the respective Committees on Expenditures in the Executive Departments of the Senate and the House of Representatives shall certify that the employment of such person is desirable in the public interest.

The change is merely to drop out the Civil Service Commission and supply in place of that Commission the Committees on Expenditures in the Executive Departments of the Senate and House.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair did not understand the statement of the Senator from Wyoming. Is he offering a substitute for the entire amendment?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. No; merely an addition. The language which I have read is offered to be added to the amendment offered by the Senator from Vermont.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] to the amendment of the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN].

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I see no objection to the amendment, which places the authority in Congress.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, in view of the fact that if the House refuses to accept the amendment which I offered, as amended, the matter will have to go to conference anyway, I am willing to accept the amendment to my amendment which has been offered by the Senator from Wyoming.

If there is no further objection or criticism of the bill, I wonder if we might have it passed so that we may find out what the House will do about it.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, as the author of the bill which at the last session established the Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government, I have some background on the question which I think should go into the record while we are having this discussion.

It will be remembered that the bill was reported unanimously from the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments. The subcommittee which considered it consisted of the able Senator from Maryland [Mr. O'CONNOR], whom I see in the Chamber, the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. THYE], and the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER]. The subcommittee and the full committee reported it unanimously. It was reported unanimously from the House committee. It passed the House unanimously, and it passed the Senate unanimously. It was signed by the President.

The Commission consists of six Republicans and six Democrats. The membership embraces men of the caliber of former President Hoover, Secretary of National Defense Forrestal, former Ambassador Joseph P. Kennedy, former Under Secretary of State Dean Acheson, President Roosevelt's former private sec-

retary, James Rowe, Mr. Mead, and Commissioner Flemming of the Civil Service Commission, and Professor Pollock of the University of Michigan. That is the type of men represented by the membership of the Commission.

Let us be realistic about these matters. These are not men who are going to try to employ persons who will endeavor to put anything over on the Government. The Commission is bipartisan, and it is being conducted on the highest possible level. The Commission is not to report until January 1949, which takes the whole question out of the election, so there cannot possibly be any politics connected with it. I am in touch with the operations of the Commission. I am greatly encouraged by the wonderful study that has already been made, and the way in which all these fine Americans are working together.

I agree with the Senator from Wyoming that there should always be safeguards against any contingency; but, Mr. President, we have six Republicans and six Democrats on the Commission. They are men of the highest reputation and ability, and there is no safeguard in the world that is better than that. There is not any bureau or commission in Washington composed of abler men than are these men. I think the notion that something wrong is going to happen is perfectly fantastic, and the idea that these men are not capable of safeguarding the Commission against anything improper is equally unrealistic.

In my view, the proposed amendment does not set a precedent. As the Senator himself points out, during the war we exempted all sorts of agencies. I think it is a poor principle to put the Civil Service Commission in a position so that it can control the investigations and studies of this body which is supposed to consider the whole Government. One of its prime functions is to look into the matter of Government personnel, to see whether modern methods of personnel selection or promotion can be applied to the personnel of the Government.

I think the original amendment of the Senator from Wyoming is unnecessary. I think it might very well hamper the operations of the Commission. I appreciate the fact that he has modified it, and I think the modification is a very great improvement. I do not think the amendment is necessary, however. I believe the Commission can go ahead and function with the modification which the Senator has suggested. I assure the Senate that this Commission is a very high class body. It has gotten off to a wonderful start. The notion that anything improper is going to take place is completely beyond the realm of possibility.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I want the record to be perfectly clear that I have not even implied any criticism of the character or ability of the gentlemen who constitute this Commission. I shall be quite ready to endorse everything the Senator from Massachusetts has said about the members of the Commission in that regard. I point out to him merely that the difference be-

tween his point of view and mine as expressed here today is the difference between government by men and government by law. If we now set a precedent whereby one group of excellent men of high character shall be able to grant exemptions from the provisions of the criminal laws, it may at some time in the future bring forth a similar exemption, just as the exemption we granted to the Selective Service and to other bodies at the height of the war is cited now as a precedent for this exemption for what we might call a peacetime department.

I am very happy that the Senator from Vermont has indicated his willingness to accept my amendment.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair understands that the Senator from Vermont accepts the amendment of the Senator from Wyoming to his amendment.

Mr. AIKEN. The Chair understands correctly.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment as modified, offered by the Senator from Vermont.

The amendment as modified was agreed to.

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

The bill (H. R. 4469) was read the third time and passed.

#### THE REMEDY FOR INFLATION

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia. Mr. President, the inflation situation confronting this Nation calls for self-control and a willingness on the part of every producer to contribute to the national stock pile of goods and services the equivalent of what he desires to withdraw from it; and that is a problem which no law can solve.

Congress is wrestling with proposals to curb this inflation, which already is hurting many people and which, if it continues upward for another 6 months as it has for the last 6, is bound to end in disaster for us all.

In my opinion, there are no laws which Congress can pass which can adequately protect us from the consequences of selfishness, greed, and group rivalry. No small group can sit behind closed doors in Washington and play providence for 140,000,000 people. No group in Washington is wise enough to so balance an intricate economy in a democracy as to make it function successfully.

In our present emergency a partial price control would tend to accentuate the prices free from control and a complete price control would not function without rationing. But rationing and price control in peacetime would not have the public support it had during wartime and therefore would not function successfully.

The more I hear the testimony of witnesses before the Banking and Currency Committee and read the testimony of witnesses before other committees on what the Congress should do to cure our ills, the more I am convinced that the

real answer lies with the American people.

Consider the price of steel, for example. It was not necessary to advance that price \$5 a ton to offset an increase in the price of coal from captive mines of \$1.50 a ton or less. The steel workers are demanding a third round of wage increases, although the average of industrial wages has risen 110 percent since 1939, while the cost of living has risen in the same period 66 percent.

Now is the time for the leaders of the steel industry to show wisdom as well as patriotism by reducing the price of steel which is such a major factor in so many other industries.

Now is the time for every manufacturer to carefully examine his net income after taxes to determine which will be best for him in the long run—reasonable profits in a stable economy or excessive profits in a boom which is bound to end and which possibly may end before the fall of 1948.

Now is the time for labor leaders to consider the effect upon future employment of wage increases which add to the cost of production and for farmers to consider the public attitude toward a price-support program in the years to come if they wring the last dollar from a world-wide shortage of wheat.

The more highly organized society becomes, the less we can interpret personal freedom in terms of the primitive man. In such a society personal freedom of the natural man must yield to certain controls. But free will is the law of God and its counterpart is accountability. We have achieved a record production in a system of free enterprise and there is no other system comparable to it, but the absence of state control implies the necessity for self-control, and there is no substitute for it.

#### TREATMENT OF THE INDIANS, AND AMERICAN RESPONSIBILITIES AT HOME

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, last evening I received a telegram which reads as follows:

Congratulations to you and your five colleagues for negative Europe relief vote. More charitable from a practical standpoint to first feed starving American Indians.

That telegram is from the Benson County Board of Commissioners.

I might add, Mr. President, that this board of county commissioners is an experienced board. It is a board of very representative and patriotic American citizens. It is my judgment that the board truly represents the feelings of the people of North Dakota who are familiar with the Indian problems, because Fort Totten is located in Benson County. There is another Indian reservation close by with which these county commissioners also are undoubtedly familiar.

A few moments ago we heard upon the floor the fact that no State is responsible for the care of the Indians within its borders. The senior Senator from New Mexico had a good deal to say about the Navajos. The Navajo question was gone into by me very carefully approximately a week ago.

I have in my hand a copy of the Albuquerque Tribune for the 29th day of November 1947, which says:

Navajos will use violence to get food, bishop asserts.

It refers to Bishop Stoney of the Episcopal district of New Mexico and southwest Texas.

While we are sending \$597,000,000 to Austria, Italy, and France, right here in the United States our own people are starving to death.

On the front page of the paper to which I have referred I find this statement:

#### CITY JOINS IN TRUCK CARAVAN TO AID NAVAJOS

A truck caravan to get food and clothing to the destitute Navajo Indians by mid-December was organized here this morning, and by noon eight other communities had pledged their support to the movement.

In other words, as the distinguished senior Senator from New Mexico said, the care of these Indians may not be the obligation of Arizona or of New Mexico, but by almighty heaven it is the obligation of the United States of America, the obligation of our Government. Nevertheless, we simply have not done anything about it, Mr. President. Year after year those Indians have become poorer and poorer. It will be recalled that when I last discussed this matter, a week ago, I referred to the number of medals Indian boys received during the last war. Two of them received the highest honors any soldier can receive at the hands of our Government.

The good bishop says this:

The Navajo Indian will resort to violence—

Mind you, Mr. President, this article was published only 4 days ago in the Albuquerque Tribune—

The Navajo Indian will resort to violence to solve his present starving state on "a small island of ignorance, disease and poverty maintained by the Government through 80 years of failure and neglect," an Albuquerque churchman declared in an interview here today.

Bishop James M. Stoney, of the Episcopal missionary district of New Mexico and southwest Texas, said his personal inspections of the Navajo Reservation in western New Mexico and eastern Arizona had convinced him that force is the only alternative remaining for the Navajo.

"There are two possible ways of expression for any group: Votes or violence. The Navajo has no vote, and he is starving. What is there to look for?" Bishop Stoney said. He did not elaborate on the type of violence he expected.

#### THEIR WORST WINTER

He reported that the Navajos had begun pawning of their family jewelry in September and that they are experiencing the worst winter in their long association with the white man, an individual, who the Navajo is convinced has succeeded only in gypping the Indian.

"The Government has fallen down absolutely in its promises of health and education," Bishop Stoney asserted. "Administrators have expected more of the Navajos than we expect of ourselves.

"Teachers who cannot speak Navajo attempt to educate Navajos who cannot speak English—and the Navajo language was probably the only 'code' which could not be

'broken' during the recent war. School enrollments are padded and only one hospital is provided where 10 are needed."

The potential of starvation and disease has existed for a long time, but has been pointed up this winter because of the end of Government wartime allotments, the return of former Indian soldiers "who know the score," and the failure of Indian handicraft to compete in the white man's market, the church leader explained.

#### ONLY 200 TB BEDS

He said unofficial figures showed a 35 percent incidence of tuberculosis, and a 20 percent occurrence of syphilis among the Navajos.

"Government schools and hospitals are marvels of equipment but they manage to provide only 200 beds for TB patients among 55,000 Navajos," he said. "Only 25 percent of the children can enter the schools, and most of them get only as far as the fourth grade."

He continued: "We tell them it is not patriotic to use violence, but then we keep them from voting. Politicians will do nothing for the Navajos—or other Indians—because it will gain the politicians no votes. But something must be done to avert the violence which has seethed under cover since WP! days."

Mr. President, this statement was written by Mr. Doyle Kline. The caravan which I described a moment ago was organized in Santa Fe, to get food to these people.

On the front page of this newspaper is another article bearing the heading "Warehouse is empty; Navajos still hungry." This article comes from Gallup, N. Mex., bearing date of the 29th of November:

**WAREHOUSE IS EMPTY; NAVAJOS STILL HUNGRY**  
GALLUP, November 29.—The warehouse from which winter relief food and clothing has been distributed the last few weeks to the Navajos will be empty this week end.

Bert Pousma, field agent for Navajo Assistance, Inc., which is serving as the clearinghouse for contributions coming from all over the country, said he would take "a small truckload of stuff" to the Sheep Springs and Tohatchi areas north of here this morning, completely emptying the warehouse.

Truckloads of goods from Denver long since have been distributed, he said, and there were continued requests for help. A request for clothing for 50 families near Keams Canyon, Ariz., cannot be filled until more contributions are received at the warehouse. Present supplies are cartons sent from Pomona, Calif., things collected in the Gallup schools last week, individual shipments of cartons and donations received through the Gallup Woman's Club.

The goods received have been distributed over a wide area, Pousma said, from Farmington and Shiprock on the north, Torreon 150 miles to the northeast, and Oljato, Utah, in the Monument Valley country, most isolated and needy part of the reservation.

Pousma said there were promises of truckloads of supplies from Albuquerque and a truck caravan from California which should reach here before Christmas. The caravan is being organized by the AMVETS. Fifteen to twenty bales of clothing to be shipped by the American Friends Service Committee are not scheduled to reach here for a few weeks.

All missions, schools, traders and other agencies in the Navajo country are helping in the distributions of the goods, Pousma said. They survey their local needs and make them known to Navajo Assistance, Inc., and are given the goods from the warehouse as they are available, Pousma said.

So, Mr. President, again I refer to the telegram signed by the five fine men who compose the Board of Commissioners of Benson County, N. Dak.

The day after I spoke upon this floor on this subject I saw an announcement coming from the White House to the effect that something was going to be done for these Navajo Indians. But I submit that that is not anywhere near sufficient to take care of the hunger and the want and the starvation of American Indians. As I said when I spoke a week ago, I have visited in the State of California, and there among the Torreon-Martinez Tribe I found exactly the situation that we find among the Navajos. The trouble has been that these Indians have not been taken care of properly. I remember that when the Civil Service Committee met a year ago and called in representatives of the Office of Indian Affairs they did not say anything was wrong. From the Secretary of the Interior, the Under Secretary of the Interior, and the Indian Commissioner we received the impression that everything was all right.

Let me now refer to the further fact that the Indian Commissioner has been ill now for month after month after month after month after month. At the time when the present Indian Commissioner was appointed he frankly admitted that his experience was confined to New Mexico, and that he had to take a trip to other States and to Alaska, where we have Indian tribes, to become familiar with conditions there. Nevertheless, his appointment was finally confirmed, over the objection of various members of the committee. Now we find that we have an Acting Indian Commissioner.

I maintain that it is passing strange and is a sad commentary upon the United States Government that at the time when it is setting out to rule the world and has sent \$58,000,000,000 to country after country after country, at the same time, it has not even taken care of the Indians in the United States. Not only that, Mr. President, but the United States has not even taken care of Alaska or Hawaii or Puerto Rico, as I shall point out later in my remarks. The situation is damnably rotten, if I may use that expression upon this floor.

Mr. President, I hold in my hand a copy of the Los Angeles Examiner for December 1. In this Hearst newspaper we find an editorial entitled "A Disgrace to America," with a cartoon above it showing that Uncle Sam is sending billions of dollars to Europe, while lined up before him are the starving American Indians—Indians who actually are starving while billions of dollars are being handed out to foreign countries.

I wish to make it clear that if the statement from the White House refers only to Navajo Indians, the amount of money for support and relief will not be sufficient, because, as I said before, there are other tribes here in the United States that are in want and misery. For that reason, unless something is done promptly and announced by the Indian Bureau, I propose to introduce a bill by next Monday calling for an appropriation of not

less than \$100,000,000, to be expended by some existing relief board. I intend to confer on that matter with my distinguished colleague from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], who at the last session introduced one of the outstanding Indian bills dealing with claims of Indians; which, however, was not passed.

It was shown by the testimony of the Indian Commissioner before the Civil Service Committee that certain Indians in the State of Oregon were almost as intelligent and as well educated as the average white man residing upon the Indian reservation, and that upon an Indian reservation in the State of Oregon there were a very great many white men. Nevertheless, when a few Indians get together, there are five Federal employees present to see that the law is not violated. The testimony has shown further that the children of Indians and whites attend the same schools. When one reads the testimony of the Klamath Falls Indians, but one conclusion can be reached, and that is, that the Indians are being wrongfully deprived of their liberty and their property. Under the bill introduced by the distinguished Senator from Oregon, they would be entitled to manage their own property.

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

Mr. LANGER. I yield to the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MORSE. I want to say to my good friend from North Dakota that I appreciate his remarks, because I interpret them to mean that I can rely upon him for support of my bill when I succeed, as I think I shall, in calling it up for a vote in the next regular session of the Congress.

Should I also understand from the remarks of the Senator from North Dakota that he agrees with the junior Senator from Oregon that we should give careful consideration in this country to removing all Indians from the role of wards of the State at the earliest possible date?

Mr. LANGER. That is correct. I agree with that fully.

Mr. MORSE. I want to say to the Senator from North Dakota that I think the time has come when there is need for a complete overhauling of the Indian Service; not that I criticize the personnel of the present Service, but that I criticize the basic principle on which the program rests, namely, that the Indians must be treated as wards of the State. I think that in a country boasting of a free school system we ought to be able to put into practice the real purpose of that free school system, and let intelligent and educated Indians run their own affairs as all other free Americans do.

Mr. LANGER. May I ask the distinguished Senator from Oregon a pointed question? Would the Senator say that the United States Government has made a success of dealing with the Indians when, after a hundred years of education, there cannot be found a single Indian, even an Indian of half-blood, whom the President would consider fit to be Indian Commissioner, although some of them are graduates of Harvard, Columbia, Yale, and Princeton, in the



East, and of some of the large universities of the West, including the University of North Dakota and the University of Oregon?

Mr. MORSE. I simply do not share the conclusion that it is impossible to select a good many very competent Indians to run their own affairs. I would add, I think the continuance of the type of Indian Service that exists in this country has become the establishment of a type of bureaucratic government that ought to be modified at the earliest possible date.

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

Mr. LANGER. I yield to the Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. MOORE. As no doubt the Senator from North Dakota knows, the State of Oklahoma has the largest Indian population of any State in the Union.

Mr. LANGER. I am familiar with that fact.

Mr. MOORE. The Senator also knows that there probably is no difference between the mental capabilities of Oklahoma Indians and the mental capabilities of the average white people who are neighbors of the Indians. He also knows that many Indians from the State of Oklahoma have been elected to the highest courts, have held the highest State offices, have been elected to the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States, and have been elected to legislatures. Yet all those Indians are wards of the United States Government. It seem to me the Indian Bureau is the most useless Bureau and the most powerful Bureau and, so far as I can see, the Oklahoma Indians, especially the Five Civilized Tribes, and probably all the Indians, including the Osages, should be freed entirely. They are citizens of the United States and of the State of Oklahoma. They have the right to vote and the right to own property, but they do not have the right to manage their affairs with the United States Government. So far as I am concerned, I should like to see the Indian Bureau entirely abolished and the responsibilities of the Indians placed upon themselves.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator from North Dakota yield, so that I may ask the Senator from Oklahoma a question?

Mr. LANGER. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. I wish to say to the Senator from Oklahoma that I appreciate his remarks, because I think, if he will permit me to say so, he is the best-qualified man in the United States Senate to pass judgment upon Indian affairs. I think he knows more about Indian affairs than any other Senator with whom I have conversed. I should like to ask the Senator from Oklahoma if he agrees with me that we have developed the Indian administration to such a point that it has created a large number of very soft, push-button, plush-bottomed jobs for a good many people.

Mr. MOORE. I definitely agree with the Senator in that respect.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I notice in the Chamber the distinguished Senator from Minnesota, who, as a for-

mer Governor of his State, was, I think, as surprised as I was to discover at a hearing, when the Acting Indian Commissioner, Mr. Zimmerman, testified, that today in the city of Minneapolis, Minn., there are 2,000 Indians who are wards of the United States Government and who are enrollees. In the city of Brooklyn, N. Y., there are hundreds of Indians who are wards of the Government. The distinguished junior Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS] asked the Indian Commissioner, "I think I am one one-hundred-and-twenty-eighth Indian; do you think I am a ward of yours?"

When Mr. Collier became Indian Commissioner there were, roughly, as I recollect now, 240,000 enrolled Indians. An effort was made immediately to get every single Indian they could find, no matter how well educated, and put him on the rolls, with the result that there are now nearly 400,000 enrollees. In the month of January 1947 the Government had actual charge of approximately 233,000 Indians. To take care of those 233,000 there were approximately 12,000 Federal employees. From those figures it can be understood whether or not the question the distinguished Senator from Oregon asked was adequately answered by the distinguished Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. KNOWLAND in the chair). Does the Senator from North Dakota yield to the Senator from Oklahoma?

Mr. LANGER. I yield.

Mr. MOORE. The Senator from North Dakota knows, I am sure, that the claim for appropriations is based upon the number of enrolled Indians of the country, and that is the very reason why it is considered necessary to have as many enrollees as possible.

Mr. LANGER. The Senator from Oklahoma knows that the appropriation last year was in the sum of \$45,000,000, and that the Appropriations Committee this year, only after a struggle, was able to reduce it to, roughly, \$40,000,000.

In connection with the telegram which I read originally, I might say that I have received scores of letters commenting favorably upon the votes of those in the minority on the interim aid bill. I desire to bring to the attention of Senators a feeling which I believe prevails throughout the United States, that before appropriations of money are made for the so-called Marshall plan we should first take care of the people of our own country. I wish to read just a few letters that I have received from my own State.

Here is a letter that was written to me from Courtenay, N. Dak., November 23:

I am writing in regard to my mother-in-law's pension.

I shall not give her name.

She is getting a Civil War pension of \$40 a month. Senator Frazier got it for her. Now she is 86 years old, nearly 87, and she needs more than that in order to meet the high cost of living. Do you think you could help her get a raise? She cannot get an old-age pension, because she is the widow of a veteran. If she is to get more coal, food, and money for doctor bills, \$40 is not enough.

Her son is a cripple and he only has one limb, and he only works a few days a week and then is laid off 2 or 3 weeks, often with arthritis which he has awfully badly. I wish you would see what you could do to raise this pension, that they may pay higher monthly payments, for food and coal today are so much higher.

Mr. President, later I shall read a letter from a veteran's widow. Then I shall let this body decide as to what the American people may think, when our own people in this country are actually suffering and in want, while we are sending \$597,000,000 to France, to Italy, and to Austria, without first having made a survey of what our own people are undergoing at the present time.

I have here a letter from Baltimore:

I have long been trying to call your attention to a matter.

The writer is referring to the Senate, not to me personally. It is the first letter I have ever received from him.

I am now 68 years of age. Have applied for old-age payments and they tell me I must earn \$100 pay to get any additional pay at all.

I was one of the white-collar men as a salesman in Washington for 25 years with Moses & Son, Eleventh and F Streets NW., until the income tax put me out of employment. I lost my wife and am now being supported by my only daughter. When I was working during the war I was charged from \$9 to \$12 a week, but I have been out since the close of the war. I cannot get employment at any time. They tell me I am too old; must have a younger man. If I can get anything to do I will gladly do it. I have not been able to take the slurs of my daughter that she is supporting me after having been out about 15 years.

I have here a letter from my own State, from a man whom I know well, and I have no objection to giving his name. It is from Wilton, N. Dak., dated November 24:

DEAR SENATOR LANGER: I have been wondering why we do not get farm machinery here. In order to get it, we have to pay black-market prices. Are they shipping this machinery to Russia, or what? I have heard they are shipping it to Russia. Is that really true?

NICK KRUSH.

The only answer I can give him, Mr. President, is that not only have shipments of farm machinery in considerable amounts been made to Russia, but in addition to that thousands of locomotives have been sent to Russia and to other countries. Many thousands of boxcars, manufactured in this country have been shipped to other countries. For example, 4,000 boxcars were sent to Argentina. Two thousand boxcars were sent to Mexico. That was done at the very time when the junior Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG], my distinguished colleague, and I were trying to secure some boxcars for North Dakota last year and the year before, as well as this year, in order to move to the market crops raised in the United States, crops which the farmers were piling up out on the prairies of our State, and also upon the prairies of the State of Montana.

I have here a letter from Belleville, Ill., from the secretary of a branch of the

National Rural Letter Carriers Association. The job of the rural-mail carriers is to deliver the mail in the rural communities. The writer says they cannot obtain cars. He writes me:

As secretary of the St. Clair County branch of the National Rural Letter Carriers' Association, I am writing to you on a motion that was passed at our last meeting.

These letter carriers say they have to secure congressional help in order to obtain automobiles. These men are not able to obtain cars, while, as I shall show later on, cars of every kind of manufacture are being sent abroad. Mr. President, the shipment of such cars abroad could be stopped tomorrow by the President, under the present law, through refusal to permit the export of the cars. These men are asked to make a living by delivering the mail, carrying the mail in miserable old cars which can barely navigate.

Mr. President, I have here a letter from New York. Talk about this great country which is going to rule the world. It is going to rule Germany through the men who are now over there, and it is going to rule other countries. The letter I am about to read shows how our own prisoners in some institutions are taken care of. I shall not give the name of the individual in question, and when I read the letter I think Senators will understand why. The letter is dated November 24:

DEAR MR. SENATOR: We visited our son yesterday and he reports to us that on November 17 the inmates in McNeil prison were served breakfast food containing rat excrement and ants, and that when he complained to the steward he was reprimanded and denied yard and movie privileges.

On Friday, November 21, the cook dropped two pieces of fish on the floor, and picking them up, he placed them back in the prisoners' food.

I think, Mr. President, that letter speaks for itself.

I have here another letter telling about highways. Mind you, Mr. President, we spent hundreds of millions of dollars in Alaska on the building of a highway during the war. I protested against that action, and was instrumental in having a special committee appointed to investigate the subject. The special committee was headed by former Senator Clark. Former Senators Shipstead and Tunnell were also members of the committee. That subcommittee never did find out who ordered the highway in Alaska built. It was built without a survey. The testimony showed that an airplane flew over the country and then \$130,000,000 or \$140,000,000 were spent in constructing the highway. Also during the war this country built highways in a number of foreign countries to the south of us.

The letter I refer to relates to Highway No. 81. Federal highways in North Dakota are full of chuck holes so automobiles cannot even traverse them.

I have a letter from Rolette, N. Dak., addressed to me, as follows:

DEAR SIR: My mother and father had to have State old-age assistance for a few years. They acquired a debt around \$2,000 on their property, a small rooming house here in Rolette. \* \* \* She has been crippled for

several years and has not been able to run the rooming house—

The reason for her old-age pension—so she has rented the building to—

I shall omit the name—

who pays her \$65 a month. She has now moved to Portland, Oreg., to live with a married daughter out there. The welfare case worker has stopped her relief checks.

Mr. President, I want to know if that woman has any rights.

I have here a letter from a Negro:

I have a case I am presenting to you of a disabled former soldier who served in the Pacific and European theaters of war. He has received—

Mind you, Mr. President—

the Asiatic-Pacific campaign ribbon, the European theater ribbon, the Good Conduct Medal, the World War II Victory Medal, the Bronze Silver Star for Rhineland, and the various campaigns in which he has participated.

Senator, this is an outrageous case.

This letter was written day before yesterday, December 2.

Knowing you as I do is why I am going to be frank in speaking to you about this case. \* \* \*

This soldier was awarded compensation in March by the Veterans' Administration of \$13.80 per month for disabilities connected with his service in the Army. Also from the records I have before me, he has suffered from a heart condition for which he was discharged and found to be suffering by the Veterans' Administration at the time he was awarded the compensation for other disabilities.

This is one of the most damnable outrages that could be perpetrated upon our World War II veterans by a Government agency which is supposed to be of service to the taxpayers of this Nation. This veteran has had to do the best he could, trying to work, although suffering from a service-connected disability as a result of his military service, but not being compensated by the Veterans' Administration, to which he is entitled.

Mind you, the man who signed this letter, Mr. President, has been governor of one of our great islands.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. STENNIS in the chair). Does the Senator from North Dakota yield to the Senator from Illinois?

Mr. LANGER. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. The Senator said he had received that letter only day before yesterday.

Mr. LANGER. This letter, which came from Washington, D. C., I received day before yesterday. The other letters I read I received earlier.

Mr. LUCAS. I am wondering whether the Senator has taken time to discuss this man's case with the Veterans' Administration.

Mr. LANGER. The writer of the letter has done so. I have here a full report on the case. The letter is written from Washington, D. C.

Mr. LUCAS. What does the Veterans' Administration say in reply to this particular case, which seems to be so serious from the Senator's standpoint?

Mr. LANGER. This ex-soldier is supposed to be in the hospital. He was sup-

posed to be hospitalized around November. Yet he is still out of the hospital.

I understand that the employees in the Veterans' Administration made the remark that they did not care anything about Senators or politicians who might write them letters regarding such cases.

He was supposed to have been in the hospital in November. I suppose the situation is that there are not enough beds to take care of veterans at the particular hospital to which he went. I know that has been the situation in some of the other veterans' hospitals. This letter is dated December 2. I received it this morning. I intend to refer it to the Veterans' Administration.

Mr. LUCAS. Then I understand that the Senator has not yet referred the matter to the Veterans' Administration.

Mr. LANGER. Not in this particular case; but I may add that I have referred any number of cases in my own State to the Veterans' Administration.

Mr. LUCAS. I appreciate that; but I was interested only in this one letter, because the Senator was making a very severe indictment against the Veterans' Administration as a result of the information he received in that letter.

Mr. LANGER. The Senator entirely mistakes my criticism. My indictment is not against the Veterans' Administration at all. My indictment is against our Government—against whoever may be responsible for sending \$597,000,000 to France, Italy, and Austria without first taking care of our own people. I wish to serve notice—and that is why I am occupying the floor—that before the Marshall plan reaches this floor I want some committee, whichever committee has charge of the matter, to find out how much it will cost our Government for old-age assistance, for taking care of the widows of veterans and of veterans themselves, for taking care of our roads, and for the thousand and one other things which go with good government, before we give away any more money to anyone else.

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

Mr. LANGER. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. I do not desire to get into an argument with the Senator about the Marshall plan. I know what the Senator's feeling is in that respect, from the remarks he has made. My only reason for rising was to clear up any misunderstanding about the statement which the Senator made with respect to the Veterans' Administration. I distinctly understood that the Senator was more or less adopting the language of the letter written by some individual seriously complaining about the treatment received by a certain service man. If that is a true and correct conclusion, certainly the Veterans' Administration should be called to account. I hope that when the Senator receives his reply from the Veterans' Administration he will place it in the RECORD. As one Senator, I should be very much interested to see it.

Mr. LANGER. I do not know how the Senator can arrive at the conclusion that I am criticizing anyone. I was reading from a letter which I received.

Mr. LUCAS. The Senator was reading from a letter which he received. I do not know whether the Senator adopts that language or not; but if I were reading from a letter which I had received from one of my constituents, I would believe that I was telling the truth, and I would adopt that language as my own language if I read it on the floor of the Senate. Perhaps the Senator does not follow that theory; but I never read a letter on the floor of the Senate unless I adopt it as my own language. Otherwise there is not much point to it.

Mr. LANGER. I suggest that the Senator adopt the language of the next letter. This one is dated November 21, and is from Hannover, N. Dak.:

I have come to feel it is my duty to call your attention to certain facts concerning the Federal crop-insurance program. According to information received, Oliver County was very successful in selling 3-year contracts covering 1947, 1948, and 1949. One of the main points was the so-called accumulated reserve, which would entitle the producer to one-half rate premium sooner or later.

Due to congressional failure—

I do not care whether the failure is a failure of Democrats or of Republicans. I think I have made my position clear time after time on this floor. With only three Democrats and three Republicans voting "nay," the Senate voted to send \$597,000,000 abroad. Our Government promised the farmers of our country crop insurance. What happened?

Due to congressional failure to provide funds for continuing these contracts—

Contracts made by our own Government, and signed by our own Government. The farmer relied upon that contract, bought machinery, and put in his crops, but the Congress would not appropriate funds.

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

Mr. LANGER. Wait until I finish reading the letter:

Due to congressional failure to provide funds for continuing these contracts, the insurance corporation has found it necessary to cancel them. I object to this failure to at least carry out the 3-year contracts. If there had been a reduction in premiums in cases where no loss had occurred cancellation of contracts might have been acceptable.

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

Mr. LANGER. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. The Senator is reading a letter which, from my own personal knowledge, is absolutely correct. There is no question that last year the Congress of the United States did eliminate crop insurance. At the time I thought that was wrong, because a few years previous to the last session of Congress we entered into a program in all sincerity in order to try to give the farmers of the country some security against crop failure.

The Senator well knows who is responsible for cutting off the funds for crop insurance. The Republicans are in control of Congress, and they must assume that responsibility.

Mr. YOUNG rose.

Mr. LUCAS. I see my good friend the junior Senator from North Dakota rising. I know exactly what he is going to say. Before I take my seat, therefore, let me say that he is not one of the Republicans who are responsible. He happens to be a member of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, of which committee I am also a member. We see eye to eye on most questions involving agriculture. However, agriculture is not the only question involved. The Republican Congress eliminated funds in a great many instances, in the name of economy which was false from start to finish. The Senator now is helping to make a case for the Democratic Party in connection with crop insurance.

Mr. LANGER. I now yield to my colleague.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Illinois for his kind remarks concerning my views on agriculture. By legislative act, and not by appropriation legislation, the crop-insurance program was reduced to an experimental basis. The administration now can carry on the program in only a few counties of each State. I should like to inform my distinguished colleague that I was the only member of the conference committee between the House and Senate who refused to sign that report bringing this about. The committee was comprised of both Democrats and Republicans. While I am on my feet I wish to commend my colleague for the able speech he is making.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I come back to my original premise. We voted to send \$597,000,000 to Austria, France, and Italy. We did it at a time when we were failing to carry out the contracts which our own Government had signed with the farmers of the Nation.

Mr. President, I have another letter. This one is from Fargo, N. Dak., where we have a very fine agricultural college. There is need for a certain type of building, in order properly to train the farm youth of my State and surrounding States. The local authorities have begged for a building, but are unable to obtain it. The particular building has to do with quarters for the Federal Government. The building was promised time and time again. Similar buildings have been erected in some of the other States. We had a difficult time even in obtaining soil pipe for some of the trailer camps.

I have another letter dealing with the question of accumulated reserves which have been set aside in crop insurance.

I have a letter from a businessman which reads as follows:

While our American people are going without a lot of necessities of life, including material for building homes, steel and iron for making cars, farm machinery, etc., it leaks out every once in a while that we are sending all such scarce items to the European countries including Russia. I heard over the radio the other day that we are sending iron and steel to Russia, including locomotives, and then a lot of administration officials and other politicians are telling the American public (who pay the taxes) that we have got to help the European countries to avoid the spread of communism.

I have before me a resolution from the Crow Indian Tribal Council. There was a meeting of delegates of the Crow Indian Tribe. I shall not read all of the resolution. They want money.

Whereas in the requests for sale of lands by Indians far advanced in years who may be sick, childless, and in need of money to meet the cost of the necessities of life or medical aid, or who may be the possessors of land far beyond their needs and who may wish to sell a portion of their land holdings and thus obtain needed cash for their needs before they die or who, for any other reasonable purposes, wish to sell a portion of his or her lands cannot do so, on account of the closed-door to sale-or-disposal-policy of the Indian Bureau.

What this tribe says bears out what I said a few days ago about the Indians who came back to Arizona and New Mexico—GI's who are unable to make a GI loan because they do not own the land. Title to the land is in the name of the Government.

Mr. President, it will be remembered that at that time I gave a list of distinguished men who had received honors at the hands of our Government; yet they were unable to get a loan.

I have here another letter from Jamestown, N. Dak., which reads as follows:

I wish to give you the opinion of one veteran's wife—and doubtless there are a lot more of the same opinion—on the veteran's school allotment.

They were promised \$90 for married vets. On the strength of it we've built a home—rather are still in the process of building—nearly 2 years. By budgeting our income, allowing for overtime, he could work to help finance it. We nicely got everything started, including loan, etc., when allowance was cut and a ceiling put on veterans' earning powers regardless of number of hours he'd work. The more overtime he puts in the more he is cut down—instead of getting \$90 he is getting \$41.20 in spite of rise in living costs in the past year.

Here is another letter, Mr. President. These letters have all come within the last few days. This one reads as follows:

I am writing you a few lines to see if you can help me.

My husband has arthritis so bad in the spine and neck he hardly can't do anything. He was in the Veterans' Hospital in Fargo, N. Dak., for 3 weeks. They told him when he was discharged they couldn't help him any. He put in for a pension when he was there. Last week he got a letter from them that he wasn't getting any pension. They said he had to be totally disabled before he could get any pension.

Mr. President, every Senator on the floor knows that that is not true. They can pay 10 percent disability or 20 percent or whatever it may be. As can be seen by looking at the letter, it is written by a person who is rather ignorant. But here is a man who was misinformed, and so his wife writes a United States Senator that kind of a letter.

I have here a letter from the Second Assistant Postmaster General stating that in order to save \$1,172.72 and to save 55 miles of travel, the Department is discontinuing a rural route. The farmers have to go without their mail while we send \$597,000,000 to foreign countries.

I have here an article appearing in the St. Louis Post-Dispatch. We are helping all the foreign countries, but here is how we have taken care of Alaska, according to the St. Louis Post-Dispatch:

Congress has delivered Alaska into the hands of a salmon monopoly which pays only very small taxes to the Territory and does not even provide full local employment. Alaska's economic colonialism is made still more stultifying by the Jones Act of 1920 which requires all Territorial commerce by sea to be handled in American bottoms—which means, in practice, a Seattle shipping trust.

The rates—

This is what the distinguished Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER] was talking about a while ago.

The rates these steamship lines charge for both freight and passengers are among the highest in the world. Another transportation incubus is imposed by freight rates on the Government-owned railroad, the only one in the Territory—

Mind you, here is a railroad owned by our own Government in Alaska; and we are supposed to help Alaska. What freight rates do we charge in Alaska? The article says further:

Another transportation incubus is imposed by freight rates on the Government-owned railroad, the only one in the Territory, which are the highest in the Western Hemisphere.

That is how we are developing Alaska—by charging the highest freight rates in the Western Hemisphere. I can readily join with my distinguished friend from Nebraska in what he stated a while ago in connection with the Jones Act.

I read further:

These and other arbitrary barriers to the free use of natural resources are the causes of incongruous weaknesses in the economy. For example, despite abundant coal reserves and rich soil that will grow two crops a year, Alaskans must import coal and 90 percent of their foodstuffs.

Then the editorial says further that the proposed legislation would give war veterans "a maximum of 3 square miles of land in the Tongass National Forest. Since the veterans could hardly farm this mountainous and wooded terrain, they would be natural prey for predatory lumbermen."

I have another letter dated November 27, which reads as follows:

I am writing you a few lines again and asking you if the boys we are staying with will have to take us off the welfare board, and the boys don't feel like doing that. \* \* \* We don't have no property. The boys let us stay with them. We was getting \$15 and \$14 for a while. Now she has cut us down to \$9.

They have taken old pioneers and cut them from \$15 to \$9. At the same time we are sending vast sums of money to foreign countries.

Mr. President, I have here a copy of the speech made on Monday by the distinguished Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER], appearing on page 10976 of the RECORD. I should like to quote what he said about the situation in this country, as follows:

Figures were given out the other day indicating that the median of American income per family is \$2,300. Half of the families make less than \$2,300 a year and half make

more than that. What kind of a standard of living is possible today for people making less than \$2,300 per family? The majority of the children of America, Mr. President, that have to fight our wars and build our strength in the future are living in families of four, on an average, where the gross income is less than \$2,300 a year.

It was only a short time ago that a report was made by Mr. Delano, the head of the National Resources Board, which stated there were families at that time in America trying to live on \$230 a year. How well I remember that the Senator from Delaware said he simply did not believe it. Yet there was that report by the National Resources Board which went into detail in giving the income of families at that time.

What does the average farmer think when he reads an account such as this one which appeared in the New York Times a short time ago? I read:

British industry seeks steel here. Two million five hundred thousand tons of finished products believed to be goal of new buying mission.

Interests acting in behalf of several British steel companies and other industrial concerns will attempt next week to place orders—

And so forth. In Hettinger County, N. Dak., according to sworn testimony of the county agent in the presence of 400 farmers who appeared there when a meeting was called, the farmers lost \$1,000,000 worth of flax and wheat because there was not steel enough to get farm machinery to produce the crops. Two million five hundred thousand tons of steel are going to England, just as 34,000 boxcars have been sent to England. We sent to foreign countries 30,000 prefabricated houses built in this country at the very time when our own veterans were unable to get homes.

Mr. President, I have an article appearing in the New York Times which states that a London curio shop put up a sign reading, No Americans Are Welcome Here. That is on the front page of the New York Times. That is the way they feel after our sacrificing and sending them machinery to help them win the war.

I have here a letter showing the difficulty a farmer is having in trying to get a tractor so that he can make a living. I received the following letter this morning:

DEAR SENATOR LANGER: Will let you know that we are still waiting for a tractor, and you say till next harvest. What do you think about our spring work? How can we get it out without any tractor? Ours is no good. We had to wait until two of our neighbors were done with their spring work to help us get our crop in, so you see that we need a tractor right now for spring work right away.

Then there is a postscript as follows:

Hope to receive a new tractor as soon as possible.

That tractor, Mr. President, means everything to that particular family. Yet we send many thousands of tractors to one foreign country after another, including Russia. These folks are supposed to be patriotic American citizens, fighting communism.

Mr. President, I hold in my hand an article headed "U. S. gift-loan held cause of British crisis," appearing in the Chicago Tribune on September 4,

1947. The first paragraph reads as follows:

NEW YORK, September 3.—Max Aitken, publisher of the London Daily Express and the Evening Standard, believes that the basic cause for the present political situation of England is the American gift-loan to Britain and the conditions under which it was accepted.

In other words, if we had not loaned them or given them the \$4,000,000,000 they would not be in trouble today, and therefore we are to blame.

Mr. President, I hold in my hand resolutions which were adopted by the Williams County Farmers Union, of Williston, N. D. These resolutions give fairly well an idea of what the rank and file of the people are thinking. They read as follows:

WILLIAMS COUNTY FARMERS UNION,  
Williston, N. Dak., October 15, 1947.  
HON. WILLIAM LANGER,  
Senate Office Building,  
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. LANGER: At the annual convention of the Williams County Farmers Union, October 11, 1947, at the Williston Armory, the following resolutions were adopted by the group:

"Be it resolved by the Williams County Farmers Union in annual convention assembled this 11th day of October 1947, That we strongly urge upon our Senators and Representatives that they actively work for and support legislation providing for increased funds for the building of rural electrification lines."

"Whereas big business is profiting and creating scarcities and is trying without justification to blame farmers for the inflation that is resulting; and

"Whereas some industries, such as steel, have openly and defiantly engaged in a sit-down strike against adequate production; and

"Whereas the statistics from the Department of Agriculture show that the farmer actually has 10 percent less purchasing power than in July 1947: Be it therefore

"Resolved by the Williams County Farmers Union in annual convention assembled this 11th day of October 1947, That we ask for restoration of tested inflation controls, and that copies of this resolution be sent to the North Dakota Farmers Union and Senators and Representative from North Dakota."

"Whereas there is already developing a serious shortage of electric energy in many parts of our country; and

"Whereas the continued expansion of REA lines to our farm people may suffer delays if such power shortage is not corrected: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved, That we, the members of the Williams County Farmers Union, in annual convention assembled in Williston, N. Dak., this 11th day of October 1947, respectfully request that the United States Corps of Army Engineers and the United States Bureau of Reclamation to take all steps necessary to increase the generating capacity at the Fort Peck Dam to its maximum at the earliest possible date; be it further

"Resolved, That we urge General Wheeler, Chief, United States Corps of Army Engineers, and Mr. James Webb, Director, Bureau of the Budget, Washington, D. C., to request adequate appropriations from the next session of Congress to make possible immediate enlargement of generating capacity at Fort Peck."

Yours very truly,

ALVIN ANDERSON,  
Secretary, Williams County Farmers  
Union, Williston, N. Dak.

As we see, the resolutions refer to the Rural Electrification Administration and the fact that it has been impossible to obtain any materials with which to build rural electrification projects. Mr. President, I disclaim all responsibility for that condition. That situation existed before I came to the Senate. But in the State of North Dakota, one of the 48 States of the Union, there is less REA than in any other State. Yet when we spoke to Mr. Claude Wickard and some of the other Federal administrators and said that we need more REA in North Dakota, they said, "We do not have the money." So our farmers' wives out there do not have refrigerators, and the children have to read by lamplight instead of by electricity, and there is no electric power in many parts of the State, all for lack of adequate materials—materials which have been sent abroad in great quantities. In many areas in the United States the proper materials still cannot be had.

Today we pick up the newspapers and read that buyers from foreign countries are in the United States buying such materials. For instance, I hold in my hand an article stating that Europe seeks 40,000,000 tons of United States coal in 1948. Mr. President, in my State our farmers work. Yet when they pick up the newspapers, they see articles stating that there are 1,000,000 or 2,000,000 persons on strike. So they say, "What kind of government do we have?" Mind you, Mr. President, this \$597,000,000 is not to be sent to help poor people in those countries, but it is to be sent to their governments; and those governments apparently are run so poorly that they cannot get their own people to work and dig coal. So they send agents to the United States seeking 40,000,000 tons of coal in 1948. Of course, if that purchase is made, the result can only be that the price of coal in the United States will rise, even if we do not have an actual shortage of coal. As a matter of fact, there is a shortage. For the last 2 weeks my colleague, the junior Senator from North Dakota [Mr. Young], and I have been busy answering telephone calls. The cold weather has come to our State. Veterans living in trailers in Jamestown, N. Dak., have not had fuel with which to heat their trailers. They cannot get coal, oil, or anything else. We finally got them some. A little later we received a call from the Farmers Union at Casselton, N. Dak., stating that there was no fuel oil there, and then we received word from Grand Forks, N. Dak., the third largest town in the State, that there was no fuel oil there.

Mr. President, I wish to make it perfectly plain that, so far as I am concerned, I intend to do everything within my power to see to it that before this Marshall plan is adopted, we find out exactly what is needed in this country by the aged, by the annuitants, by the widows of veterans, by the veterans themselves, and by people all over this country. We should find out what is needed by the school teachers. Some of them are living on starvation wages. I believe in appropriating money for our teachers, for our highways, for the REA, for our hospital needs, and for anything

else that is absolutely necessary and essential here, before we send any more money to any foreign country, no matter what foreign country that may be. I think that certainly before we appropriate \$16,000,000,000 or \$20,000,000,000 for any Marshall plan, a thorough analysis should be made of what is needed in the United States.

Finally, Mr. President, I wish to refer once more to the telegram coming from the Board of County Commissioners of Benson County, N. Dak. I state in all sincerity that in my opinion it represents the feeling of the rank and file of the people, not only the people of Benson County, in my own State, but the people of the United States, wherever one may go. I have talked with people on the streets of Washington, and I have asked them what they thought about sending this money to one foreign country after another. I carry with me a list of such gifts and loans. It is based on a map of the world, and shows exactly how much money every one of these countries has received. I have had the great pleasure of asking men in high authority here, "Where is the country of Yemen?" They would look at me blankly, and would say, "I never heard of it." Yet, Mr. President, we gave that country \$1,000,000 as a gift. I have here a complete list showing the distribution around the world of United States funds. The list is shown in conjunction with a map of the world, and underneath it is the following statement:

This new map of the world by William Wisner, Tribune staff cartographer, shows where the United States, since the beginning of World War II, has distributed more than \$66,000,000,000 in the form of foreign loans and gifts of various kinds. Reverse lend lease reduces this grand total, as shown under the heading Recapitulation, to a sum in excess of fifty-eight billion. Figures are from governmental agencies, and are approximate and by no means final or complete.

From this list we see that Russia has received \$11,631,393,732 and that the total going to Russia and her satellites has been \$12,969,039,448. China has received \$2,834,908,280; Mexico, \$187,475,683; Guatemala, \$2,436,700; Honduras, \$1,791,500; El Salvador, \$2,697,500; Nicaragua, \$6,932,000; Costa Rica, \$8,954,607; Colombia, \$57,848,452; Ecuador, \$25,197,134. The list also shows the amounts of money which our country has sent to Venezuela, Peru, Brazil, Bolivia, Paraguay, Uruguay, Chile, and various other countries. For instance, Chile has received \$105,142,330.

Mr. President, we hear many statements on this floor about communism and about the fact that we have made the recent appropriations to head off communism. I should like to bring to the attention of the Members of this body that the best way to get communism here in the United States is just to keep on the way we have been going. If we do so, we shall get plenty of communism when hard times strike.

A while ago we passed a labor law. In this country we have many monopolies in industry. Nevertheless we passed a stringent labor law. Yet no law of any kind was passed against monopolies or cartels in industry. In 1890 the Sher-

man Antitrust Act was passed, and a criminal provision was made. But up to the present time not one person has been put in jail in the United States for violation of that act, regardless of whether we had a Democratic or a Republican Attorney General.

Mr. President, if Senators think that the people of the United States sooner or later are not going to understand that situation, then I submit that the Senate has a very poor conception of the intelligence and smartness and ability of the rank and file of the people of this country. I really believe that when it comes to foreign aid the rank and file of the people on the street, no matter into what State we may go, understand the situation better than does the average officeholder in Washington.

#### EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

Mr. LANGER. Wait a moment. May I see the calendar?

Mr. WHITE. It has nothing on it but a few Coast Guard appointments.

Mr. LANGER. Very well.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. STENNIS in the chair). The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Maine.

The motion was agreed to, and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

#### EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

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

#### EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

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

Walter J. Donnelly, of the District of Columbia, a Foreign Service officer of the class of career minister, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to Venezuela, to which office he was appointed during the last recess of the Senate;

H. Freeman Matthews, of Maryland, a Foreign Service officer of the class of career minister, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to Sweden, to which office he was appointed during the last recess of the Senate;

Paul H. Alling, of Connecticut, a Foreign Service officer of class 1, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to Pakistan, to which office he was appointed during the last recess of the Senate;

Nathaniel P. Davis, of New Jersey, a Foreign Service officer of class 1, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to Costa Rica, to which office he was appointed during the last recess of the Senate;

J. Klahr Huddle, of Ohio, a Foreign Service officer of class 1, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to Burma, to which office he was appointed during the last recess of the Senate;

Donald R. Heath, of Kansas, a Foreign Service officer of class 1, to be Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary to Bulgaria, to which office he was appointed during the last recess of the Senate;

James Hugh Keeley, Jr., of California, a Foreign Service officer of class 1, to be Envoy

Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary to the Republic of Syria, to which office he was appointed during the last recess of the Senate;

William Benton, of Connecticut, to be a representative of the United States of America to the second session of the General Conference of the United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization, to be held in México, Mexico, from November 6 to December 3, 1947, to which he was appointed during the last recess of the Senate;

Laurence Duggan, of New York, to be a representative of the United States of America to the second session of the General Conference of the United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization, to be held in México, Mexico, from November 6 to December 3, 1947, to which he was appointed during the last recess of the Senate;

Milton S. Eisenhower, of Kansas, to be a representative of the United States of America to the second session of the General Conference of the United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization, to be held in México, Mexico, from November 6 to December 3, 1947, to which he was appointed during the last recess of the Senate;

Reuben G. Gustavson, of Nebraska, to be a representative of the United States of America to the second session of the General Conference of the United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization, to be held in México, Mexico, from November 6 to December 3, 1947, to which he was appointed during the last recess of the Senate;

Miss Helen C. White, of Wisconsin, to be a representative of the United States of America to the second session of the General Conference of the United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization, to be held in México, Mexico, from November 6 to December 3, 1947, to which she was appointed during the last recess of the Senate;

Detlev W. Bronk, of Pennsylvania, to be an alternate representative of the United States of America to the second session of the General Conference of the United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization, to be held in México, Mexico, from November 6 to December 3, 1947, to which office he was appointed during the last recess of the Senate;

Charles S. Johnson, of Tennessee, to be an alternate representative of the United States of America to the second session of the General Conference of the United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization, to be held in México, Mexico, from November 6 to December 3, 1947, to which office he was appointed during the last recess of the Senate;

Mrs. Louise Leonard Wright, of Illinois, to be an alternate representative of the United States of America to the second session of the General Conference of the United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization, to be held in México, Mexico, from November 6 to December 3, 1947, to which office she was appointed during the last recess of the Senate;

George D. Stoddard, of Illinois, to be an alternate representative of the United States of America to the second session of the General Conference of the United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization, to be held in México, Mexico, from November 6 to December 3, 1947, to which office he was appointed during the last recess of the Senate;

Howard E. Wilson, of New York, to be an alternate representative of the United States of America to the second session of the General Conference of the United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization, to be held in México, Mexico, from November 6 to December 3, 1947, to which office he was appointed during the last recess of the Senate;

John H. Hilldring, of New York, to be an alternate representative of the United States

of America to the second session of the General Assembly of the United Nations, to be held in New York, N. Y., beginning September 16, 1947, to which office he was appointed during the last recess of the Senate;

Admiral Alan G. Kirk, United States Navy, retired, to be the representative of the United States of America on the Special Balkan Committee established by the General Assembly of the United Nations October 21, 1947, to which office he was appointed during the last recess of the Senate;

Frank Porter Graham, of North Carolina, to be the representative of the United States of America on the Good Offices Committee of the Security Council of the United Nations on Indonesia, to which office he was appointed during the last recess of the Senate;

Paul H. Alling, and sundry other persons for promotion in the Foreign Service;

Basil F. Macgowan, of Tennessee, and Robert G. McGregor, Jr., of New York, Foreign Service staff officers, to be consuls; and

Philip F. Dur, of Massachusetts, and several other persons for appointment as Foreign Service officers.

#### NOMINATIONS IN THE ARMED SERVICES

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, I report certain nominations approved and recommended by the Armed Services Committee. I may say that these nominations are those which come to us because of the unification of the Army, Navy, and Air Forces, and include the names of men who are to be Under Secretaries and Assistant Secretaries of the Army, Navy, and Air Forces, along with nominations in the National Resources Board and the Munitions Board. Among them is the name of General Spaatz, Chief of the Air Forces, as well as that of the new Chief of Naval Operations, Admiral Denfeld.

At this time I give notice to the Senate that because of unification and the promotion bill passed at the end of the regular session, there have been numerous promotions, retirements, and transfers, as between the Air Forces and the Army, as well as in the Navy and Marine Corps. These promotions and transfers total almost 8,000.

The expense of printing these names on the Executive Calendar would be tremendous. Therefore it is my intention to give notice to the Senate that any Senator interested may look over the list in detail in the room of the Armed Services Committee. We shall be glad to secure any information any Senator may wish with respect to any of the nominations, and be as helpful as possible. It is not my intention to ask unanimous consent for the approval of the nominations at this time, but I believe the Senate will agree that this is too large a list to print.

It has already been printed once in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, as I understand. Some time next week, if there is no further objection, I shall ask unanimous consent to consider them en bloc.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator from South Dakota if it would be practical, in connection with the promotions and transfers, to have the committee compile a brief statement as to how many four-star generals we are to have, and how many full admirals, so as to get a picture of the overhead in these services. I do not mean necessarily only those included in this list, but I should like to know something about the entire organization.

Mr. GURNEY. I shall be glad to have such a statement prepared, and will transmit it to the Senator in letter form, or submit it for information on the floor of the Senate if he so desires.

Mr. CONNALLY. I should like to have the statement go as far as to include the number of lieutenant generals and the number of comparable grades in the Navy and the Marine Corps.

Mr. GURNEY. I shall be glad to obtain such information for the Senator.

By Mr. GURNEY, from the Committee on Armed Services:

William H. Draper, Jr., of New York, to serve as Under Secretary of the Army, to which office he was appointed during the last recess of the Senate;

Gordon Gray, of North Carolina, to serve as Assistant Secretary of the Army, to which office he was appointed during the last recess of the Senate;

John L. Sullivan, of New Hampshire, to be Secretary of the Navy;

W. John Kenney, of California, to be Under Secretary of the Navy;

Admiral Louis E. Denfeld to be Chief of Naval Operations in the Department of the Navy, with the rank of admiral, for a term of 2 years;

W. Stuart Symington, of Missouri, to serve as Secretary of the Air Force, to which office he was appointed during the last recess of the Senate;

Arthur S. Barrows, of California, to serve as Under Secretary of the Air Force, to which office he was appointed during the last recess of the Senate;

Cornelius V. Whitney, of New York, to serve as Assistant Secretary of the Air Force, to which office he was appointed during the last recess of the Senate;

Eugene M. Zuckert, of Connecticut, to serve as Assistant Secretary of the Air Force, to which office he was appointed during the last recess of the Senate;

Gen. Carl Spaatz (major general, U. S. Air Force), Air Force of the United States, for appointment as Chief of Staff, United States Air Force, with the rank of general, for the period of 4 years beginning September 26, 1947, under the provisions of law;

Vannevar Bush, New Hampshire, to serve as Chairman, Research and Development Board, to which office he was appointed during the last recess of the Senate;

Rear Adm. Roscoe H. Hillenkoetter, United States Navy, to be Director of Central Intelligence, to which office he was appointed during the last recess of the Senate;

Arthur M. Hill, of West Virginia, to be Chairman of the National Security Resources Board, to which office he was appointed during the last recess of the Senate;

Thomas J. Hargrave, of New York, to serve as Chairman, Munitions Board, to which office he was appointed during the last recess of the Senate;

Vice Adm. William R. Munroe, United States Navy, to be placed on the retired list with the rank of vice admiral;

Sydney M. Kraus and sundry other officers for appointment in the line and staff corps of the Navy; and

Harry Schmidt and sundry other officers for appointment to permanent grades in the Marine Corps.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will proceed to state the nominations on the Executive Calendar.

#### UNITED STATES COAST GUARD

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, there are four or five nominations to the Coast Guard, purely routine in character. I ask unanimous consent that they may be confirmed en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nominations will be considered en bloc, and, without objection, the nominations are confirmed.

Mr. WHITE. I ask that the President be notified immediately of the action of the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

#### RECESS TO MONDAY

Mr. WHITE. I move that the Senate stand in recess, in executive session, until Monday next at 12 o'clock noon.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 3 o'clock and 1 minute p. m.) the Senate took a recess, in executive session, until Monday, December 8, 1947, at 12 o'clock meridian.

#### NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate December 4, 1947:

##### DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

Herbert S. Bursley, of the District of Columbia, a Foreign Service officer of class 1, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Honduras.

Avra M. Warren, of Maryland, now Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary to New Zealand, to be Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Finland.

##### POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT

Paul Aiken, of Kansas, to be Second Assistant Postmaster General, to which office he was appointed during the last recess of the Senate.

##### IN THE AIR FORCE

Lt. Gen. Hoyt Sanford Vandenberg (major general, U. S. Air Force) Air Force of the United States, to be Vice Chief of Staff, United States Air Force, with the rank of general with rank from October 1, 1947.

Maj. Gen. Lauris Norstad (brigadier general, U. S. Air Force), Air Force of the United States, to be Deputy Chief of Staff for Operations, United States Air Force, with the rank of lieutenant general with rank from October 1, 1947.

Maj. Gen. Curtis Emerson LeMay (brigadier general, U. S. Air Force), Air Force of the United States, to be Commanding General, United States Air Force in Europe, with the rank of lieutenant general with rank from October 1, 1947.

Maj. Gen. Idwal Hubert Edwards (brigadier general, U. S. Air Force), Air Force of the United States, to be Deputy Chief of Staff for Personnel and Administration, United States Air Force, with the rank of lieutenant general with rank from October 1, 1947.

Maj. Gen. Howard Arnold Craig (brigadier general, U. S. Air Force), Air Force of the United States, to be Deputy Chief of Staff for Matériel, United States Air Force, with the rank of lieutenant general with rank from October 1, 1947.

Maj. Gen. Benjamin Wiley Chidlaw (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Air Force), Air Force of the United States, to be Deputy Commander, Air Matériel Command, with the rank of lieutenant general with rank from October 1, 1947.

Maj. Gen. Elwood Richard Quesada (major, U. S. Air Force), Air Force of the United States, to be commanding general, Tactical Air Command, with the rank of lieutenant general with rank from October 1, 1947.

Maj. Gen. Edwin William Rawlings (major, U. S. Air Force), Air Force of the United States, to be Air Comptroller, United States

Air Force, with the rank of lieutenant general with rank from October 1, 1947.

##### TO BE MAJOR GENERALS

Brig. Gen. Franklin Otis Carroll, United States Air Force, with rank from October 1, 1947.

Brig. Gen. Joseph Hampton Atkinson (major, U. S. Air Force), Air Force of the United States, with rank from October 1, 1947.

##### TO BE BRIGADIER GENERALS

Col. Edward Higgins White (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Air Force), Air Force of the United States, with rank from October 1, 1947.

Col. John Beverly Montgomery (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), Air Force of the United States, with rank from October 1, 1947.

Col. Horace Armor Shepard (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), Air Force of the United States, with rank from October 1, 1947.

NOTE.—These officers were appointed to the grades indicated on October 1, 1947, during the recess of the Senate.

##### APPOINTMENT IN THE REGULAR ARMY OF THE UNITED STATES

TO BE PROFESSOR OF MILITARY TOPOGRAPHY AND GRAPHICS AT THE UNITED STATES MILITARY ACADEMY, WITH RANK FROM DATE OF APPOINTMENT

Lt. Col. Charles Russell Broshous (captain, Corps of Engineers), Army of the United States.

##### IN THE NAVY

The following-named officers to be rear admirals in the Navy, for temporary service:

##### REAR ADMIRALS

Earl E. Stone  
Augustus J. Wellings  
William S. Parsons

##### COMMODORE

James E. Maher

##### CAPTAINS

Leon S. Fiske	Byron H. Hanlon
Harry R. Thurber	Robert F. Hickey
John E. Whelchel	Ruthven E. Libby
James H. Doyle	Herbert E. Regan
Clarence E. Olsen	John P. Whitney
Lucian A. Moebius	Hugh H. Goodwin
Francis X. McInerney	Edgar A. Cruise
John P. Womble, Jr.	

#### CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate December 4, 1947:

##### UNITED STATES COAST GUARD

TO BE COMMODORE IN THE UNITED STATES COAST GUARD RESERVE FOR TEMPORARY SERVICE, EFFECTIVE AUGUST 13, 1947

Halert C. Shephard

TO BE LIEUTENANT COMMANDERS IN THE UNITED STATES COAST GUARD, TO RANK FROM SEPTEMBER 30, 1947

Gustave A. Lohse  
Michael J. Kentos  
Joseph T. Drake

## HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

THURSDAY, DECEMBER 4, 1947

The House met at 11 o'clock a. m.  
Dr. Frank G. Smith, pastor emeritus, First Central Congregational Church, Omaha, Nebr., offered the following prayer:

Dear Lord and Father of mankind, before entering upon the duties and re-

sponsibilities of this day, we would pause for a moment in Thy presence to invoke Thy guidance and Thy blessing. Give us, we pray Thee this morning, new understanding of the meaning of those words of him who said:

"Prayer is the soul's sincere desire,  
Uttered or unexpressed;  
The motion of a hidden fire,  
That trembles in the breast."

Heavenly Father, it is our sincere desire this morning that in this communion with Thee we may all have a clearer consciousness of the eternal truth that every human being who dwells upon this planet that we call our home is by nature a child of God; that, no matter how underprivileged his environment or how primitive his heritage, there is unfolded within his mysterious spiritual being an embryonic potential that, properly guided, enables him to become a strong son of God, enables her to be a gracious daughter of the Most High, for we are all sparks from the infinite mind, all sparks from the eternal flame.

Here in these legislative Halls we are face to face with serious problems, weighty decisions, and challenging opportunities. We may not always see eye to eye, but we do pray that we may live in such a spirit of tolerance as was revealed in him who gave us the formula:

"There is so much that is good in the worst of us,  
And so much that is bad in the best of us,  
That it behooves all of us  
To say nothing ill of the rest of us."

And so, as steel sharpens steel and as one chemical acts and reacts upon another to produce a compound of larger value and greater worth, so may these cross-currents of honest opinion and genuine endeavor jell finally into a remedial balm that will ease every troubled mind and heal every wounded heart, not only here at home but in the farthest outpost of the troubled world. So undergird us by Thy strength and brood over us with Thy love and guide us by Thy wisdom that we may all in our hearts this morning breathe the prayer of him who set the throbs of his patriotic heart to the music of verse when he said:

"Our father's God from out whose hand  
The centuries fall like grains of sand,  
We meet today, united free,  
And loyal to our land and Thee,  
To thank Thee for the era gone  
And trust Thee for the coming one.

"O keep Thou us through centuries long,  
In peace secure, in justice strong;  
Around our gift of freedom draw  
The safeguard of Thy righteous law,  
And, cast in some diviner mold,  
Let each new era shame the old."

This is our sincere desire, our simple, earnest prayer in Thy dear name, and in the name of the Prince of Peace, our Lord and Master, we ask it. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of Tuesday, December 2, 1947, was read and approved.

## RESIGNATIONS FROM COMMITTEES

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication:

DECEMBER 4, 1947.

HON. JOSEPH W. MARTIN, JR.,  
*The Speaker, House of Representatives,*  
*Washington, D. C.*

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: I hereby tender my resignation as a member of the Committee on House Administration.

Very sincerely yours,

HUGH A. MEADE,  
*Member of Congress.*

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the resignation will be accepted.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication:

WASHINGTON, D. C., December 3, 1947.

HON. JOSEPH W. MARTIN,  
*Speaker of the House of Representatives,*  
*United States Capitol,*  
*Washington, D. C.*

MY DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Please accept my resignation as of today as a member of the Committee on Banking and Currency of the House of Representatives.

Very sincerely,

DONALD L. O'TOOLE,  
*Member of Congress.*

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the resignation will be accepted.

There was no objection.

## ELECTIONS TO COMMITTEES

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution (H. Res. 387) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

*Resolved, That DONALD L. O'TOOLE, of New York, HUGH A. MEADE, of Maryland, and CLARK W. THOMPSON, of Texas, be, and they are hereby, elected members of the standing Committee of the House of Representatives on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.*

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution (H. Res. 388) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

*Resolved, That ABRAHAM J. MULTER, of New York, be, and he is hereby, elected a member of the standing Committee of the House of Representatives on Banking and Currency.*

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution (H. Res. 389) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

*Resolved, That EDWARD A. GARMATZ, of Maryland, and KEN REGAN, of Texas, be, and they are hereby, elected members of the standing Committee of the House of Representatives on House Administration.*

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

## HOUR OF MEETING TOMORROW

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet at 10 o'clock tomorrow.

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

There was no objection.

## EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mrs. BOLTON asked and was given permission to extend her remarks in the RECORD in two instances and to include in each newspaper articles and editorials.

Mr. BRADLEY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include resolutions.

Mr. DAGUE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include excerpts from an editorial appearing in the Bristol (Pa.) Courier.

Mr. ROBERTSON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

Mr. GRIFFITHS (at the request of Mr. ROBERTSON) was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

Mr. FULLER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an address on community life in a small town.

Mr. McDONOUGH asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an address delivered recently by the former Ambassador to Poland.

Mr. CLEVINGER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial and an article appearing in the Cleveland Plain Dealer.

## HAVE YOU HAD ENOUGH?

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. FLETCHER. Mr. Speaker, I wish to read into the RECORD a portion of a letter I received this morning from Mr. John Cotton, of San Diego, Calif.:

SAN DIEGO, CALIF., December 1, 1947.

HON. CHARLES K. FLETCHER,  
*Member of Congress,*  
*House Office Building,*  
*Washington, D. C.*

DEAR CHARLIE: I hope you can make those contemporaries of yours down there realize that we have had enough. We had enough by election time last year, and that is why they are there.

What can we do to help you convince the Congressmen and Senators that we didn't send them back there to plan and dream, but to get rid of the planners and dreamers? Have they in 1 year forgotten that winning slogan, "Have you had enough?"

A return to controls now would be an acknowledgment of defeat. You know and I know that controls beget controls; they multiply like guinea pigs. We have been successful so far in reducing the controls that were strangling our economy; let's stay on this same road until we get to our destination. If we turn back now, we might just as well say we have turned the country back to the Socialists and Communists and quit. We can't do that.

I want prewar butter prices, and eggs and clothing at prewar prices as badly as the next fellow, but I want butter and eggs and clothing more. I would rather have my pocket-book tell me how much I can afford than to have my Government tell me how much I can have.

Our opponents chide us with the statement that present prices are higher than black-

market prices before controls were removed. That may be, but just imagine what the black-market prices would have been by now if we had had controls on all this time?

If they want to ration anything, let them ration bureaucrats and big government, but let's not control the people. We have had enough.

Sincerely,

JOHN COTTON.

## PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

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

There was no objection.

[Mr. KEEFE addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

## EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. KEATING asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a letter from Mr. Edgar G. Brown, director of the National Negro Council, and a telegram to the President of the United States.

Mr. BUSBEY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a speech by Col. Robert R. McCormick, publisher of the Chicago Tribune, on Constitution Day, September 17, 1947.

Mr. GWYNNE of Iowa asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a copy of an address delivered by him at the annual meeting of the American Bar Association.

Mr. ANGELL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an address on atoms in industry, by Ivan Bloch.

Mr. JUDD asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances and in each to include some printed material.

## PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks and include a letter and an article.

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

There was no objection.

[Mr. JUDD addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

## "TRU" OR FALSE"

Mr. JONKMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. JONKMAN. Mr. Speaker, President Truman, on October 24 last, in his radio address to the American people, on his call for a special session of Congress, said:

The major cause of high prices in this country is the great demand among our own people for available goods. An attempt has been made to place the blame upon our foreign aid program, but this is not borne out by the facts.

Is the last statement true or false?



Secretary of Commerce Harriman, on November 13, in testifying before the Committee on Foreign Affairs, said:

The interim aid program, in other words, has no new impact upon our domestic grain markets. To say that it has no new impact is, of course, in no way to deny that export purchases have already had a substantial impact on our domestic prices. Our record wheat crop could hardly command a price of \$3 per bushel in the absence of heavy foreign demand.

Is President Truman ducking responsibility for the high cost of living? Just another \$64 question for the American people.

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BLAND asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include an address on freight forwarders by the former counsel to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

#### CONSUMER-CREDIT CONTROLS

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, on August 9, 1941, under authority of the Trading With the Enemy Act, an Executive order was issued establishing controls over consumer credit. During most of the war a one-third down payment was required on installment purchases of automobiles and many other classes of consumer goods—20 percent on furniture—while a period of full payment was limited to 12 to 15 months, depending on the article.

On December 1, 1946, the Federal Reserve Board, which administered the controls, lifted them from everything except automobiles and 11 other consumer durable goods which remained in short supply, such as radios, washing and sewing machines, and so forth. In the spring of 1947 President Truman wrote to Chairman Marriner S. Eccles, of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve Board, that he did not think the controls should be continued under wartime authority and that he would lift them unless Congress provided new and specific legislative authority.

Separate bills dealing with the subject were introduced in the Senate by Hon. C. DOUGLASS BUCK and in the House by Hon. JESSE P. WOLCOTT.

The final conference report on credit control was a compromise on a very simple resolution which declared that existing controls should end November 1, 1947, and no new consumer-credit controls should be imposed except in a state of emergency or war originating after that date. The conference report was accepted by both Houses on July 25, 1947.

Now, after 1 month, I find sentiment among business interests in my congressional district predominately in favor of restoration of consumer-credit controls and a reinstatement of legislation similar to regulation W, as existed since December 1, 1946, on automobiles, furniture, and 10 other household items. Typical

of the business reaction after 1 month's trial is the following telegram sent to me by one of my constituents:

Highly important and beneficial to country's economy that regulation W be restored. These regulations are a safeguard against the average wage earner mortgaging his future. Buying on the installment plan is so easy when little down payment is required, and a purchaser is inclined to buy the easy way, going from store to store opening an account. A little recession will make him unable to meet his obligations and chaos results. Under regulation W, the merchant is forced to demand certain down payments and rapid repayment. Thus, the average worker can budget his earnings and keep his credit standard at a high level.

I might say that I supported the Wolcott bill, House Joint Resolution 222, and now from a cross section of sentiment, after only 1 month's trial, I believe that it would be a wise thing to reinstitute regulation W into legislation.

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. LARCADE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD in three instances and include newspaper articles.

Mr. JONES of North Carolina asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include an editorial from the Charlotte News.

Mr. BRYSON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include a speech on soil conservation prepared by him for delivery tomorrow night in his district.

#### WHAT THE WORLD NEEDS

Mr. MATHEWS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for a half a minute.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MATHEWS. Mr. Speaker, what this world needs is fewer plans and better principles.

#### THE TENNESSEE VALLEY AUTHORITY

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, the December issue of the Reader's Digest carries an article by my old friend John T. Flynn called The Hidden Red Ink in TVA's Books. In his article Flynn unblushingly declared that I advocated the TVA. And he asks rhetorically, "Do I want TVA destroyed?" And then answers "Certainly not."

Yet that is what he advocates. For the proposals he makes concerning the TVA are just the ones which have been advocated openly by the Power Trust and its satellites who make no attempt to disguise their hatred for this highly successful regional agency. Mr. Flynn's points and his arguments can be found in any propaganda handbook of the Power Trust lobby.

Right at the beginning of the article he has a financial analysis which follows down the line on the kind of analysis made by the Edison Electric Institute, the Power Trust propaganda organization. He seeks to show that the TVA has a deficit by the simple ruse of charging navigation and flood-control costs, with an assumed interest charge, against power revenues. Of course, he shows what he calls a deficit. Yet certainly Mr. Flynn knows that in other parts of the country, on the Ohio and the Mississippi and other rivers which the Government has developed for navigation and flood control, the costs are not borne by the electric consumers.

The navigation dams on the Ohio and the levees on the Mississippi are not paid for by the electricity consumers along their banks. They are paid for by the Federal Government in the interests of the general welfare.

There can be no justification for assuming that things should be different in the Tennessee Valley—that there, unlike any other place in the country, power consumers should not only pay the power costs but those of flood control and navigation as well.

Mr. Flynn tries to make several points with respect to TVA power. And for an economist he has a strange notion of what interest is. He says it is an element of cost. But as any regulatory commission could tell him, interest is not a cost but a part of the return on profit. Rates of return are set by regulatory commissions without reference to interest. Out of this return, the utility pays whatever interest it has to pay—depending on the amount of bonded debt in its capitalization and on the interest rate it must pay.

But Mr. Flynn goes further than that. The TVA is required by law to pay back to the Treasury money invested in its power system within 40 years. That is something that private utilities do not do; they usually refund their debts, that is, they replace old bonds by issuing new ones. Mr. Flynn seems to think the TVA ought not only to pay back to the Treasury the money invested in the power system, but to pay interest on the money on top of that.

There is nothing the enemies of TVA would like better than to see the TVA hampered and hamstrung by just such a double burden. It would place the TVA under a handicap under which no power system, public or private, could survive. The TVA cannot, like a private utility, go out and borrow money. It has only two sources of funds—appropriations by the Congress and revenues from its power sales. The double burden proposed by the TVA's alleged friend, Mr. Flynn, would tie up this second source of funds, revenues, so that it is doubtful if it could fulfill its obligations to provide electric service to the 750,000 consumers who are dependent upon it.

Mr. Flynn claims that competent engineers have said the dams are almost wholly for power. Of course, some engineers have said that. Every time the utilities have gone to court against the TVA they have rounded up as many such competent engineers as they could lay their hands on and put them on the

stand. They did it in the so-called Ashwander case. That is the case that followed Newton D. Baker's \$50,000 private opinion, paid for by the Power Trust, that the TVA was unconstitutional. The United States Supreme Court did not uphold that private opinion.

They tried it again in the 18-company case, and after listening at length to the competent engineers, this is what the three-judge Federal district court said:

Certain expert witnesses, in answer to hypothetical questions, stated that the dams might be operated for the primary purpose of power. Thousands of pages of testimony and numerous exhibits were introduced to show that Congress might have adopted a better plan than the TVA unified system. Experts equally qualified testified to the contrary.

The court is of the opinion that the relative value of these various plans is immaterial, since it has been established that the TVA project is reasonably adapted to use for combined flood control, navigation, power, and national defense, and that in actual operation the creation of energy is subordinated to the needs of navigation and flood control.

So much for Mr. Flynn's competent engineers.

Mr. Flynn declares that all the non-power activities of the TVA—agriculture, fertilizer production, forestry, and other projects—should be transferred to appropriate departments of the Government. In that statement Mr. Flynn shows either that he has never read the TVA Act and does not know what the TVA unified development of resources is, or that he has read the act, knows it very well, and thus knows just how to go most effectively about destroying it.

Mr. Flynn looks on the TVA as simply another power system, in business solely for the money there is in it. It is true that power is important in the unified development of the resources of the Tennessee Valley—it is the paying partner, the only activity which brings in revenues in the commercial sense. But power is only a part of the whole regional development program which has done such great work in controlling floods, promoting navigation and commerce, and restoring the soils and forests of one of the great regions of the country. The TVA is much more than a power project. Either Mr. Flynn does not know that—or he does know it and wants to destroy it.

Mr. Flynn's anxiety to destroy the TVA leads him to some strange conclusions. Former TVA Chairman Lillenthal, he says, "calls attention to the vast growth of Federal power. It has become so great that, he says, it cannot be wisely administered from Washington. But the power must not go back to the Governors, mayors, legislatures, and councils elected by the people."

Mr. Flynn here has missed the point. The powers Mr. Lillenthal referred to are Federal powers—the power to develop interstate streams and so on—which never could be held or exercised by States and local governments. The TVA, under the direction of Congress, does not exercise new powers, but simply administers in a new, integrated, and much more effective way the powers which the Federal Government has always possessed. Nor does the TVA, as Flynn suggests, have these powers in itself; the

powers are exercised by the Congress, which sets the policies; the TVA carries out those policies.

When Flynn suggests that the TVA has taken over State and local powers and functions, he raises a bogey without any substance. If, as he claims, he has spent months investigating TVA and has gone to the TVA country, then he ought to know better. Just the contrary is true. Two years ago, one of the leading newspapers of the country—the St. Louis Post-Dispatch—asked each of the governors of the seven Tennessee Valley States whether the TVA had encroached upon the rights of the States. The consensus was a vigorous "No." Moreover, the governors said, the TVA had in most cases increased the effectiveness of State and local agencies with which it cooperated in the regional program; they were stronger than ever before.

Mr. Speaker, as everyone knows, I was coauthor with Senator Norris, of Nebraska, of the bill creating the Tennessee Valley Authority. I have fought its battles from the beginning. No one could be more jealous of its reputation or more solicitous of its success than I am. I repeat what I have said on this floor time and time again, that it has wrought the greatest development of ancient or modern times.

From the building of the Pyramids down, there has been no single development that compared with that of the Tennessee Valley Authority. It is now generating between twelve and fifteen billion kilowatt-hours of electricity a year that was formerly going to waste. That power is being distributed to the people within the distribution radius at reasonable rates.

Its yardstick, showing what electricity should cost the ultimate consumers, is saving the users of electricity outside of the TVA area hundreds of millions of dollars annually. It is one of the few great developments the Government has ever undertaken that is paying its way. Every dollar of the cost of construction and operation that can be legitimately charged to power, as I said, will be paid back to the Government within 40 years; and in the course of time the revenues derived from this power will return to the Government every dollar invested for all purposes.

It is controlling floods on the Tennessee River and helping to control the floods on the lower Mississippi River, thereby saving untold millions of dollars of such damages as are being experienced along the Missouri and Ohio Rivers almost every year.

It has provided a navigation channel from Paducah to Knoxville, something like 600 miles, enabling the people of that area to use this great stream for transportation purposes.

At the same time it has carried out its program of reforestation, soil conservation and experiments in the development of fertilizers that have been of untold value to the farmers of the Nation.

But the private power interests that are owned by the vast holding companies, which exact tribute from every power consumer they serve, are turning heaven and earth to destroy the TVA

and to take from the people of that area the benefits this great project provides; just as they are trying to take from the people along the Columbia River and the Colorado River and other similar streams their enormous wealths of hydroelectric power.

Out of the Tennessee Valley Authority grew our program of rural electrification. It has already resulted in the lighting of more than 2,000,000 farm homes. The Rural Electrification Administration now has in its files applications for \$300,000,000 to build lines to serve the farmers of the Nation, and they are coming in at a rate of from twenty to twenty-five million dollars a month, or more.

Instead of attacking the TVA, it would behoove the Members of this Congress to join me in my efforts to secure additional appropriations for rural electrification. We are going to need at least \$500,000,000 for that purpose from now to the end of the next fiscal year. We need a deficiency appropriation for that purpose now, and, in my opinion, we are going to have one, either during this short session, or in the early part of the session beginning in January.

While this Congress is appropriating billions of dollars for people in foreign lands, let us develop our own national resources, especially our water power, and see that it is distributed at the cheapest possible rates, and at the same time let us provide for the electrification of every farm home in America at rates the farmers can afford to pay.

Let us not permit selfish interests to interfere with this great program by hampering the operations of the Tennessee Valley Authority.

#### TVA EXPENDITURES

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

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN]?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN] for calling attention to that article by Mr. Flynn in the Reader's Digest. I commend it to your reading. It does not make any difference whether the argument is put forth by, or follows the theory of, the power companies or somebody else. The point is, has the TVA been hiding expenditures? Has it been hiding revenue? Has it a phoney system of accounting? Those are the questions. Now read that article and, if necessary, we will have an investigation and learn whether the TVA is proceeding under a false front.

Mr. RANKIN. You had one investigation.

Mr. HOFFMAN. And we can have another one.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MANSFIELD asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include various and sundry editorials.

## INTERIM-AID BILL, 1947

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I call up the resolution, House Resolution 386, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

*Resolved*, That immediately upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 4604, to promote world peace and the general welfare, national interest, and foreign policy of the United States by providing aid to certain foreign countries, and all points of order against said bill are hereby waived. That after general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and shall continue not to exceed 12 hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the reading of the bill for amendment, the committee shall rise and report the same to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit. After the passage of the bill H. R. 4604 it shall be in order in the House to take from the Speaker's table the bill S. 1774 and to move to strike out all after the enacting clause of said Senate bill and insert in lieu thereof the provisions contained in H. R. 4604.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ALLEN] is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may require.

Mr. Speaker, this resolution provides immediate consideration for H. R. 4604, which is a bill reported by the Committee on Foreign Affairs to promote world peace and the general welfare, national interest, and foreign policy of the United States by providing aid to certain foreign countries.

Our decision on this bill may change the whole course of world history for a long time to come. Every Member of this House will probably want, and has the right, to express himself on this bill. The Committee on Rules has therefore provided 12 hours of general debate, which is more than was asked for by any witness before our committee. In addition to this 12 hours, every Member is entitled to an additional 5 minutes to discuss proposed amendments to this bill under the 5-minute rule. The Rules Committee has done everything in its power to guarantee a fair hearing for this bill—including a waiver of points of order against the bill.

If this bill passes the House, there is a provision in the rule to take the Senate bill from the Speaker's table and to strike from it all after the enacting clause. The language of the House bill will then be substituted for the language in the Senate bill. The Senate bill will then be passed.

There were some serious questions in the minds of some of the Members of the Rules Committee on the advisability of enacting this proposed legislation, but nevertheless, they voted unanimously to send the bill to the floor. I, personally,

am against the bill, for reasons which I will explain in a moment—but I voted to send this bill to the floor so that every Member of the House would have his chance to speak on it.

Whether you are in favor of the aid proposed in this bill—or against it—I hope you will vote for this resolution and submit the question to the membership of the House.

And now I will give you my personal opinion of the bill.

This bill is cited as the Interim Aid Act of 1947. The interim contemplated is from the passage of this bill, if it is passed, until the approval by Congress of the so-called Marshall plan. It must be obvious to all of you that the passage of this bill will be interpreted by many as tantamount to the passage of the Marshall plan when it comes before the House. I think it is wise, therefore, to consider the merits of the Marshall plan itself before deciding on this bill providing interim aid.

I believe that our first consideration should be whether our national economy can stand the strain of a foreign relief program of a magnitude and extending over the long period of time contemplated in the Marshall plan. The strain on our national economy should be considered both from the standpoint of our immediate ability to produce and with a view to the exhaustion of our natural resources in years to come. If, in either case, it is determined that our economy cannot stand the strain or that our people will be seriously handicapped by the proposed foreign aid, I think we have no alternative but to defeat this bill. A number of reports have been made concerning the impact on our national economy of the proposed aid. Four of these reports have been made at the request of the President, and one by the Special Committee on Foreign Aid appointed by this House. There is considerable divergence in the findings and recommendations of these different committees and it is understandable that some Members may not be able to resolve in their own minds whether or not this Nation can afford the extent of aid contemplated. I personally believe we cannot.

If, however, it is decided that the strain on our economy will not be unbearable, the next question which rises concerns the advisability of making these loans and grants. That is, will our national interests be served or is there a possibility, or a probability, that all we give in the way of aid may eventually be used against us in one way or another.

The foreign aid contemplated in this bill is largely in the form of commodities: Wheat, fertilizers, coal, steel and steel products, petroleum, and timber. Supplying these commodities will certainly have some effect upon our domestic economy, and to study this problem, four committees were appointed. The Krug committee, the Harriman committee, and the Nourse committee were appointed by the President—and the Special Committee on Foreign Aid was appointed by the House of Representatives.

It is apparent that the Krug report was tailor-made to justify, or to ra-

tionalize, the Marshall plan. The reason for this is too obvious, and further explanation is unnecessary, but it is interesting to note that even the Krug report implies that the proposed foreign aid will be a strain on our economy, and that commodity allocations and price controls will be necessary in this country if the plan goes into effect. Now to my way of thinking, if we are so short of supplies at home that we cannot go into this foreign-aid program without increasing prices, or without price controls and allocations, then we cannot afford loans to Europe. The strain on our economy would be too great.

In regard to our ability to supply Europe's needs for wheat, the report of the Herter committee points out that a very serious shortage of wheat in this country next year is now a probability. The report also states that—

Any increased food-export program beyond 1947, unless underpinned by unexpected abundant production and conservation of supplies, would undoubtedly be a significant factor in further rises in the cost of living.

On the basis of the report of the Herter committee, it should be obvious that shipments of wheat for European relief in the amounts contemplated would be a severe strain on our domestic economy.

The Paris report of the Council for European Economic Cooperation also drafted heavy demands on this country for fertilizer. In his testimony before the Senate Appropriations Committee on November 24, Secretary of Agriculture Anderson said that our fertilizer supplies "will not be sufficient to meet all farmers' requirements." I am certain that those of you who know the problems of our farmers would not be willing to send fertilizer abroad that is needed so desperately by our own farmers.

The situation is about the same in regard to steel. The report of the Herter committee points out that honoring the European demands would impose a staggering deficit on the consumers of steel in the United States. It would raise our existing deficit of steel—amounting to 1,600,000 net tons—to 5,000,000 net tons. Further, the contemplated exports of steel raises a question of the increased rate of exhaustion of our irreplaceable natural resources.

Now, all of these reports—the Krug report, the Harriman report, the Nourse report, the Anderson report, and the Herter report—they all agree that the European-aid program contemplated in this bill will increase the cost of living in the United States and most of the reports recommend price controls and rationing to meet the increased prices. I would like to talk for just a moment about price control.

All of the reports on the needs of Europe point out that the farmers in European countries have food, but that they will not send it to the cities because there is nothing for which they can exchange it. In other words, there is no incentive for the farmers to sell their food. On the other hand, the workers in the city will not work and produce because there is no food in the markets for which they can exchange the result

of their labors. There is no incentive for the workers in the cities to produce. Europe has suffered great dislocations due to war, but the fundamental causes of today's economic distress in Europe are found in government policies that have stifled initiative, controlled enterprise, upset currencies, and disrupted production. They have suffered, in short, from supergovernmentalism.

Human beings are much the same throughout the world. They will not work and produce without incentive. In the not too far distant past, we had in this country about the same problem Europe now faces. People could not get meat; there was a shortage in the market of all types of food. The housing program for veterans was lagging. Production of nearly everything was restricted. Price controls had removed the incentive to produce. Farmers would withhold from the markets all the produce that could be stored and they kept cattle grazing rather than sell below cost. OPA had removed the incentive. Manufacturers and producers of all types refused to get back into production because they feared the arbitrament of the OPA. There was no incentive to produce.

Here, then, is our present situation with regard to aiding Europe. If we send the aid contemplated, it will reduce supplies in this country and increase prices. To avoid an increase in prices, the administration recommends price controls and rationing. If we provide price controls and rationing, we restrict production by removing incentive. The restricted production will make it impossible to fulfill the commitments made to Europe in this bill, and will reduce the economic level of the United States to that of the countries this bill proposes to aid.

To my way of thinking, any measure which would lead this country so near to the brink of economic collapse should meet the determined opposition of every Member of this House.

In addition to the strain the proposed aid would impose on our domestic economy, we should also consider whether the aid might eventually be used against us in one way or another. For example, if we lend this money, and ship the steel and equipment to build up the productive capacity of industry in these European countries, might they not be riper fruit in the eyes of Russia. If Russia should occupy these countries, which are virtually defenseless, the industrial plants built with our money might be used to manufacture the implements of war for Russia to use against us. But if Russia should detour from the path to war—which I pray she will—the proposed aid can injure the interests of the United States in another way. The industrial capacity we have built up in these foreign countries will flood the world market with manufactured goods which would inevitably compete for the export markets with producers in the United States.

We are now about to embark upon a discussion of a plan which may change the whole history of the world for the next hundred years—a plan which may bankrupt this Nation, or destroy it by

exhausting our irreplaceable natural resources. If we pass this bill, we may commit ourselves, in the eyes of the world, to the so-called Marshall plan. And, as I have tried to point out, that plan may be the path from which there is no turning back.

Mr. Speaker, of course there is some merit to this bill. There is some merit to every bill introduced in Congress. Some people are for every bill. They are for the biggest army in the world, the biggest navy in the world, the biggest air force in the world. They are for spending billions of dollars for atomic-bomb development. They say they are for the British loan of \$3,750,000,000, for the Greek-Turkey loan of \$450,000,000. They say they favor flood control. They say they favor Federal aid to school teachers, and Federal aid to airports, and Federal aid to roads. They say they are for all the bills which provide around \$10,000,000,000 to take care of our disabled veterans. They are of course for paying the interest upon our national debt. They say they are for universal military training. As I say, they are for everything which totals more money than all the people in this Nation make; yet at the same time those people who favor all those gigantic expenditures demand that Congress live within its income, that taxes be reduced.

Mr. Speaker, there are many reasons why I am against this bill, the first being my belief that the United States cannot stand the strain of all these drains upon its national economy. Scarcity makes high prices of timber, steel, meat, wheat, fertilizer, machinery, and all basic commodities. When we take those things which are scarce and very high priced and send them out of this country, naturally the people of this country are going to have to pay more.

Since the start of the last war the United States has given to foreign countries \$66,000,000,000 worth of goods, \$66,000,000,000. This means we have given them goods to the extent of over a thousand dollars for every employed person in the United States. I believe no one will contend that the \$66,000,000,000 is not the chief factor in the present high prices now existing in this country. Everyone knows that if we continue through this bill of a few hundred million dollars and through the Marshall plan which is still to be presented to us and which will cost more than \$20,000,000,000, prices will go still higher.

Mr. Speaker, the proponents of this bill say they favor it from a humanitarian viewpoint. Many of them say that since we granted relief to Greece to the tune of several hundred millions of dollars things have improved there. Naturally no one will deny it. One can go to Greece or any other country where living conditions are bad and pour in food and improve conditions in that country. You can take an underprivileged person off the streets of Washington, someone who does not have food to eat or clothes to wear, give him something to eat and something to wear, and his condition will be improved.

I took this up with my good friend the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. Judd] yesterday in the Rules Committee. You

will note that this bill provides \$60,000,000 for China, \$600,000,000 divided amongst 600,000,000 people amounts to 10 cents a person for China. I believe it was mentioned there, whether by my good friend from Minnesota or someone else, that out of this \$60,000,000, this 10 cents apiece to the people of China, they were going to raise the standard of living in China, they were going to fight communism with it, they were going to build up their industries. They were going to do all those things with an amount of money that represents only 10 cents for each person in China. So I would say that before you vote for this proposition you should go into that matter.

Then my good friend the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. Eaton] said yesterday that Russia could take over Europe in 24 hours. We could ask him whether this small amount allotted, the \$500,000,000 allotted under this bill, if given to the countries of western Europe would stop Russia from taking over Europe within 24 hours. In other words, Mr. Speaker, in my opinion, this is not a proposition of a few hundred millions of dollars.

It is stated that we want to raise the standard of living of the undernourished over there. After all it hurts a baby in India, a baby in South Africa just as much to starve to death as a baby in Holland or Denmark. If we want to go into this thing, if we feel that we here in the United States have to feed the world, that we have some moral obligation to do so, I say we must go into all those countries. In order to raise the standard of living of all the people throughout this world, in order to build up the industries all over the world, in order to stop communism throughout the world, we have a \$200,000,000,000 proposition extending over the next 10 years.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. RANKIN. I have been told by Members of the House that none of the countries that this money is to be supplied to are as greatly in debt per capita as the United States. Is that true?

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. That is my opinion.

Mr. RANKIN. Then why should they not extend their credit to get food for their own people instead of asking us to further burden the overburdened taxpayers of the United States?

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. MASON. The \$260,000,000,000 debt of the United States is more than the total national debt of every country in Europe, including Russia.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. JUDD. Inasmuch as the gentleman mentioned my name, I am sure he will be glad to have the House informed also that I specifically said I did not think this bill could be justified just on a humanitarian basis.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. That is true and I want to say here that I have the greatest respect for your truthfulness and ability.

Mr. JUDD. And I said I believe that it is justified solely on concern for the national defense of the United States.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. That is true. The gentleman will remember, however, that the gentleman from New Jersey, Dr. EATON, said Russia could take over Europe in 24 hours. Does the gentleman believe the amount we are allotting those three countries would stop Russia from doing that? How much does the gentleman think it would require for us to put these European countries in a position where Russia could not take them over in 24 hours or take them over at any time for that matter?

Mr. JUDD. I can answer only in terms of possible alternatives. I do not know that a bill of this sort will tide them over even until April 1. But I am dead certain that Greece and Italy and France would already be under Communist control, if it had not been for the stand the United States took last spring in two acts of this sort in support of peoples striving to remain free. I think that once we can reverse the trend toward communism, and I think our action probably has reversed the trend, then there can and will be a progressive decrease in communism over there. Our action will not solve their problems but can give the people the opportunity to build up the recuperative forces in their own countries. If they are given hope and help they can stay free. They want to survive the same as everybody else does.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. I know the gentleman is a great authority on China. Now, \$60,000,000 is about 10 cents an individual over there. Does the gentleman think we can raise the standard of living, build their industries and stop communism in China for \$60,000,000?

Mr. JUDD. No, and I have never made any such contention, as the gentleman well knows.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Then what is the purpose of this bill so far as China is concerned?

Mr. JUDD. The purpose of the bill is first to give the Chinese at long last some hope; second, to declare a policy of support which should lead our Government to make available to China certain surplus commodities, especially munitions, in the United States or the Pacific islands, supplies which they desperately need in order to survive, and which will not cost us 1 cent; third, to help them balance their international payments and stabilize their currency so that they can begin to get their economy going again. There are many problems in China, but next to the military the single biggest one is the problem of their inflated currency. They cannot cure it without help. It would require only \$200,000,000 to redeem all the trillions of Chinese dollars now in circulation. You could buy it all up for \$200,000,000.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Well, all of this was known some time back. It was known more than 10 days ago that Chinese currency was not worth much.

Mr. JUDD. Yes, and, as the gentleman also knows, I have tried ever since VJ-day to get our country to stand by the Chinese in peace as they stood by us in war. One reason for their present condition is because they followed our advice and urging, and continued to fight and bleed themselves white instead of making terms with the Japanese which would have enabled them to eliminate their internal enemy, the Communists. Instead they concentrated on their external enemy and ours, Japan, allowing the Communists to expand. Then after Japan was defeated, we wouldn't help them with the internal enemy.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. COLE of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. COLE of Missouri. Last week I heard a news commentator state that the countries of Europe had some \$26,000,000,000 in securities here in the United States. Would it not be well for those countries to liquidate some of those securities rather than for us to dig down into the taxpayers' pockets to put money over there?

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. I agree with the gentleman.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HOFFMAN. The gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. JUDD] said that in his opinion—if I understood him correctly—\$60,000,000 would not prevent the Communists from taking over China. Well now, if that is true, what is the use of putting it over there? Is it for the purpose of fattening them and making it worth while for the Communists to take over? Is that what you want to do?

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. In regard to this Communist question, here is my opinion, that we are going to hear a great deal about communism, and I think that there are many people in foreign countries who are going to meet that assertion with the cry that "if you do not continue to help us, we are going to go Communist." That is their ever-threatening attitude and it will always be until we say, "Start doing something for yourselves."

I will say, in conclusion, that this Nation owes \$258,000,000,000. Fortunately, our national income is great, whereby, in fact, we can pay and just about keep even. But maybe that is not going to be true forever. Maybe a time will come when we are not going to have a national income of \$200,000,000,000. Maybe the time will come when we cannot tax the people more money than it costs them to eat. I say in conclusion, to protect and feed and clothe the nations of the world and to stop communism, it is not this kind of money that will do it. We must decide whether we want to pay \$200,000,000,000 in the next 10 years, and in my opinion, with a \$258,000,000,000 debt, we cannot spend that kind of money.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. WALTER. Does not the gentleman feel that the aid proposed under this measure to be given to France will bolster Premier Schuman in the heroic efforts which he is now making to stabilize that country?

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. I will say in answer to that that after giving \$66,000,000,000 to them, that this amount of money will not stabilize, build their industries and feed them or stop communism in any two or three nations.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. I yield.

Mr. MASON. Since hostilities ceased in Europe we have given France over \$2,000,000,000, and France is now in worse shape than she was at the close of the war, and communism has a stronger hold upon France today in spite of that \$2,000,000,000 than it had 2 years ago when it was turned over.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. MONRONEY. The gentleman used the figure of \$66,000,000,000 several times. Will the gentleman tell the House how much of that was lend-lease which represented weapons in the hands of foreign soldiers to prevent the loss of life of American soldiers?

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. I will say this, that the war will cost the United States about a trillion dollars before we get through. We already gave, outside of operating this war, \$66,017,790,335.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. I yield.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Well, now, in the President's message he asked that we do something about inflation. If we give away all the money we can rake and scrape together to these foreign countries and provide that they spend it outside the United States, will that not help create inflation here because our people will not have anything to buy with?

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. I agree with the gentleman. Of course, this bill will pass, and I predict that about every 3 months we will have other similar bills before us costing billions of dollars for foreign relief. Again I say, our national economy cannot stand it and that we should not dissipate the wealth accumulated through generations by such men as Armour and Swift in the field of packing, Carnegie and Schwab in the field of steel, Morse and Bell in the field of communication, Ford and Chrysler in the field of transportation, Hill and Gould in the field of railways.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. Cox].

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, the first thing we have to realize and the country made to know is that Russia is waging everything but a shooting war against us. It is fine to talk about extending relief for humanitarian reasons, but we cannot justify this bill upon those grounds alone. This is an investment in national security.

I am not disposed to quarrel with gentlemen who find it impossible to give

their support to the bill, because I can understand that there are many, many reasons why people should entertain doubts with reference to its efficacy. I am not even going to venture the opinion that the bill will accomplish the results we desire and so badly need. But I will say that, in the light of existing conditions, it is a gamble that we are compelled to take.

I find fault with the administration of the relief programs which we have heretofore set up. I find fault with the way we have carried on in Europe since the fighting war ended. In my opinion, the Morgenthau plan was completely insane, that it has brought down upon us many miseries, and is in part responsible for the sorry plight in which the country finds itself. We are now undertaking to rescue ourselves from the prison which we ourselves built. That we will succeed I do not know, but do fervently hope and pray. The most awful sin committed thus far against humanity in all time has been our appeasement of Russia. We took Russia as a third- or second-class nation and deliberately built her into a monster that now has the entire world trembling in its boots.

I was one of the Members of this body who went to Europe in the sincere desire to acquaint myself with existing conditions and to make honest report of what I found. I came back with the feeling that our chief asset in that part of the world is the spiritual will of broken, wrecked, and starving Germany to survive. All of Europe is in a critical attitude toward the United States. The British are quarrelsome and the French are ungrateful. I never found in any place I went the slightest evidence of appreciation for America except in wrecked Germany. I know that it is unpopular to say it, but the truth ought to be made known, and the truth is that if Germany, in all of its misery and woe and hunger and nakedness, should break and turn to the east there is no power this side of heaven to keep all of western Europe from following.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COX. I yield.

Mr. BLOOM. With all due respect to the gentleman's speech, I cannot allow that statement to go by with reference to the Germans, the French, and the other countries of Europe.

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman will have time to make answer.

Mr. BLOOM. I know, but at this point I want to say I object to that.

Mr. COX. I want to say to the gentleman that the people who think as he thinks are in the main responsible for the misery and the woe which comes down upon us at the moment.

Let me say to you at this point that unless there is to be a change of attitude and a change of mind on the part of the people who will spend this money, then you had as well pour it down the rat hole.

The people who have been thinking for us—the thinking of the people who have been administering relief programs—has not been too different or too far apart from the thinking of the people we are now undertaking to stop. Let me say to you, my friends, that Russia is every-

where. There is no spot on this globe inhabited by man but that Russia is there, promoting discord, preaching revolution, and making war against the liberty and peace of this world. You may question whether Europe wants to stand with America. I think she would like to, but Europe is old and sick and afraid. The governments of western Europe are all concessions to Russia, and they are made so because they live in mortal fear of Russia. So it would not be difficult for the British, for the French, for the Italians to turn to the east. If the will of Germany to survive should break, they will turn to the east, and it would only be a matter of time when we would be completely encircled by Russia because Asia would fall.

Let me say to you, my colleagues, as mighty and as powerful as the United States is, we cannot successfully contend, either in trade or in war, with an angry and hostile world organized against us. Our policy in Europe has not been consistent. We build with one hand and destroy with the other. We talk against communism and then we help it. Certainly here after the shooting war ended we could cease cutting the throats of people we so badly need in our resistance of Russia.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COX. I yield.

Mr. RANKIN. The gentleman says that this is a war proposition.

Mr. COX. I do.

Mr. RANKIN. I am not quarreling with his conclusion. But if that is the case, had we not better turn the atomic bomb back to our military authorities, keep an ample supply on hand, and build the strongest air force on earth, and let the world know that we are prepared to take care of America at home before we attempt to take care of those countries abroad?

Mr. COX. Let me say to my friend that in the joint enterprise with Russia we acted in good faith. Russia betrayed us at every turn. At the moment it is known by everyone that knows anything, that Russia is feverishly preparing for war. Yet, in spite of that knowledge, we continue in the insane enterprise of destroying a people whom we badly need in resisting the aggression of Russia. Does the gentleman understand me?

Mr. COUDERT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COX. Yes, I yield.

Mr. COUDERT. The gentleman has made it perfectly plain, as did his colleague the gentleman from Minnesota, Dr. Judd, that this is primarily a war measure, in the "cold" war with Russia, and he has most eloquently stated the situation. May I ask the gentleman a question? The gentleman states that this measure now before the House is intended as a measure to stop Russian aggression in western Europe. Now that aggression has taken violent and critical form at the present moment in the civil wars now raging in France and in Italy, how far is the gentleman prepared to go or to have the United States go at this time pursuant to its avowed policy of stopping Russian aggression everywhere, in sustaining existing governments in

France and Italy, whose lives are definitely put in jeopardy by the civil wars promoted by the Communists in those countries?

Mr. COX. Let me answer the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN] first. There is no power anywhere that could prevent Russia taking all of Europe within a week's time. Russia can take Europe without the firing of a gun, so afraid are the people of the countries of western Europe. The only influence that stopped Stalin in making the final blow, insofar as Europe is concerned, is fear of the atomic bomb.

Mr. Speaker, I should like to make the observation that up to this moment World War II has been fought for Russia and for Russia alone.

We had just as well make up our minds that if we are not willing to treat this as defensive warfare we would be very much wiser did we keep our money at home and try as best we can to preserve the strength and the might of our own country.

Mr. COUDERT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COX. Yes; I yield.

Mr. COUDERT. The gentleman now says that there is nothing that can stop Russia from seizing all of western Europe in 24 hours. If that be so, obviously this measure cannot stop them. I wonder, therefore, if it is not really the fact that the only realistic justification of this measure is primarily humanitarian and only in the long view national security.

Mr. COX. What we are by this measure undertaking to do is to enable western Europe to carry on. To let her know that our appeasement of Russia has ended and that we are determined and prepared to use all the force and power that we can command to see that the entire world is not stuffed into the already overgorged belly of Russia.

I think that the putting of China in the bill was a very wise thing to have done, because I agree with the viewpoint of the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. Judd], who is the special pleader for China in this body.

Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from New York wishes to know just how far we are prepared to go in our endeavor to help France and Italy. Let me say to you, realizing that we are in warfare with Russia, or at least Russia is waging warfare against us which we are now seeking to defend, that in the hope, in the endeavor, in the purpose and desire of preserving our country we will go just as far as is humanly possible to sustain the forces, the peoples that we need in our resistance to the further advancement of Russian power and influence.

Mr. COUDERT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for one more question in that same connection?

Mr. COX. I yield.

Mr. COUDERT. There is an immediate crisis confronting us. Is the gentleman prepared to go to the point, if the courageous and embattled Governments of the present French Republic or Italian Republic should be in jeopardy, to send American troops to maintain them in power?

Mr. COX. Let me say to my friend that if a million American soldiers could

turn up in Germany tomorrow it would insofar as security is concerned be worth all the billions we could provide.

What is troubling Europe is the fear of being absorbed by Russia. We need to take a firm stand so as to strengthen the morale of European peoples.

Mr. BUSBEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COX. I yield to my friend.

Mr. BUSBEY. I think the gentleman from Georgia has made a very fine statement of this situation. I believe the Members of this body and the people of the United States as a whole are fully aware of the crisis of events in the world and particularly Europe, but I am wondering if the gentleman from Georgia would not discuss for a few minutes before he leaves the floor the causes that led up to this situation, that put us in this predicament, and who is responsible for it?

Mr. COX. I do not know that it would profit anyone anything for me to particularize further as to the reasons for this distress in which we find ourselves. At the moment we ought to find it possible to forgive and to forget. This is an American question. The call is to America and to the cause every one should rally, even though it means the suppression of an angry dissatisfaction with the people who heretofore have been carrying on. I do want to say to you now, and this is repeating what I have already said, that unless we find people of a new mind and a changed attitude to administer these relief programs, you better forget the whole question. That would mean our withdrawing from Europe, and that would mean that Europe would go communistic. It means that Russia would soon encircle us and that would mean it would be only a matter of time before liberty would perish from the face of this earth.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COX. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. RANKIN. In reply to our distinguished colleague from Illinois [Mr. BUSBEY] I call attention to the fact that this situation was probably created by a superabundance of international moon-gazers in both Houses who have not been realistic enough to realize that we had better look out for our own defenses and our own country first.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COX. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. CHURCH. Could the gentleman use his influence to stop his administration from shipping the present shipments that are going on to Russia?

Mr. COX. If the gentleman seriously thinks I have any influence, I am afraid he is overgenerous. I do want to say that there is nothing more shocking to the American people and to a large part of the membership of this House than that we should be shipping implements of war and other supplies to the country that is waging war against us. I make that statement in complete disregard of the political effect of what I say. I know that it is wrong, I know it is hurtful to America, and I make that declaration re-

gardless of whoever may seek to defend such practices.

Mr. CHURCH. The Members of the House know the gentleman's influence, his strong position as a member of the Rules Committee. The Congress is being asked by the administration for this measure. Cannot the gentleman use his influence to stop this practice to which I referred?

Mr. COX. I am afraid that the gentleman has no influence in that respect.

Mr. Speaker, this is a serious moment. We are taking the first step in an enterprise which if it succeeds then liberty lives, America carries on; if it fails, everything is lost. The whole world will be Russianized. I approach the whole question in a prayerful sort of attitude.

Mr. BUFFETT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COX. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. BUFFETT. The gentleman from Georgia makes out a very strong case for this new outpouring of American funds. I am wondering if he is prepared to vote for price controls which will prevent a further inflation in this country as a result of this new outpouring of our money?

Mr. COX. I am for anything and I am for everything that is necessary to the salvation of my country.

Mr. BUFFETT. Does the gentleman think that that answers the question?

Mr. COX. It is the best answer that I can give the gentleman.

Mr. BUFFETT. I was not being in any way facetious.

Mr. COX. I know, of course, that the gentleman was not.

Mr. BUFFETT. I felt, through a study of the problem, that inflation is the surest road to communism. Lenin himself declared that the surest way to overturn an existing social order was to debase the currency. We have been on that road a long time now. We are still on that road.

I wonder how we are going to stop communism at home if we cannot solve our economic problem. This is a part of it.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COX. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. RANKIN. The gentleman has made a very fine and very forceful and very courageous statement. If we are going to fight communism abroad, had we not first better get it out of this country and suppress its activities in our educational institutions, in our Government, motion pictures, radio, and other activities that tend to strengthen that atheistic ideology throughout the country?

Mr. COX. Of course, the honest answer to the gentleman's question is "Yes." It is the people whose thinking has not been too different from that of the group that the gentleman from Mississippi refers to who are responsible in the main for the position in which we find ourselves.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COX. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. I meant to go into the question of UNRRA. The proponents of this bill, a short time ago after we gave about 72 percent of the money amounting to billions of dollars to UNRRA, had certain utopian dreams of what was going to happen. We were going to have a perfect world. Will the gentleman tell us what he thinks about UNRRA?

Mr. COX. The gentleman knows as well as I that UNRRA's record has not been perfect. I think I can go further and agree with him that the record of UNRRA has been bad. Let me make this last statement.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COX. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. I want to congratulate the gentleman from Georgia on the fine statement that he has made. I thoroughly agree with him that Russia is in a position to take western Europe, and the reason that Russia does not take western Europe is on account of our atomic energy. The one thing for us to do today is to help the people of western Europe, who are down and out, to get on their feet before Russia has time to build war machines similar to ours.

Mr. COX. The gentleman is eminently correct.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. This is a battle in which both parties should fight together. The question of who is responsible for bringing about our present condition is not so pertinent at this time—the question of responsibility might be pertinent next November, but not now. We must pull together to save our country.

Mr. COX. I want to thank the gentleman. I take that view. His statement reflects the feeling that I think everyone should have.

Let me make this statement. If this money is to be used to sustain some of the governments of western Europe, to further pursue policies which have contributed to the distress of western Europe and of the world, then I think it would be a mistake to make the grant. Therefore, I very strongly urge the support of the conditions attached to the grant which are provided in the bill.

This is the first step of a long program. In the setting up of a program for the long plan I think it would be tragic not to provide an entirely new organization responsible to the Congress and the President. We must make certain that we are not providing the plume to fledge the shaft that Russia will return to seal our doom.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. HERTER].

Mr. HERTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise on this matter both in support of the rule and in support of the bill. As the chairman of the Committee on Rules has stated, the rule is a very generous one from the point of view of time, in that it allows a full 12 hours of general debate, during which I hope many of the problems that are disturbing, and quite rightly disturbing, Members of the House

with respect to the program it makes in order will be gone into in great detail.

With respect to the bill that will be taken up if this rule is adopted, I think the Committee on Foreign Affairs should be congratulated on having done a very conscientious and very thorough job, fully documented, in bringing out the type of legislation they have produced. Personally, I would wish to see a different type of bill. I say that only because I feel very strongly that if we are going to continue foreign-aid programs on anything like the scale that might be indicated by the world situation, the sooner we can set up a piece of administrative machinery in which we have real confidence, so that the American dollar can be used to the very best advantage, the better it will be not only for ourselves but for recipient countries. However, as far as this bill is concerned, it is designed to meet what is in effect an emergency situation, an emergency situation brought about by two things: First, a terrifically severe winter last year in northern Europe, followed by a drought such as Europe had not seen in the last 100 years, thereby reducing very materially northern Europe's indigenous food supply. Second, the resources which the nations—particularly Italy, Austria, and France—might have had available to them in prewar times with which to meet this particular catastrophe are not available to them. They have come to the end of their dollar resources.

The purpose of this bill is to make it possible for those nations during an interim period of time to secure enough food to keep their people even at the low-ration level they are now on and to get enough fuel so that they may maintain their industries without mass unemployment and the resultant social dislocations that come from mass unemployment.

The details of this bill will be gone into during the period of general debate, so I do not want to address myself to those now. I do want to address myself to one phase of this relief or reconstruction operation that I think is very generally misunderstood.

There have been questions asked as to the effect of this program upon our own price level in the United States. They are entirely fair questions.

I fully agree with every Member of this House who feels our primary responsibility is to maintain our own economy on a strong and high level. I think there is a very general lack of knowledge as to where this European relief program fits into the over-all picture. Let me cite some figures. In the first quarter of 1947, the second quarter of 1947, and the third quarter of 1947 we exported from the United States at a rate averaging better than \$19,000,000,000 per year. That is the rate at which we exported to all the nations of the world. The area of the 16 nations of Europe which met in Paris last summer received about one-third of that total. In other words, these nations who are running out of dollars with which to buy their raw material and food requirements received less than one-third of the total exports which went out of the United States during that 9 months' period. The rest went to

Canada, Australia, New Zealand, Cuba, Mexico, Central America, South America, South Africa, India, and so on.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HERTER. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Is it not a fact that most of the food which was exported went to the western European countries during that period?

Mr. HERTER. Yes; I am coming to that item in just a moment.

Mr. BELL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. HERTER. I am very glad to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. BELL. Does the gentleman have any figures on how much of those exports went to Russia or her satellites during that period?

Mr. HERTER. No; I cannot give the gentleman the exact proportion, but I hope I can give the full break-down on that as well as the commodity break-downs before debate on this bill is over.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HERTER. I am glad to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. LODGE. The break-down on these figures is in the hearings on page 124, I believe, if my recollection serves me. Mr. Harriman gave us the figures on the amount sent to Russia and the satellite countries.

Mr. HERTER. Was that the amount for the year 1946 or the first 9 months of 1947?

Mr. LODGE. For 1946 and the first 9 months of 1947.

Mr. HERTER. I know that the figures were given for the amounts, but I am also trying to get them by commodities. The reason I am emphasizing that point is that in many cases we in the Congress have been accused of being responsible for inflation because of the amount of money we have voted for foreign relief. It is not the money for foreign relief, assuming that one bases inflation entirely upon the foreign demand, that is responsible for this. During the war period we spent a great many dollars in a great many areas of the world. Those dollars were spent abroad and could not in turn be used for the purchase of goods, because during the war period we were unable to supply goods. Those dollars are now coming back to the United States and are purchasing goods in this country. It is that accumulation, the war accumulation of dollars, that is responsible for the export phase of our inflationary cycle.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HERTER. I yield.

Mr. HALLECK. Before we recessed last summer, the President asked us to extend the authority to limit exports. My recollection is we granted that authority. Is it not true that these exports which have been going to countries outside of the so-called aid or need area might have been controlled and curtailed by the President and his administration if they had seen fit to do so?

Mr. HERTER. The gentleman is quite correct. That is just the point that I was coming to.

We extended export controls last year. That export control power was without any limitation whatsoever. It allowed the President through the Secretary of Commerce to control all exports from the United States by administrative fiat.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HERTER. I am glad to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. CHURCH. And that authority is unlimited yet, is it not?

Mr. HERTER. That is still unlimited. The power expires in February 1948, but I am hopeful that it will be extended, if not strengthened.

Mr. ROBSION. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HERTER. I yield.

Mr. ROBSION. Does that power extend to exports going to Russia?

Mr. HERTER. It applies to all exports from the United States, regardless of the commodity or the quantity or use to which it is to be put. It seems to me that that point must be emphasized, because today we are beginning debate on a bill which takes up only a very small segment of the over-all problem, and a segment of this over-all problem that to my mind is very definitely in our interest to fulfill.

The committee with which I was privileged to be associated this summer had three subcommittees, dealing with three of the countries which are involved in this bill. One on France and the Low Countries, headed by the distinguished gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. WOLVERTON]; another dealing with Italy, Greece, and Trieste, headed by the distinguished gentleman from Ohio [Mr. JENKINS]; and a third which dealt with the Austrian problem, as well as the German problem, headed by the distinguished gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. CASE].

Insofar as the first two of those subcommittees are concerned, they worked day and night when they returned to this country to make an analysis of the problems within those countries, particularly France and Italy, because we knew we would be called upon to report on those two countries in connection with this program.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. HERTER] has expired.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman the balance of the time.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman is recognized for 4 minutes.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HERTER. I yield.

Mr. RANKIN. I think I understood the gentleman to speak about this power of the President to curtail shipments abroad. The gentleman's party is in power. If they want to stop that authority they have the power to do so.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HERTER. I yield.

Mr. HALLECK. We gave the administration that power at its request, to be executed as an administrative matter. The fact is that the administration did not choose to use it. Hence, I charge,



and I think correctly, that much of the high-price situation in this country today is their responsibility, for failure to exercise export controls that they asked for, and the best evidence of that is that in the last few days, since some of us have been talking about it, the Secretary of Commerce now announces the addition of some 36 items on the export-control list.

Mr. HERTER. The gentleman is absolutely correct, that that export-control power could have been used. If the responsibility for this inflationary situation is being placed on the excessive exports from this country, those could at any time have been controlled during the last 8 or 9 months.

But to return to the reports of these committees on the countries principally involved, those subcommittees, unanimously, and the full committees, unanimously, approving their reports, recommended substantially the degree of aid that is provided for in the bill that has been reported out by the Committee on Foreign Affairs. Our committee consisted of a group of Members representing various different committees in the House who made as conscientious a study as any group could make. The Speaker could not have appointed a better committee than he did, to try to ascertain the truth, and to try to relate what appeared to be the minimum needs of certain foreign nations with what the United States could properly apply to those needs without impairing its domestic economy.

It is for that reason, and based upon those reports, that I feel this present bill that has been brought out by the Committee on Foreign Affairs deserves the most serious and sympathetic consideration.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HERTER. I yield.

Mr. CHURCH. Does the gentleman intend to offer his bill by way of amendment to take care of machinery?

Mr. HERTER. No. I will say to the gentleman that the form of organization which every member of our committee felt ought to be set up in order to give proper administration to relief, is now in the form of a bill before the Foreign Affairs Committee, and I have been advised that hearings will be held on it just as soon as this matter is disposed of.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HERTER. I yield.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. The gentleman referred something to the recommendations by these two subcommittees. Is it not a fact that the committees stated what the requirements would be, without having in mind a special session of Congress and making recommendations?

Mr. HERTER. That is correct. They were an analysis of the over-all figures. On the other hand, these subcommittees pointed out that there were very definite needs. In addition to that there were some real corrections made in the figures on availability within those countries, which I am glad to see the Foreign Affairs Committee has adopted.

I am hoping that in the debate on this matter we are not going to be led astray by a lot of red herrings. The only question before us is whether we are going to give this particular amount of aid and do it both to relieve hunger and unemployment and in our own self-interest, do it in order that we may be able to create a situation in western Europe and perhaps in China which will be beneficial to us from the point of view of maintaining friends under free governments.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has expired; all time has expired.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. EATON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 4604) to promote world peace and the general welfare, national interest, and foreign policy of the United States by providing aid to certain foreign countries.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 4604) providing emergency foreign aid, with Mr. MICHENER in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. EATON] is recognized for 6 hours, and the gentleman from New York [Mr. BLOOM] for 6 hours.

The gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. EATON. Mr. Chairman, I wish to make an announcement—and I hope everyone will pay attention to this—as to the time. On this side we have 6 hours. I have decided—and apparently it has met with the acquiescence of my folks—that we will divide this time—half to the proponents of the bill, of whom I am one, and half to the opponents. I hope now and pray that no one this time will accuse me of trying to keep any of my distinguished colleagues from expressing themselves upon the floor of the House.

We are going to allot this time as Members come here and ask for it—first come, first served; and I am going to ask now my dear friend the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN]—

Mr. HOFFMAN. Very dear friend.

Mr. EATON. My very dear friend, who was greatly grieved last time over the matter—

Mr. HOFFMAN. And I still am—

Mr. EATON. How much time he wishes.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Three minutes.

Mr. EATON. The gentleman wants 3 minutes. Thank God for the shortness of the period.

I have one further announcement before we proceed with the program. My beloved friend from Minnesota, who is a

great expert on food and who has probably consumed his full portion of it in his time, arranged to speak for half an hour under a special order; but since, so the RECORD said, the only person he had to hear him was the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] he decided that the gentleman needed no further illumination on the subject and he asked to be transferred to this program. So, after I introduce my distinguished colleague at my right to explain this bill I am then going to put the gentleman from Minnesota on for 15 minutes on the proponents' side and 15 minutes on the opponents' side so that he will have a chance to do what most of us are now doing on this subject, face north and south.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EATON. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Chairman, I wish to make the same announcement that the gentleman from New Jersey has just made. The time on this side will be divided the same way, one-half to the opponents and the other half to the proponents of the bill. May I say also that the Members who wish to speak on one side or the other should immediately ask for time, so we will know how to arrange it.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EATON. With pleasure.

Mr. HOFFMAN. The gentleman said he is going to divide the time equally. Then he said he would yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota, to be used on one side, then 15 on the other. Is he going to divide it that way or is he going to charge the 30 minutes up to the opponents of the bill?

Mr. EATON. Only in this particular case on account of the extreme anxiety of the gentleman to give us the full benefit of his views on food.

Mr. HOFFMAN. And our great need for it.

Mr. EATON. And our great need for it. Is the gentleman satisfied?

Mr. HOFFMAN. It is difficult to be satisfied with anything the gentleman states. That is due, perhaps, to my own ignorance.

Mr. EATON. I am glad to have penetrated the Stygian gloom of the gentleman's mind on this subject.

Mr. HOFFMAN. I think I know how I am going to vote, but I have found many times the gentleman did not know.

Mr. EATON. I expect the gentleman will vote for the bill and speak against it.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Well, while many are laughing, may I say that there is not a Member of this House who does not know what my position is. It is always quite clear, even though it might be mistaken. The gentleman may do as do some, speak on one side and vote on the other. The gentleman knows very well I will vote against this bill.

Mr. EATON. I am glad to have that matter cleared up.

Mr. Chairman, I now yield 15 minutes to my distinguished colleague from Ohio [Mr. VORYS] who has, like all the members of our committee, given an immense

amount of time and work in the preparation of this bill, to explain the bill to the House.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, the first point to explain on this bill arises out of this situation: Apparently a substantial majority of the Members of Congress is in favor of doing something on interim aid in the critical situation that faces us, but there are two points of view. One is that whatever we do is all right if this is merely another hunger-and-cold relief emergency bill. The other view is that what we do is all right only if this is part of a long-time policy. I happen to belong to those who hold this latter view.

This is the third emergency relief bill we have had on the floor of Congress in 1947. To go back to what we heard a year ago, I have had enough of emergency relief legislation.

However, this bill resolves this conflict as between those who want merely a short-time proposition that commits us to nothing and a bill that is a part of a long-time proposition, by two provisions in the bill. It is provided in section 12 of the bill, page 8:

This act, however, shall not imply any present or future obligation to give aid to any foreign country, nor shall it imply or guarantee the availability of any specific commodities.

In short, we are promising nothing to anybody by passing this bill. On the other hand, the bill takes care of those who feel that this should be the first step in a longer program by a provision—section 15 on page 10—as follows:

The personnel, records, and funds provided for the purposes of carrying out this act shall be transferred to the administration of any organization for general foreign aid which Congress may provide.

Thus, the bill provides for merger in any long-term program enacted, although it contains no long-term or short-term commitment to any country.

We thus find that the two views are not inconsistent. In the first place, of course, this does deal with a very serious emergency abroad, an emergency precipitated not only by war devastation, not only by unprecedented weather conditions, freezing last winter, and a terrific drought this year that made crop failures all over western Europe, but an emergency deliberately precipitated by Communist infiltration and action. So there is an emergency.

On the other hand, we realize that any long-term program must consider the situation that we find at the time in these countries and at home, and must not bleed this country white, and therefore any long-term program must be flexible enough to take care of the immediate situation in this country as well as the current situation in other countries.

On page 5 of the hearings Secretary Marshall, in discussing the long-term program, brought out this point:

The program of United States support will achieve its objective only if it is kept responsive to changing situations and varying supply conditions.

So, those who feel that by doing something here Congress is committing itself to a long-term program in which it will

tie its hands in advance need have no fear. The Secretary of State does not intend to recommend such a program, and if he does, I predict that no committee of this House would bring such a program to the floor. Any long-term plan must provide for periodical review of our resources, and foreign performance as well as needs. We will never authorize, appropriate, or commit any gigantic long-term sum all at once.

This is not just a relief proposition for starving people; it is not merely a gift. This bill, in its purpose clause, provides that it is not only to relieve hunger and cold, but also to prevent economic retrogression. There are probably a billion people in the world who are hungrier than the people of France and Italy. I question whether we would be justified solely on the basis of hunger in providing for those two countries at this time.

Let us remember this: We are attempting to keep those countries from economic collapse. This is a balance of payments bill. What do we mean by balance of payments? Suppose a shoemaker has \$20 and he needs \$10 for groceries, \$10 for leather, and \$10 for rent. If we furnish him \$10 for groceries we are making his \$20 available for his other needs. We would arrive at the same result if we paid his rent or if we furnished him his leather to go on with his trade. It is more appealing to us, and it is a great necessity that we furnish food and heat which accounts for about \$484,000,000 out of the amounts in these estimates. But, let us remember that what we are doing is meeting dollar deficits, dollars which are necessary if these countries are not to regress.

This is not a direct gift proposition. If this shoemaker I have mentioned were furnished \$10 for leather but told that he must deposit the proceeds of his shoemaking business to the order of the person who furnished him the \$10, he might be very, very thankful but he would not consider that to be an unconditional gift. Not only are the proceeds of the sales of the so-called relief commodities impounded subject to joint account until June 30, and thereafter to the sole control of the American Congress, but there are ten strings tied to the relief, which you will find in section 5 of this bill. They are strings that those who have been abroad and seen the present relief program operate believe to be necessary to make sure that this relief does not go down the rat hole, that this balance of payments does not leave these countries in the same condition again, that they start to provide for themselves, and that they distribute our relief properly.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VORYS. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I wish the gentleman would clear up that balance of payments proposition, because it was earlier stated, not here but before the committee, that France owes Belgium \$45,000,000 and owes Brazil \$10,000,000. Is it the idea in the balance of payments that we are to provide in this legislation for the payment of those sums to those countries for France?

Mr. VORYS. We do not. I believe the amounts were \$17,000,000 and \$3,000,000. They add up to \$20,000,000 that France owes other countries. France also has obligations to the International Bank. France intends to meet those obligations out of its other dollar availability. None of the money, none of the supplies under this bill, according to the justifications presented by the State Department, are to go for any such purpose. All of the supplies set up as the needs to be met under this bill are within the same classification as the relief supplies which we authorized under Public 84, the relief assistance bill, earlier in the year. But we must not kid ourselves that if we furnish relief supplies these other countries, through their balance of payments, will not meet other items they feel necessary, and in that calculation we are going to use our good influence to have them not spend their dollar availabilities on items we consider unnecessary. However, when we are attempting to preserve the integrity of a foreign nation, we should give due weight to whether or not they should refuse to pay their international obligations.

Mr. COX. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VORYS. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. COX. The gentleman says this is not an outright gift. Did not the gentleman mean to say that it is a gift with conditions attached, that since the entire fund is spent for the benefit of the people to whom the grant is made, not one dime returning to us, it is, in effect, an outright grant?

Mr. VORYS. I think the statement the gentleman made, that it is a gift but with conditions attached, is perhaps as good a description as I gave of it.

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VORYS. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. McDONOUGH. Will the gentleman inform me what constitutional authority the Congress of the United States has to make this appropriation?

Mr. VORYS. We examined into that question, and found that the first time it was raised was in connection with the Japanese earthquake contribution back in 1923, when our Attorney General, belonging to the gentleman's party and mine, passed on it. The question came up first in our committee since I have been here in connection with the so-called Polish relief recommended by ex-President Hoover in 1940, I believe. It was reviewed again twice this year. There is no specific case on the subject, because under the situation, which every lawyer will understand, there is no way in which a case can arise where the precise point can be litigated, but constitutional textbooks and the dicta of judges, like Stone and others, which we had in the memorandum before us, show that when the appropriations are for the general welfare of this country or for its national defense such appropriations are justified. In my judgment, unless every Member of this House feels that this is for the general welfare of his own country and for the defense of his own coun-

try, he is not justified in voting for this bill. I feel that this legislation clearly qualifies under those constitutional requirements.

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VORYS. I yield.

Mr. McDONOUGH. In other words, as I understand it, the gentleman is qualifying the authority of Congress under the Constitution to make this appropriation under the general-welfare clause and the clause for the common defense of the Nation?

Mr. VORYS. That is right. That is my judgment.

Mr. STEVENSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VORYS. I yield.

Mr. STEVENSON. The leader of the Republican Party in the other body, the Senator from Ohio, made the statement that this bill provides \$145,000,000 to pay for imports going to French North Africa. He also made the statement that \$10,000,000 was provided in this bill to pay a debt of France to Brazil, and \$30,000,000 to pay an old debt of France to Belgium. As I understood the gentleman here this morning, he said that that was not correct. Is the Senator from Ohio in error when he made that statement on the floor in the other body?

Mr. VORYS. As I explained, none of the proceeds of this appropriation will go to pay either of those items. But the paying for relief supplies for these countries, relief being in quotations, because the relief definition is quite broad, the paying for relief supplies does make it possible for the country in question to spend its dollar assets to pay other debts.

Mr. JONKMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VORYS. I yield.

Mr. JONKMAN. Will the gentleman explain the difference between balance of payments on the one hand and excess of imports over exports on the other hand?

Mr. VORYS. I think they involve the same things. The balance of dollar payments means that if, for instance, the exports of a country and its other invisible assets, such as tourist travel, income from outside investments, and so forth, are insufficient to produce dollars enough to pay for its necessary imports in dollars, then you have a deficit which causes a deficit balance of dollar payments.

Mr. JONKMAN. Then if the excess of imports included a lot of luxuries, that would depreciate the dollar purchasing power for necessities, would it not?

Mr. VORYS. That is perfectly true, and we certainly should not permit that. We should make arrangements so that these countries do not waste away their dollar availabilities by importing luxuries. So far as the evidence showed, they were not doing that. They were down to hardpan.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Ohio has expired.

Mr. EATON. Mr. Chairman, I yield five additional minutes to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. VORYS. There are three reasons urged for the consideration of this

measure. One is the humanitarian reason, to relieve hunger and cold. I will leave others to dwell on that as, in my judgment, that would be an insufficient reason for taking care of the needs of only three countries, and the partial needs of a fourth country at this time. In addition to the humanitarian reason, there is an economic consideration. If we had conditions of peace and progress, a recovered Europe and a recovered China would be very good customers of ours with whom we could do many, many millions and even billions of dollars of profitable business. Western Europe is never going to be able to produce enough food for itself. It will not be many years before we will have agricultural surpluses. It would be good business for us to have customers who could take off our hands our agricultural surpluses in return for things that we need. China has needs which we can fill with great profit if we had conditions of peace and progress and those countries were recovering.

That brings me to the third consideration. Why is it we do not have conditions of peace? We have involved in this bill a consideration of security, of national defense. For the first time since the end of the war our committee has brought to you the official Army estimates of the strength of the Soviet armed forces and of the free European forces and the satellite forces and our forces. You will find them on pages 12 and 13 of our report. We also show the disposition of those forces. You will find that the Soviets have 99 divisions aimed toward the West. The satellites have a hundred divisions. As opposed to them, there is one American division, the First Infantry Division, in Germany, and 104 divisions of the 12 free European countries. Those figures lead different people to different conclusions. The unquestioned fact that there is the possibility of immediate military aggression makes one group say, "Well, the inevitable is so inevitable, the conquest by military power of Europe and Asia is so clear that the best thing for us to do is to relax and enjoy it and spend billions on countless billions making ourselves militarily strong, isolated here at home." The other viewpoint is taken by those who realize that our first line of defense constitutes the forces of those 104 free European divisions, and that it is quite important not to permit the economies of those free European countries to deteriorate to the place where they can no longer support their necessary defense forces. I believe that is an element involved in this bill.

While I was hundreds of miles behind the iron curtain this fall and realized this overwhelming Soviet military superiority, it kept occurring to me, "Why don't they move? They have the troops on the ground. They could win the fight locally. Why don't they move in?" In studying that question, it seems to me there are just two answers. The answer is not that they love us so much. The answer is not that they hate war so much. The answer is not that they love the European countries. The answer is, one, the atomic bomb, and two, the fear of the tremendous eco-

nomie power of this country, once we launch into full-fledged warfare. Therefore, what should be our policy? Our policy should be not to yield another inch by way of appeasement, or another jot of a principle by way of appeasement, but to stand up in the battle of principles and argue those out. Then, our second step should be to do what we can to maintain the economies of our friends of the free, democratic nations, without bleeding ourselves white. We must not fall into the trap that the Soviets have set for us, by bleeding ourselves white through too many emergency, extravagant, and expensive operations. It is their definite policy first to prevent our aiding those countries, and second, to make any aid we render as expensive and ineffective as possible. I do not believe their policy should control our policy. We must go ahead and render aid we can afford to those who need it and who can be helpful in this world-wide struggle so as to have them ready for all eventualities.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Vorys] has expired.

Mr. EATON. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman two additional minutes.

Mr. VORYS. What are those eventualities? I hope the eventuality is that when the Soviets see that we are not backing down any place, that we intend to use our economic power, our moral power, and our military power to prevent aggression and expansion, that we will then have an era of peace. But if the situation should develop so that under article 51 of the United Nations Agreement there comes an invasion of a free nation by armed force and that nation has the right and the duty to defend itself, and other nations have the right and the duty to aid in its defense, our country and other free countries should be ready to act.

I now yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. I was in hopes that the gentleman would have time to explain that incentive-goods section in the bill.

Mr. VORYS. The incentive-goods proviso, which is found in section 3, is a provision under which we can use commodities not in short supply in this country to induce the production in other countries of commodities which are in short supply in this country. Those who have been over there know that the farmers of Europe are hoarding their grain. There is no more way to bring it out by bayonets over there than there is here—it might be a little easier—but what is going to bring it out is incentive goods. When the farmer can buy something for his money, he will quit hoarding his produce or selling it on the black market. If cigarettes, pots and pans, and other things of that kind not in short supply here but absolutely lacking over there were made available over there in appropriate markets, it would help develop not only the production but the distribution of materials and commodities which are so badly needed. It could be so handled as to save the American taxpayer money. Such an agreement is required under section 5 before

a country receives any such incentive goods. That, briefly, is a description of the incentive-goods provision.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Ohio has again expired.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Chairman, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. JARMAN].

Mr. JARMAN. Mr. Chairman, I do not intend to dwell on the situation in Europe of which this House and this country have been well advised and will be further advised in the future. You know the situation is tragic, you know there are many people in Europe today, and that there will be more in January, who are hungry, cold, emaciated, and undernourished. You know that such a condition is a fertile field for communism; that, in fact, it is the very field that Communists desire most and to the continuation of which they are anxious to contribute most. I do want to talk briefly about the cause of those conditions.

It seems to me it is necessary to go back at least to World War I when Europe lost practically a generation. That is particularly true, of course, of England, which had no conscription during the first 2 years of that war, because of which fact the flower of the youth of that land volunteered, and practically all of them were slaughtered in battle during those first 2 years. The same applies similarly to other countries, though not so extremely as to England. I have frequently wondered if the leadership which would have led England out of the slough of despond in which she unfortunately finds herself today has not slept in Flanders field since 1914 and 1915. Of course, the loss of manpower and leadership during the last war causes the losses of the other war to fade into insignificance by comparison. In the case of Germany several million of her men are still prisoners. We saw many of them, and they are very fortunate, those who are prisoners of the countries we visited. They are the best-fed Germans I saw. I do not know about those who are in Russia; I am not at all sure that they are nearly so fortunate.

Then there is the destruction wrought by that war, not only of cities, towns, and buildings, but of fields, many of which were literally churned with shells. These shells are still buried in many of the fields causing their cultivation to still be impossible. Then there is the scarcity of animals, practically all of which were eaten, driven away, or confiscated during the war. There is a similar scarcity of farm tools, seed and fertilizer.

In addition to that the crop, which would otherwise have been made even under those handicaps, was cut 25 to 50 percent due to the terrible weather of last winter and the drought which followed, which was the worst one suffered by Europe in more than a hundred years. Even in the case of that which is produced great difficulty is involved in getting it to the cities. As the gentleman who preceded me indicated, the farm people are not suffering so much. Not only is it difficult for them to transport their goods to the markets in the cities but it is only natural for them to hoard that food when they have no respect for the currency

they would get if they sold their products; when every single one of them lives in constant fear that communism will sweep over the country and that whatever money he might have will either be confiscated, devalued, or otherwise made worthless. Then there is the waste of the black market and the unfortunate fact that Russia has the bread baskets of Europe. I do not know how that happened, but it is an unfortunate fact that Russia occupies the bread baskets of Germany and Austria, and, of course, a large part of the Balkans which, with Poland, also dominated by Russia, constitutes the real bread basket of Europe, is behind the "iron curtain."

Many of you ask: Are they trying to help themselves? and Why should we assist them if they are not? I gained the very definite impression, while visiting 22 countries this summer, during which visit I could only gain a bird's-eye view because of the limited time in each country, that while there are naturally exceptions, by and large the people of Europe, not only the leadership of the countries but the individuals, are trying diligently to help themselves. Now they are not accomplishing nearly what they could but for the handicaps to which I have referred and the numerous others to which reference could be made, however, I believe they are doing very well under the circumstances.

Furthermore, as I understand it, the first requirement of the Marshall plan, toward which I consider this the first step, is that they help themselves, that each country, before it comes to us for assistance, will do whatever it can not only within its own borders but for its neighbors.

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JARMAN. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. BONNER. I think everyone in America is interested in getting food and clothing to people who are in distress. I have listened to previous speakers and I have been attentive to the gentleman's address. Is someone going to tell the Members of Congress who have not had the opportunity of listening to the hearings before the Foreign Affairs Committee just the manner in which food and clothing are going to get to individual people; or is this program going to be turned over to someone in the various countries of Europe, eventually to go into the black market, as so much of the other goods that we have sent to Europe channeled through those markets?

Now, is there a program laid down to actually get this food to the people who the gentleman says are suffering? Do we have that program? I would like to have the gentleman discuss that, if he will.

Mr. JARMAN. I will not do so in detail because of my knowledge that another member of the committee will. But I will briefly reply to the gentleman by saying that the goods must necessarily be turned over to the countries concerned. It is absolutely impossible for one country to go into another country and effect such a distribution without depending considerably on the local government.

Mr. BONNER. For instance, in China it will go to a certain class of people, and the distressed Chinese will never receive it.

Mr. JARMAN. It will go to the government of the country concerned. But do not overlook the fact that rather strenuous restrictions have been placed in this bill as to observation and inspection by our people. We have, we think, been careful to take care of that situation in this bill, although we cannot take over absolute distribution in other countries.

Mr. BONNER. All the speeches on this subject that I have heard so far are just along the same line. Now, the people in this country, as I said, are greatly interested in this material, that these goods are to reach into the people who are in destitute circumstances. I want it to reach them. I want to support the measure, but I do not want to let this go over there again and get into the hands of certain people who use these goods for their own benefit and will never reach the people that we preach back home to help.

Mr. JARMAN. We all share the gentleman's desire.

Mr. BONNER. I think there should be an explanation of that situation in this House.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JARMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. VORYS. Answering the gentleman's question, the language on page 5 of the bill, section (e), requires any country, before it receives anything, to make the following agreement:

To make available to its people at reasonable prices, consistent with economic conditions in the recipient country, such commodities as it may sell under the terms of this act.

Mr. BONNER. Who is going to distribute it? The gentleman certainly did not discuss this phase. Are you going to set up some program turning it over to the Salvation Army, that will get right down to the people, or are you just going to turn this over to a country to do whatever it chooses with it? This ought to be developed.

Mr. VORYS. It will be seen from a reading of the bill that the administration of this measure is to be under the Relief Administration which has acted fairly successfully since the bill passed last May 31. The head of it is Dick Allen, former executive, with the American Red Cross, and he is doing a very good job of making these agreements with each country and enforcing the provisions. A similar provision is in the present law.

Mr. JARMAN. Of course, I wish to express thorough agreement with the gentleman. It is mighty easy, gentlemen, to criticize and say that goods are going down a rat hole, and that we ought to go over there and undertake finite details of the distribution, but I want to agree fully with the gentleman from Ohio in the opinion that this present relief program is being well carried out, and I disagree that it should be disrupted now and a change made for this comparatively small item, particularly when we have

the Marshall plan coming on later, and particularly also when time is of the essence. Our country now has an efficient organization supervising this distribution in all of the countries concerned. It would in my opinion be ridiculous to ditch it and ask the Salvation Army to set up a new organization by January 1.

Mr. BONNER. Let me make myself thoroughly clear. I am not questioning and I am not doubting the gentleman's good intentions, but so far no speaker has told us just what the program will be about this, and from the experience of the past we do not want to follow in that footsteps.

Mr. JARMAN. I thought the gentleman from Ohio told the gentleman, but I will repeat that the program will be carried out under Mr. Allen, who has charge of our present relief program and who is evidently doing an excellent job.

Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JARMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana. On the same thought that the gentleman from North Carolina brought out, this bill provides for the sale by these local recipient governments to the people. Now, what are you going to do about the man over there who does not have any money with which to buy? What are you going to do about that?

Mr. JARMAN. He is going to get it without money.

Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana. Does it say so?

Mr. JARMAN. I think the act says so.

Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana. All right; but why do you not spell it out?

Mr. JARMAN. If the gentleman will read the bill carefully I think he will find it in the minutest detail. We could not spell out everything in this bill that every Tom, Dick, and Harry wanted. We spent nearly 2 weeks attempting to satisfy as many as possible and indulged in a great deal of entirely unnecessary tweedledum and tweedledee. If we continued to work on it and spell out everything every Member of this House wants, everybody in Europe who needs relief would be dead before anything could get there to help them.

Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana. Does not the gentleman believe you ought to spell it out, so that the hungry men can get it?

Mr. STEVENSON. That is right, spell it out so the hungry people can get it.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JARMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. CHURCH. Referring to page 5, subsection (e), to which the gentleman from Ohio referred, to make available these materials to the people at reasonable prices, how does the gentleman justify his statement just now that the poor, who do not have the money, will get them free?

Mr. JARMAN. There are many people in these countries who have ample currency of their land but no dollars. There is no reason in the world that I can conceive of why a millionaire in Italy or France or Austria should get these goods free. They will pay for them in the currency of their countries, since

they have no dollars to pay for them, but the man who is indigent will not pay. The gentleman will note that the proceeds will be placed in a special fund, much of which will undoubtedly be used for further relief to the indigent.

Mr. PHILLIPS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JARMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. PHILLIPS of Tennessee. For the benefit of some Members who have not had the opportunity of serving on the committee that considered this legislation, do you have any communication of any kind from any foreign countries making a request for any kind of relief? Where is that cablegram? What official body in any foreign country has requested this aid? Is it not a fact that we are forcing this aid upon those countries?

Mr. JARMAN. Has the gentleman ever heard of the Paris Conference, the deliberations of which were carried in the press and the radio very generally a few months ago?

Mr. PHILLIPS of Tennessee. I have heard of numerous conferences, but I have not seen any evidence or any records or any official communications to this Congress from any foreign country.

Mr. JARMAN. I have on my desk a report by the 16 nations who participated in the Paris Conference, in which they request what they think they need. If the gentleman would like to see it, I should be glad for him to peruse it.

Mr. PHILLIPS of Tennessee. Yes; I should like to see it.

Mr. JARMAN. Do the people of the United States have any duty to help relieve the situation? I am very strongly of the opinion that we do have that duty, from a strictly humanitarian standpoint. The people of the United States have never yet failed to answer the call of suffering, starving humanity when they could—and never will. The people of the United States do not wish this Congress to fail to answer that call today.

However, that is by no means all. There was a time when we were a debtor Nation. I believe we became a creditor Nation during the other World War. There was a time when but for our resources we might have been in the same situation with which those countries are confronted now, without any suitable or hard international currency. We have proceeded from that to the position of the leading and most powerful Nation of the world. That position of power and leadership places a responsibility on our shoulders when vast areas of the world are about to go under, as is the case now. It prevents us turning a deaf ear to such a near catastrophe, so dangerous to world peace.

But is that all? No, Mr. Chairman, I think we owe a duty to ourselves, to our country, and particularly to the 5-year-old boys who play around the firesides in the homes of this country, and to their unborn children, to prevent, if we can, the domination of the world by communism, and the probable slaughter of those 5-year-old boys on the battlefields of world war III and IV. Talk about high taxes, ours are low compared with what future generations will have to pay if this effort fails and the remainder of

the world becomes a police state under the domination of Russia. Think for a moment of the cost of fortifying this continent and raising and maintaining throughout the future a standing army such as no American has ever thought of in peacetime. Yes, some Member of this body—I do not think he is a member of our committee—very appropriately said upon his return from Europe, "The question is, What would it cost not to save Europe?"

And even with this tremendous expense, who can be sure that we would be saved when we know that Russia will in time possess the atom bomb or worse. Fortify our shore lines and our strategic points as we might, such fortifications would not prevent the destruction of New York, Washington, Chicago, and San Francisco by some future weapon, perhaps far more terrible than the atomic bomb.

There was a time when our foreign policy was something the average citizen could well afford to pay little attention to. He could then leave it to the President, the State Department, the Foreign Relations Committee of the other body, and the Foreign Affairs Committee of this House, but that time has gone forever. Now our foreign policy has entered, and sits around the fireside of, every home in this Nation. It plays, as it were, with those 5-year-old boys to whom I have referred and with the destiny of their unborn children.

Yes, Mr. Chairman, the greatest duty, perhaps, is to ourselves and especially to our children and theirs.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JARMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. WILLIAMS. The gentleman has been through all these hearings and he is familiar with what is in the bill. I would like to know for my own information and for the information of the Members of the House, if there is anything in the bill which would protect the American people from having scarce commodities such as fertilizer, gas, and oil, and so forth, sent overseas under this program at a time when scarcities exist in the United States.

Mr. JARMAN. The gentleman doubtless heard the President's message to the Congress. If he did, the gentleman knows that the President dealt very exhaustively with that subject. However, as the gentleman well knows, there are other committees of the Congress; and another committee, as I understand it, is considering that phase of the matter. There is no such provision in this bill. In other words, the answer to the gentleman's question is "No."

I wish to comment, however, on the gentleman's reference to the scarcity of fertilizer. While it is unfortunate that our farmers are unable to secure as much fertilizer as they wish, and I sincerely regret it, investigation will reveal to the gentleman that practically none of the shortage results from the shipment of fertilizer to Europe. He will find on the other hand that practically all of such fertilizer is being manufactured by war plants, which would not be in operation except for this emergency. The cost of

manufacturing nitrates is so great that commercial firms would not operate them and they would have long since been closed and perhaps dismantled but for this demand for fertilizer. The use of nitrate recently increased in the State of Illinois 1,000 percent.

Mr. COUDERT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JARMAN. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. COUDERT. The gentleman spoke a few moments ago about starvation and suffering. Does the gentleman take issue with the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs? Does he take issue with his distinguished colleague from Georgia and with his colleague from Minnesota, all of whom characterized this as primarily a war measure in the cold war with Russia?

Mr. JARMAN. The gentleman now in the well of the House is taking issue with no one. He has already stated that there are three particular reasons why he considers this necessary. First, the humanitarian reason; second, the position of leadership that we occupy in the world, and third, our duty to ourselves and especially to our children. I am challenging no one when I make that statement.

Mr. COUDERT. Does the gentleman state that this is an act or a measure in pursuance of the American policy of stopping Russian aggression everywhere?

Mr. JARMAN. Indeed it is. This might be termed a defense measure. I do not know whether it could be properly called, and I would not call it, a war measure. On the contrary I prefer to think of it as a peace measure.

Mr. COUDERT. Does the gentleman agree with the gentleman from Georgia and the distinguished chairman of the committee?

Mr. JARMAN. The gentleman from Georgia spoke at length and I did not hear all of his speech, nor was it my privilege to hear that of our able and distinguished chairman.

Mr. COUDERT. Does the gentleman agree that Russia could seize western Europe in 24 hours?

Mr. JARMAN. No, I do not agree with that. I do think they could do so in 2 weeks.

Mr. COUDERT. Does the gentleman take the position that the enactment of this measure and the carrying out of its terms will prevent the seizure of western Europe by Communist parties now promoting civil war in France and Italy, and if not, is the gentleman prepared to carry the American policy to its logical conclusion and to intervene in France and Italy by force, if necessary, to prevent the seizure of their governments by local Communists' organizations now fomenting civil war?

Mr. JARMAN. I take the position that the passing of this legislation while, of course, it would not become effective in 2 weeks, the very fact that it is recommended and the very fact that we are considering it has had a psychological effect which has been very potent and will continue to be most effective. Not only that, but the Greek-Turkish bill, which was passed last spring, has

had that effect. Russia has not progressed in Europe since its passage. I do not know how the gentleman voted on that.

Mr. COUDERT. I voted for it.

Mr. JARMAN. The gentleman may feel justly proud of having cast a vote that was most effective in stopping the spread of communism.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JARMAN. I yield.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. I expect to vote for this bill and later for the Marshall plan. I assume that we are going into this program with the hope that these countries eventually are going to be rehabilitated. The thought occurs to me why we should not look to those countries, perhaps 50 or 75 years from now, especially for the benefit of the 5-year-old youngster of whom you spoke, for repayment. Why should not those countries some day in the distant future, if and when they are rehabilitated, repay us? Why should not some of the countries now give us commodities of which they have surpluses? I have in mind rubber and tin and so forth that we need and of which they now have surpluses. Why could not an exchange be worked out, not under this bill, if not now, in the near future?

Mr. JARMAN. While it is not spelled out in this bill, I am of the impression that there is contemplated a sort of reverse lend-lease to take care of such items as the tin to which the gentleman refers which will contribute somewhat toward the end that he has in mind.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. The gentleman anticipates there will be some thought given to that in the so-called Marshall plan?

Mr. JARMAN. Yes; definitely.

Now, if I may, I must conclude. Some of you visited behind the iron curtain this summer. I wish every Member of this House could have done so, because of the fact that it is absolutely impossible to describe the stifling pressure, the strangulation that one feels when he realizes that every action of his is being observed, and that every conversation is being listened to, if possible; that he cannot afford to leave a secret document in his hotel room, even locked in a suitcase; that there is absolutely no freedom of speech, press, religion, or any other freedom in a police state. I say to you it is absolutely impossible to realize that condition and that feeling unless one has experienced it. Very soon we were able to detect the agents who were observing us; young men 30 or 35 years old; bare-headed; generally with their hands in their pockets, casually strolling about in front of the hotel or at the airport where we were congregated, ostensibly paying no attention to us, but by observing them closely we could see the furtive glances at us every minute or two. We were told that in Rumania our visit was preceded by the arrival of 30 of Russia's best agents, sent there, not so much for the purpose of observing us, but for observing those to whom we talked, and doubtless returning to them after our departure to put pressure on them, to give them the third degree, if necessary, to ascertain what was discussed. I certainly

hope, my colleagues, that pressure is all that those patriots had exerted on them. Yes, I hope that imprisonment is all; because, as you know, life is very cheap behind the "iron curtain."

We heard in several places, before we reached Berlin, of the disappearance of 16 girl students of the University of Berlin the day before their graduation. They constituted either a class or a sorority. They were anti-Russian. I thought it was just a story they were telling on the Russians, but we inquired of the chief of our information service in Berlin and he said it was not a story; that those girls did disappear, and no one knows yet where they are.

In Warsaw we visited the Deputy Prime Minister, in the absence of the Minister. When we entered we saw two stenographers seated by him. That is, we assumed they were stenographers, although they were a little old for stenographers. One of them was baldheaded. They took notes diligently, as the gentleman is taking notes here, of everything that was said. But finally one of them interrupted the interpreter, correcting his interpretation. I saw when our chairman asked the Deputy Minister a question, before he would answer, one of the stenographers would speak to him in Polish and then he would answer. Henceforth, one of those stenographers would speak to the Minister before he answered practically every question.

As that happened, my respect for the Minister increased, and I began to wonder whether he was a Russian agent or a Polish stooge as we thought he was.

From there we went to a luncheon with which our Ambassador favored us, and to which he invited several ranking Polish officials. We were seated by seniority, as is the custom on such occasions. I have been around here sufficiently long to acquire a certain amount of seniority and was the senior Member of the House present, although I was not senior on that occasion because I was not a Republican; but I mean in point of service.

When I walked in to this table to and behold whom should I see—and, of course, the Poles were seated by seniority too—whom should I see sitting directly across from me but this baldheaded stenographer. I looked at the chart and found that it was Dr. Sinanovich, or something like that. Then I became thoroughly convinced that there was greater hope for Poland than I had feared. I became convinced that that Deputy Prime Minister, as I said, not only was probably not a Russian agent or a Polish stooge, but possibly he was a patriotic Polish citizen who would do his duty towards his country when he found an opportunity. If such had not been the case, I concluded those stenographers with Ph. D. degrees would not be observing him so closely.

Speaking of Warsaw, in my opinion that unfortunate city is the saddest, most tragic place in the world today. It is, I believe, first, the most thoroughly destroyed large city. I have not seen Hiroshima or Nagasaki, the atomic-bomb targets, but I do not believe they can possibly be more completely destroyed

than Warsaw, where one witnesses mile after mile of absolute ruin. Even worse than the destruction there is the way that it occurred. Comparatively little of it resulted from the conquest of Poland early in the war. You will recall that she only lasted 21 days and such destruction would have been impossible had German guns and bombs been trained on her throughout this entire period. While some of it occurred then, the great majority was deliberately and entirely unnecessarily perpetrated by the Germans when they realized the necessity of their withdrawal. They then destroyed what remained of that beautiful city, not block by block, but building by building, by dynamiting it. Nor is this by any means all of the tragedy. Perhaps even still worse is the treachery of one of Poland's allies.

You recall how valiantly the underground conducted itself throughout the war under that magnificent patriot, General Bors. You recall the Russians having cautioned him as they proceeded on their victorious march through Poland not to rise too soon but to await the appropriate time, indicating to him, if not assuring him, that they would then join him, save Warsaw and drive the Germans away. General Bors did wait until the receipt of the Russian signal, which he received by radio loudspeaker and dropped pamphlets. Yes; he and his brave followers rose valiantly, but did his Russian allies carry out their agreement? No; they did not. Instead they despicably sat in sight just across the Vistula River and witnessed the destruction of that beautiful old city and the slaughter of much of the best citizenship of Poland.

When I expressed my opinion of them to the counselor of our Embassy, who was conducting me through the ruins, he ironically replied: "They simply saved themselves the trouble." Think of it, my colleagues, those treacherous Russians, who had promised to save those Poles, simply saved themselves the trouble of slaughtering them by permitting the Germans to do so. You see, the extermination of the majority of that type of Pole was necessary to such Russian domination of that unfortunate country as exists today.

That, my colleagues, is the way the Russian Army treats its allies, and such treatment is one of the things we hope to avoid by the passage of this legislation.

In conclusion, Mr. Chairman, I very much hope this bill will become law early next week, without any sizable vote against it. There are those who do not agree, of course, that such should occur and they have a perfect right to their opinion. I do not believe, however, that many who have visited behind the "iron curtain" so feel. Furthermore, I hope and strongly believe that those who do so feel do not represent the sentiment of any great proportion of our people, the tremendous majority of whom I believe agree with the opinion I have expressed of the duty which is ours.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Alabama has again expired.

Mr. EATON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes on the opponents' side and 15 minutes on the proponents' side to the distinguished gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN].

Mr. STEVENSON. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order that there is not a quorum present.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will count. [After counting.] One hundred and fourteen Members are present, a quorum.

The gentleman from Minnesota is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Chairman, I am indeed grateful to the distinguished chairman of the Foreign Affairs Committee for having allotted me 30 minutes to discuss some of the realities of the problems confronting the Congress and also the problems confronting the people of the countries who are to be the beneficiaries of this legislation.

I fully agree with the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. Cox] and the others who have spoken here about our interest in trying to prevent the spread of communism wherever it is found. We recognize that Russia operates in a very treacherous manner. I do not have the same fears that Russia will immediately take over western Europe because Russia operates through Communists within a country whether it be France or the United States. The Russians give orders, or Stalin gives orders to his leading Communists in France and Italy as well as the United States, and his local leaders seek to secure power and take control over the government and the lives of the people within the respective country.

Mr. Chairman, if the committee will bear with me, I will try to express my views on the realities of this problem, including the question as to who gets the food when we send it out of the country as a gift to the people. There should be no question in the mind of any Member of the House about the nature of what is being done here today. It is a gift, a straight out gift, to the people of France and Italy, nothing else; therefore we should treat it as a gift and express the will of the American people, or a majority of them at least, that this gift of food and other necessities shall go to the people who are hungry and need it the most. Under the present system of distribution this food will not go to the hungry people in France and Italy, and I think I can demonstrate that as I go along.

Our first duty is to think about the welfare of the American people and our own economy, because if we do not remain strong as a Nation, our leadership will be worth nothing to the rest of the world. We have had programs of scarcity in the United States.

The relief program proposed in the bill for France and Italy, and for other countries before another harvest, may cause serious complications in this country unless there is some reasonable limitation placed upon the volume of grain which may be exported so as to keep supplies in line with the demands

of our domestic economy. If the plan of the State Department prevails for the exportation of excessive quantities of wheat, there will be a decided shortage of wheat in this country and the prices for meat and other food products will sky rocket above existing levels. Such a man-made tragedy will cause great distress for millions of Americans who do not receive the income with which to buy vital food. These fellow Americans are entitled to protection and it is up to Congress to look out for their welfare.

Mr. Chairman, last July our Subcommittee on Food anticipated higher food prices because of Government grain buying, when we said in our report:

Recognizing the desire of the American people to share their food with needy persons in other parts of the world, the committee believes it should be pointed out that the price paid for food by consumers in this country is greatly dependent upon the quantity exported to foreign countries.

It is again emphasized that the supply and cost of food to American consumers will depend upon the outcome of this year's (1947) production on American farms and the amount of food allotted for export to foreign countries.

It does not take a college professor to figure out that higher prices for food and other products will result when excessive quantities of such necessities are removed from the domestic market. That is what is happening today in this country. Large exports of wheat result in higher prices for bread, meat, and other foods.

#### EXPORTS OF FOOD TO EUROPE AND OTHER COUNTRIES

We have not been niggardly in sending food to countries in need. In the fiscal year ending July 1, 1946, we sent out 17,300,000 tons of food. In the last fiscal year ending July 1, 1947, we sent out 19,200,000 tons of food. A large share of it went to western Europe. I know it is rather difficult for people to visualize or think about the meaning of 19,200,000 tons of food when we deal in billions and hundreds of billions of dollars, so I am going to try to point out to you just what it means.

Mr. Chairman, it took 480,000 American boxcars to haul that food to the seaports for loading onto boats. If those 480,000 boxcars of food had been broken down into trains of 52 cars each, with 90,000 pounds in each car, there would have been 9,219 trains.

Mr. STEVENSON. The Friendship Train.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. No; not exactly the Friendship Train, because there the distribution of the food was handled in a different manner. But, putting those 480,000 boxcars into one train, we would have a train 3,861 miles long that would reach from Washington to Paris, and then some.

The gentleman mentioned the Friendship Train. I feel it was a wonderful idea because the food was given by the American people willingly and gladly, and it is to be distributed by charitable organizations in France and Italy to the people who are in need. Let me also call

to your attention that food packages are being sent by hundreds of thousands of Americans. During the last 12 months nearly 600,000,000 pounds of food and clothing packages have been sent out of this country to needy people in Europe and other countries of the world; a gift from the American people to people in need. Our people paid the postage on it. Unfortunately, the postage cost more than the contents of the packages, so I have introduced a bill which I hope will be considered as an amendment to this legislation that all of such packages shall go post-free when they are sent to needy people, and I feel that the American people will double their food shipments if such a law is enacted.

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. COLE of New York. I rise merely to suggest that the gentleman in the revision of his remarks translate the amount of food which he said we have shipped out into terms of calories per person so that we can get an idea of how many people can be fed by that quantity of food.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. It is said on reliable authority—and I will try to give that to the gentleman—that the amount of food that was shipped out would have taken care of and provided a minimum diet for nearly 300,000,000 people in the world. Those figures were just given to me a few days ago, and I will endeavor to put the information into the RECORD.

Now, I do not go so much by calorie content of food, because I recognize that it is very difficult to change the historic diet of the average person. If the average person does not like pea soup, why he is going to be pretty hungry before he is ready to eat pea soup, and so with other things. I know I have my dislikes for certain kinds of food, and so do others, but over in these countries of Europe, particularly France and Italy, where the masses of the people are accustomed to eating bread and drinking wine, it is rather difficult to give them some other diet to which they are not accustomed.

I quote from the text of the Cabinet committee's report on the food situation to President Truman dated September 22, 1947, as to the caloric content of the food exported from the United States:

From July 1, 1946, through June 30, 1947, the United States exported nearly 18,500,000 million long tons of foodstuffs—the largest total ever shipped from one country in a single year. These shipments represented about 49,600,000,000,000 calories of food—enough to supplement the diets of 300,000,000 people to the extent of around 450 calories a day throughout the year.

Since this report was submitted the export figures on food have been increased to 19,200,000 long tons for the 12-month period, which increases the caloric value of the food by several billion calories. I cannot vouch for the accuracy of the Cabinet committee's figures.

#### DROUGHT IN EUROPE

Now, let me talk a little while about the need for sending out the food from

the United States. Europe, as most of you know, has suffered from the severest drought in 50 to 100 years. This, of course, will necessitate large imports before another harvest in order to take care of the needs of the people; imports particularly of cereal grains with which to make bread. All of the 11 countries that my committee visited, which included all the countries of western Europe, asked us to send them wheat for bread. Now, they were more interested in getting wheat for bread than they were in Communist activity over there. As a matter of fact, all of those countries had either trade agreements with Russia last year or were attempting to negotiate a trade agreement with Russia. Russia, fortunately for herself, at least, produced a crop of wheat 58 percent above 1946 production. So, they have the supply. But Russia will not sell any or provide any of their wheat to other countries unless they are paid for it with dollars or goods.

Some of you heard last year about the alleged magnanimous gift that Russia made to France of 500,000 tons of wheat and barley.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. WALTER. I call the gentleman's attention to the fact that they not only demanded that they be paid for it but that they be paid in dollars.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I am going to bring that out.

It was published in the newspapers last year that Russia saved the French people from starvation by giving them 500,000 tons of wheat. We thought it was a gift. The Communists in France made a lot of noise about it. They brought out the bands when three Russian lend-lease ships came into Marseilles Harbor with wheat. When we got over there, I thought it would be interesting to get the facts for the benefit of the American people, so in going over the records with the French officials I found this to be the answer. Russia did provide 400,000 tons of wheat and 100,000 tons of barley, making a total of 500,000 tons of cereal grain, but Russia got paid for it in American dollars at the American price, and American dollars paid the freight on every bushel of wheat that went to France. Seventy percent of that wheat was hauled in American boats. Russia used three lend-lease ships, for which American dollars paid the freight, and they got all the credit for it.

I asked our Ambassador in France, "Why didn't you do something about getting publicity for the 250 boatloads of wheat and other food we have brought into France during the past 12 months?" He said, "We gave it out to the papers." To me, however, it appeared that the attitude of some of our officials was that it was beneath our dignity to dramatically publicize what we were doing to help France.

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I yield to the gentlewoman from Ohio.

Mrs. BOLTON. Did it not occur to the gentleman that possibly if we had had a proper information service in France we might have got some of that information out to the people?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I am certainly delighted that the gentlewoman brought that up. I suppose she is referring to the Voice of America?

Mrs. BOLTON. No; I said the information service.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. We have an information and public relations service over there. We have such a big staff in Paris and in other countries that it was difficult to find space for them. Why in the name of common sense could not our officials do a good turn for the American people by making available this information? Here are our people being taxed directly to pay for this food, and, secondly, being forced to pay higher prices for the things they buy in the United States. They are things to think about now so that appropriate safeguards may be established.

If I had my way, there would be an American flag attached to every package that goes to every recipient in every country. The American people are entitled to some credit for the sacrifices they are making, but under the present distribution system no credit is given and there is much hatred against us, because the people generally throughout Europe, including France, feel that everyone in the United States is a multi-millionaire and should give more. It is difficult to convince them that about 99 percent of us have to work for a living to earn our daily bread. They also have an idea that we have a big barrel filled with food and that barrel never gets empty; that we can just dish it out and dish it out and dish it out, and there will always be enough left for everybody. There are over 800,000,000 people in the world that are asking us for food today.

When we consider this interim aid program for France and Italy, I think we should consider the availability of the food, and where it will be found. It is wheat that they want, wheat for bread. Where is the wheat? We had a tremendous crop in the United States this year, the largest one in history, 1,407,000,000 bushels is the latest estimate. It is a wonderful crop, and it is a fine thing for the world the good Lord provided us with a crop of that size.

Then they said we had an imaginary carry-over of 83,000,000 bushels, which gave us 1,490,000,000 bushels to draw from. Of course, we have to do something to provide bread and wheat for the American people. According to the Department of Agriculture, we have the lowest consumption of wheat in the United States—3.6 bushels per person. Figuring that out, we find that with an estimated population as of January next year of 145,000,000 people, we will need 532,000,000 bushels for human consumption in the United States. It is stated, and I am quoting from the Department, that we will use 325,000,000 bushels for the feeding of livestock, and there is also some wastage. Certainly we have to have some for seed for next



year's crop. That is 87,500,000 bushels. Then they have a little item down here of 5,000,000 bushels for industrial purposes. That makes a total of 949,500,000 bushels, or nearly a billion bushels, which we need for our own use. Certainly we ought to have a carry-over going into next year's crop, because nobody can predict today what the crop of wheat in the United States will be in 1948. Therefore we must provide for a carry-over. What is the growing situation in the United States? It is not very good. In the area of the United States where we produce one-third of our wheat, down in the Southwest, in western Kansas, Oklahoma, Nebraska, and the Panhandle of Texas, they have had a serious drought. The planting season has been late. That is winter wheat. It must be planted in the fall and it must have moisture to make the seed germinate, and it must begin growing so that it can withstand any winterkill. We just had rain there within the past 2 or 3 weeks. I dare say that down there if I were to make any safe prediction for the next year's wheat crop, it would be at least that the crop would be pretty short and not half of 1947 production. The Department has estimated that we will have a wheat crop of 1,000,000,000 bushels next year. We have only had such a large crop four times in the history of the Nation. Therefore they cannot in any way predict or prophesy what the wheat crop will be next year. Therefore I say until we make sure what the wheat crop will be, which will be sometime in April or May, we should set aside at least 300,000,000 bushels as a carry-over for 1948, so that our people will be sure of having something to eat.

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I yield.

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. Has the Department of Agriculture ever indicated what our minimum requirements are for a carry-over? Yesterday I had a discussion with a very distinguished Member of Congress from the wheat-growing area. He thought that if we had a carry-over of 50,000,000 bushels, it would be enough. I told him that was not enough. I wonder if the Department has ever spoken on that.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. You cannot get some of the officials to speak publicly on that question, but I think if you talk with any sensible man in the Department of Agriculture, he will say that we ought to have at least 250,000,000 to 300,000,000 bushels of wheat on hand as of July 1, 1948, to make sure that the people will have bread until the crop is determined.

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. In that connection, if the weather conditions are as the gentleman says they are, and as everybody seems to know they are, it is highly probable that we will have a billion bushels.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. No; do not stake your hope that we will get a billion bushels of wheat, because the spring wheat has not been planted and will not be planted until next April, May, and June, and much of the winter wheat is not out of the ground yet. All we can

do is to pray to the good Lord and nature to give us rain and good growing weather. But the reason I pointed out these figures on production in the United States is the fact that our next crop for the American people is uncertain; our production is uncertain.

Now, where are the other places in the world that surplus wheat is available? Well, there is Australia, Canada, and the Argentine. You will find that the United Kingdom has sowed up 160,000,000 bushels of wheat in Canada and that Canada will not have over 20,000,000 or 25,000,000 bushels to export. You will find that the United Kingdom has sowed up wheat in Australia, which crop is just in the making. Well, what happened down in Argentina? They have only 16,000,000 acres of wheat. They reduced their wheat acreage from 18,000,000 to 16,000,000 because their own government down there paid farmers only \$1.35 a bushel for wheat, whereas the government itself sold it for over \$5 a bushel. They want to sell their surplus to us. But for relief purposes they will not give it. They want us to pay in American dollars, and \$5 is the price.

Now, let us get down to what is promised in this bill. Under allocations of wheat—this comes from the Department of State and from the Department of Agriculture—France has been promised 900,000 tons of wheat up to April 30, 1948. From July 1, 1946, to November 30, 1947, France received 616,000 tons, and for May and June will need 320,000 additional tons, making a total of 1,876,000 long tons of wheat from the United States out of the 1947 crop. If they carry out the scheme as provided in this bill, that is what they will get, 1,876,000 long tons of wheat.

The food situation will be more critical in April, May, and June, until the people in Europe harvest another crop, than it is now, and there will be greater need for wheat at that time. They do not harvest their crop of wheat until July and August. So they will need it from some place, and, of course, they will look to the United States to get it.

Italy has been promised approximately 700,000 long tons of wheat in this bill. For the 6 months ending December 31, 1947, Italy will have received 568,000 long tons of wheat, and she will need 230,000 tons for the months of May and June of 1948. This makes a total of 1,504,000 long tons of wheat from July 1, 1947, to July 1, 1948, which Italy expects to secure out of our 1947 wheat crop.

Reduced to bushels, France and Italy will require 126,074,000 bushels of wheat before those countries produce another crop.

#### WHEAT REQUIREMENTS FOR OTHER COUNTRIES

The minimum wheat requirements for other countries in western Europe, excluding France and Italy has been estimated at 6,150,000 long tons. The minimum estimated needs for all other countries in the world, for wheat supplies from the United States is stated to be 3,750,000 long tons. This makes a total of 13,280,000 long tons of wheat from our 1947 wheat crop, or approximately 496,-

000,000 bushels of wheat. This total includes exports to France and Italy.

Mr. HINSHAW. Will the gentleman translate those tons into bushels?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I will do that in just a minute. That means 13,280,000 tons, or 496,000,000 bushels of wheat.

The reason I mention this today is because we may ship out too much wheat from the United States before we know what another crop will be. We must be careful to protect our domestic economy.

One man said, "We want the wheat in Italy right away." Of course they do, because they will eat it as soon as they get it. It is better for us to husband the wheat in the United States and send it out gradually to the countries that are in need, and divide it up so that they will all get a fair share and have enough over to take care of the needs of the American people. That is our first duty.

We frequently hear so much about other countries lending assistance, like the Russian wheat deal in France. Why cannot Russia be called upon to give some of her big crop as charity to help feed the hungry people of Europe? Why should not Argentina and Canada be invited to contribute wheat into a charity pool with which to help feed the hungry people? Certainly Canada, Australia, and Argentina will benefit as much as the people of the United States from a rehabilitated Europe. Therefore, they should be as willing to assist to the limit of their capabilities as are the American people. This bill, however, is to provide dollars whereby the United States will guarantee payment in dollars for the grain furnished by the other exporting countries. That is one thing that ought to be changed. We cannot afford to underwrite the food needs for the entire world.

#### AVAILABILITY OF WHEAT IN THE UNITED STATES

After estimating minimum requirements of wheat for the United States at 949,500,000 bushels for the crop year, and adding estimated exports, which I have stated to be approximately 496,000,000 bushels, we find that the United States will be left with a carry-over of only 35,000,000 bushels. To be safe, considering the poor condition of the winter wheat crop in the Southwest, we should provide for a carry-over into the 1947-48 crop-year of from two hundred and fifty to three hundred million bushels of wheat. I want to issue this warning: The administration will be held responsible by the American people for any shortage in our 1948-49 wheat supply in the event it does not provide for any adequate carry-over. The carry-over that I have suggested should be retained until the size and quality of the 1948 crop is determined.

How much wheat should we export? Various estimates have been made. The Cabinet committee in its report to the President on the food situation on September 22, 1947, estimated that we could export about 400,000,000 bushels of wheat and flour—about the same as last year. It was also estimated that we could export approximately 70,000,000 bushels of coarse grains. The committee stated

that in arriving at the estimated export availability careful consideration was given to the probable effects of exports upon prices because the undesirable results of a price spiral were apparent.

On November 26, 1947, the Secretary of Agriculture appeared before the House Banking and Currency Committee in support of a proposal to reestablish allocation rationing and price powers over agricultural commodities similar to those exercised during the war. When asked whether he had any opinion as to the amount of wheat that could be exported without the necessity of putting on the controls he was suggesting and at the same time maintaining some stability in our domestic markets, he stated that he had given quite a bit of thought to that problem and he had tried to indicate in a report submitted by the Cabinet Food Committee to the President that we could export 400,000,000 bushels of wheat without the necessity for the controls he was requesting and without doing any violence to our domestic economy.

It is abundantly clear from the foregoing statements that the administrative officials are in agreement on one thing, namely, that we are quite likely to have undesirable and perhaps violent effects upon our domestic economy if we export more than 400,000,000 bushels of wheat and 70,000,000 bushels of coarse grains and that it will be necessary to place our domestic economy in the strait-jacket of controls in an attempt to offset the undesirable and disastrous effects caused by overexporting.

With the conclusion of the Secretary of Agriculture and of the Cabinet committee that the exportation of more than 470,000,000 bushels of all grain will bring about undesirable results for our domestic economy, I heartily agree. But, I would be so bold as to suggest a very different course of action than that taken by the President and the Secretary of Agriculture.

Let me describe briefly the action which they have taken. On September 25, 1947, which was 3 days after the Cabinet committee's report on the food situation was issued, the President brought Mr. Charles Luckman, president of Lever Bros., a large soap company, to administer a grain-conservation program. Luckman, the great, evolved the brilliant theory that a dead chicken would eat more grain than a live one so he decreed that no poultry should be eaten on Thursday. About the same time this program was being staged by Luckman it was announced that the grain export goal was raised to 570,000,000 bushels, of which 500,000,000 bushels was to consist of wheat and 70,000,000 bushels coarse grain.

This is exactly 100,000,000 bushels more than the amount the Cabinet committee on food and the Secretary of Agriculture indicated could be exported without the danger of undesirable and violent results to our economy. The establishment of a grain export goal of 570,000,000 bushels was not all that was done. About the time of the issuance of the report of the Cabinet committee on food and of the establishment by the President of the Luckman committee and the announcement of an increase of

100,000,000 bushels in the grain export goal, the Commodity Credit Corporation stepped into the market in a big way and made huge purchases of wheat at a time when the price was approximately \$2.50 a bushel at Kansas City. During the last 10 days of September and the first 10 days of October approximately 45,000,000 bushels of wheat were purchased. Almost 11,000,000 bushels were purchased on 1 day. These purchases were also made at a time when the Commodity Credit Corporation already had large quantities on hand or under contract for delivery. What happened to the price is well known. It rose from \$2.50 per bushel about the 19th of September to more than \$3.20 per bushel. The rise in price is directly attributable, in my opinion, to the announced intention of the administration to try and increase wheat exports by another 100,000,000 bushels and to the huge daily purchases by the Commodity Credit Corporation during that period.

Was this a deliberate attempt by the administration to start the price spiral, which it knew would follow if grain exports were increased above the 470,000,000 bushels established by the Cabinet Food Committee, and by increasing the tempo of purchases by the Commodity Credit Corporation in an effort to meet the increased goal? Was such action taken to lay the groundwork for the President's speech to the Congress and to create a situation whereby it would be necessary to grant the President the allocation, rationing, and price powers he was requesting? If there had been any real desire to prevent inflation and to stop the price spiral, other action would have seemed much more appropriate, for example, it could and probably should have been announced that no more than 470,000,000 bushels of grain would be permitted to be exported during the crop year 1947-48—at least until such time as the crop prospects for next year could be estimated with some degree of accuracy. The Secretary of Agriculture could have also been directed to have ceased purchasing or to have held purchases of grain to a minimum for awhile until the market stabilized itself. Had this been done, I venture to state that sharp increase in price from the 20th of September to the present would not have occurred.

Not only has the administration started the price spiral by these inflationary activities but it has continued such activities. About the middle of November the Secretary of State appeared before committees of the House and Senate in behalf of the interim-aid bill. In his statement he estimated the United States export availability of wheat at 520,000,000 bushels. This is 120,000,000 bushels more than the 400,000,000 bushels which the Cabinet Committee on Food and the Secretary of Agriculture stated could be exported without undesirable and possible violent effects upon our economy. These constantly varying statements as to the amount of wheat the administration intends to export during this crop year does nothing but create uncertainty and confusion and adds to the spiral of inflation.

From all the foregoing there can be but one conclusion. There has been a wanton disregard for the well-being of our domestic economy. There has been a willingness and a determination to export grain at a rate which will force our prices to rise so high as to have admittedly undesirable and violent effects. There has been a willingness and determination to risk the well-being and safety of our Nation by exporting wheat in such quantities as to leave us an inadequate carry-over in the face of poor crop prospects for 1948. If we should export 450,000,000 or 500,000,000 bushels of wheat based on present availability and crop prospects, it would leave us with almost no reserves in case we run into a short wheat crop next year and on the basis of present information the prospects of a short crop next year are dangerously real. This legislation should carry a provision placing a limitation on the amount of wheat to be exported from the 1947 crop to protect the United States from the danger of short wheat supplies and inflationary prices.

#### FOOD DISTRIBUTION IN FRANCE AND ITALY

Under the present system of distribution, our wheat is given to the French Government. Let us assume for purposes of illustration that we send over 50,000,000 bushels of wheat. Does the French Government give that wheat to the low-income groups or the people who do not have money to buy? No; evidently not. The food we send to those countries is sold to the people. In all of our travels in Europe we did not find any mass starvation, but we did find many low-income people who did not have the money to buy food at the high prices prevailing in the public market and in the black market; and in France and Italy the black market reaches such heights as we have never seen in this country. You can buy anything you want on those black markets but it takes money and a lot of it. Now, we give this wheat to the French Government, as a gift. The French Government will take this wheat and sell it to the flour mills in France. They are going to sell it to the mills at the same price the French farmers receive for their wheat so as not to destroy their domestic production. That price is the equivalent of \$4.25 a bushel. The French Government keeps that money except, as the gentleman from Ohio said, Congress may at some future time direct how the money shall be spent in France and Italy. The millers, of course, sell the flour to the bakers, and the bakers bake the bread and sell the bread to the people, and the people who have money can buy it.

It is true they are holding down the price of bread over there because that is the one thing that is rationed, and they have a bread ration in France of 200 grams, which is a little more than three slices a day—not very much. So those people who have the money can buy a loaf of bread and use the entire 200 grams a day.

We have low-income people in the United States and they are suffering now, they do not have the money with which to buy the food they need at the prevailing high prices—we have a lot of

them here but they have more of them over there. Possibly three-quarters of the population over there is in the low-income group. That is the group the American people want to help. We do not want to establish a world-wide WPA relief project; no, but we want the food we give to go to hungry people. So I will offer an amendment to the provisions of this bill at the proper point providing that at least two-thirds of the food that is sent under this bill to France and Italy shall be distributed through the Red Cross, through church organizations, and through other charitable and reliable societies under supervision of a commissioner named in this bill, so that the people who are hungry and who are most susceptible to Communist influence will be the ones who will get the proceeds.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. In just a moment.

I think that is the best way to stop communism in any country. We cannot, of course, go on feeding them indefinitely but if we will give those people food, keep them in condition so they can work a little harder maybe they will produce a little more not only in food but in manufactured goods so that they can buy the food the next time—if we have a surplus to sell, because we cannot have a permanent world-wide relief project to feed 800,000,000 hungry people in the world. It is not possible. Therefore I ask for the sympathetic consideration of the amendment I shall offer when the bill is read for amendment.

For the information of the membership of the House I am including herewith two amendments to H. R. 4604, which I will offer when the bill is read on Monday:

Amendment No. 1: Page 7, line 8, after the period insert the following sentence: "All food made available under the authority of this act or the containers thereof, when such food is processed and distributed to consumers in a recipient country, shall bear a replica of the American flag and a statement in the language of the country disclosing that the food is a gift from the people of the United States."

Amendment No. 2: Page 6, line 18, strike out the period and insert a semicolon; and after line 18 insert the following indented paragraph:

"(k) to insure that, notwithstanding any other provision of this act, the following conditions are fulfilled in the case of food made available to it under the authority of this act: (1) not more than 33½ percent of such food shall be sold; (2) the proceeds from such sales, or as much as is required, shall be used only for paying local expenses of processing and distributing food made available under the authority of this act; and (3) all food made available to it under the authority of this act which is not sold shall be distributed among persons in low-income groups in such country, without cost to such persons, except the surrender of coupons for rationed food, through the Red Cross and through such other relief, charitable, and church organizations as may be approved by the field administrator referred to in section 10 of this act."

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Minnesota has expired.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from California [Mrs. DOUGLAS], a member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Mrs. DOUGLAS. Mr. Chairman, we have no pending requests for time on this side of the aisle.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the Chair understand the gentlewoman from California, in charge of the bill on the minority side, to say that there is no further demand for time in general debate on that side?

Mrs. DOUGLAS. At this time.

The CHAIRMAN. That is different. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. EATON], chairman of the Foreign Affairs Committee. Is anyone seeking time in general debate?

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. LEMKE].

Mr. EATON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for an inquiry?

Mr. LEMKE. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. EATON. Mr. Chairman, I direct this inquiry to the leadership on the other side. Have they no more requests for time in general debate?

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Chairman, the situation is all right, as far as I am concerned. Some people say they have no more requests for time today. Of course, if we are going to use an hour today and an hour every day, and we have 12 hours general debate, it will take 12 days to get through general debate. Whether anyone wants time, I do not know.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair may say for the information of the gentleman that under the rule not to exceed 12 hours is provided for general debate. Under the precedents of the House, if there is no demand for time in general debate, the Chair is directed to order that the bill be read for amendment. I think the distinguished gentleman from Texas, the former Speaker, understands that.

Mr. RAYBURN. That is what I would interpret the duty of the Chair to be.

Mr. LEMKE. Mr. Chairman, may I have 10 additional minutes then?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair may advise the gentleman from North Dakota that this is all coming out of his time.

Mr. LEMKE. Mr. Chairman, I decline to yield further.

Mr. Chairman, we have a grave decision to make—a decision whether we are going to continue the America we know or substitute an America we know little about—the America of the internationalists and the one worlders. The question is, Shall we blindly follow the executive department and give America away? Shall we denude it of the raw materials that belong to unborn generations?

We have already depleted our natural resources from 11 percent to less than 9 percent of the world's supply. I submit we have no moral, legal, or constitutional right to do so. But there is no way to get a fair test of the constitutionality. This because the Chief Justice of our Supreme Court is one of the denuders. As Secretary of the Treasury, he helped prepare the agreement under which we made a loan to Great Britain of \$4,400,000,000 and then, with \$650,000,000 of our own money, canceled the \$34,000,000,000 that she owed us.

This Nation, born amidst the sufferings of Valley Forge, is not ours to betray or destroy. It belongs to unborn millions, as much as it belongs to us. It is the property of future, as well as of living Americans. The step that we are asked now to take is a betrayal. It leads to inevitable depletion and destruction. Lincoln was right when he said that this Nation would never be destroyed unless we ourselves were its destroyers.

We are here asked to accept, without question, the false propaganda of international profiteers and multimillionaires that infest various departments of our Government. The trouble with this Government, since the days of President Harding, has been that the President has had too many multimillionaires in his Cabinet. We have gone from the Mellons to the Sumner Welleses, the silver-topped Stettiniuses, the Lovetts, the Claytons, the Grews, the Harrimans, and scores of other international bankers and international businessmen—all products of or aligned with Wall Street.

Behind this bill, if the truth were known, are the international bankers and manufacturers. These are ably assisted by their friends, and parties in interest in the various departments of our Government. These are interested in advancing their financial gains, by selling products that rightfully belong to Americans, to foreign nations. They are interested in having these nations pay for these goods with our American dollars. This at the taxpayers' expense. They, in their greed, would denude this Nation of all its raw materials to further enrich themselves.

May I warn you that if this policy is continued, we will soon be a depleted fifth- or sixth-rate nation. There will no longer be an American standard of living. We will then have brought our people down to the lowest standard of foreign nations. We will then be mingling our poverty with the poverty of other nations. Then, in case of war—and we are now in an undeclared World War III—our lot will be a sad one.

If to prefer Americans to foreigners is isolation then we are isolationists. If desiring the abolishment of our own slums, rather than go slumming in foreign nations at the expense of our taxpayers is isolation, then we are isolationists. If to refuse to prefer other flags to the Stars and Stripes—if to refuse to denude and exhaust our natural resources that belong to future generations—if to prefer our Nation to other nations is isolation, then we are isolationists. It was not so very long ago that to say you were an American was almost equivalent to saying you were a criminal.

Only an ignoramus would say that we were ever an isolated nation. We have always mingled with all the people of the globe. Often we nosed into places where we had no business. As a nation, we will continue to mingle with the rest of the world—not in a "holier than thou" attitude, but with a feeling that comingling and friendship among the nations of the world is our destiny. However, that does not mean that we will follow the international lunacy of denuding and destroying ourselves.

We are willing to help feed the hungry, out of our surpluses, not out of our necessities. We will do our full share in helping rebuild the world that we helped destroy—again out of our surpluses, but not out of our necessities. Charity begins at home. Before we build homes for foreigners let us build them for our veterans that won World Wars I and II.

The same tactics are being used to put this legislation over that were used in putting over lend-lease, UNRRA, Bretton Woods, Dumbarton Oaks, and the reciprocal trade agreements. In each case the truth was not given to the people, but in place false propaganda was spread throughout the Nation. This because Wall Street and the one worlders control over 90 percent of all the avenues of publicity. They control the radio, the metropolitan press, and the theaters.

First, we were told that lend-lease would save our boys—"give us the tools and we will do the fighting"—but our boys did the fighting and the dying, and our taxpayers paid, and will continue to pay the bill, which will ultimately amount to \$623,000,000,000.

Then came UNRRA. We were told that if we passed this legislation the white dove of peace would perch over the world forever and ever. With tears in their eyes and with trembling voices the proponents of that legislation told us that if we did not pass it Russia would withdraw from the conflict. What a blessing it would have been to future generations if she had. Then we would not be in the mess that we are in now.

Again we were told that Bretton Woods would bring about permanent peace and love among the so-called 52 peace-loving nations—peace-loving aggressors. The truth was that Bretton Woods was a scheme by Lord Keynes of Great Britain, and sold to the gullible Morgenthau—"morning dew." By this scheme the American taxpayers have been fleeced out of billions and will be fleeced out of billions more.

Then came Dumbarton Oaks. That word should be divided into two words, "Dumb Barton." Again the "one worlders" and the internationalists took over Morgenthau, and the UN was hatched. Again this institution was to bring about permanent peace. It was to stop aggression. Yet from the very beginning, after it was baptized at San Francisco and given a nice name, it condoned liquidation, murder, and theft, by some of the so-called peace-loving aggressor nations, of other nations' people and property.

Since then, the UN has degenerated into a name-calling institution. Like a bunch of rowdy boys, the delegates stick their tongues out at each other and call names. Worse still, the institution that was founded to stop aggression has become an aggressor. Again the UN was created at the expense of the American taxpayers. The delegates were largely wined, dined, and housed at the expense of our taxpayers. It has since been largely financed by Uncle Sam's taxpayers.

Not satisfied with that, these same internationalists and "one worlders" came forward with another request. They asked that the reciprocal trade

agreements be not only extended but that the President be given the power to cut the tariff an additional 50 percent. In other words, giving the international horse traders in the State Department an opportunity to sell America still further short. Thus, the farmers' markets have and will again be sold, by the international bankers and manufacturers, to foreign horse traders.

Let us keep the record straight. To date, outside of our own war efforts and expenditures, we have given to foreign nations, in round figures, over \$66,000,000,000. In addition, we gave them over \$5,150,000,000 worth of surplus property for less than \$1,000,000,000—for \$950,000,000. This international lunacy has made a sucker of us. I do not blame the foreign nations for sponging on us. I blame our own stupidity.

With one hand we arm the Greeks, Turks, and other nations to stop communism, and with the other hand we arm Russia and its satellites. Through UNRRA and through loans and other sources we furnish her with war material. The thing does not make sense. America, wake up! There are things going on here in Washington that are not for the best health of our form of government—a Government of, for, and by the people.

I know that there were 200 Members of Congress investigating the slums and the poverty of other nations, but they could have spent their time more profitably by going slumming in our own slums. They could have spent their time more profitably by visiting the Navajo Indians, where out of 149 deaths the records show that 73 die of starvation and another 49 because of malnutrition.

I repeat the time has come to take care of our own people first, and then, out of our surpluses, and not out of our necessities, take care of others. I repeat that our present indebtedness, with future obligations, already amounts to over \$623,000,000,000. This is twice the normal value of all our property. It is more than five times as much as all the rest of the world owes. Time to think—had enough?

I am aware of the President's message—a message full of holes large enough to throw a cat through without touching the hole. Let us have the facts. Let us stop playing politics. The situation is too serious. America's future is at stake. Among the Congressmen who visited in Europe there are some who believe that you can bribe nations into opposing communism. In fact, some have become so foreign-minded that they talk more like representatives of foreign governments than as Members of Congress.

Others give you the low-down on the European situation. They agree that this foreign romancing, at the taxpayers' expense, should be stopped. They tell us that there are some worthless DP groups. These eat American short ribs of beef and other American luxuries to the extent that they have grown fat and lazy. They tell us that there are also some worthy DP groups. These cut the wood and render services for the favorite groups. This under the

auspices of the American occupation army. There are also foreign official crooks, grafters, and black marketeers.

They tell us that due to misgovernment—due to the Teheran, Yalta, and Potsdam blunders—there are millions of indolent. These hate us, but live on American charity—or should we say American stupidity. There are also hungry children—hungry because of indolent parents. A sensible solution to this problem would be to have the Red Cross and the Salvation Army take over. They are best equipped for the job. No political grafters or black marketeers or incompetents are needed. The indolent parents should be told to go to work or suffer the consequences.

The Marshall plan will produce only hatred and war. It is as stupid as it is dangerous. If adopted, it will create an additional indebtedness of \$20,000,000,000 to \$30,000,000,000. If adopted, we will have created an international WPA that will be hard to abolish.

Under the existing rate of taxes, it will take 86 years to pay our present indebtedness. This \$20,000,000,000 will have to be borrowed, and payment postponed for 86 years. With simple interest at 2½ percent, it will, at that time, amount to \$86,000,000,000. With compound interest, it will be \$160,000,000,000.

The time has come that we talk plainly and call a halt to the further looting of America under the Marshall or any other plan. Anyway, why accept a plan by a general who does not yet know where he was on December 7, 1941? If he did not know then where he was, does he know now where he is?

There is only one way to bring down the high cost of living, and that is to stop squandering and giving to foreign nations the products and food that rightfully belong to Americans. As long as the administration takes, directly or indirectly, on an average, 57 cents out of every dollar earned, the cost of living will remain high.

There are already 73 hidden taxes on a single hot-dog sandwich, 126 on shoes, 154 on a bar of soap, 148 on a pair of overalls, 125 on a cotton dress, 172 on a bottle of milk of magnesia, 378 on other medicines, 205 on gasoline, 195 on farm dresses, and last, but not least, 52 on a loaf of bread. We have had enough of taxes.

As long as the administration takes the taxpayers' dollars, and gives them to foreign nations to compete with the consumer in the domestic markets, prices will be high. As long as the administration takes the taxpayers' dollars, and in addition to the foreigners, becomes a competitor with the consumer, there will be high cost of living. Stripped of all political chicanery the high cost of living is caused by our ignorant foreign policy.

The Republicans were elected to put an end to these foreign ideologies. Unfortunately, some of them have ignored that mandate. A few of them have been with the New Dealers so long that they, too, have the international disease—the disease of pauperizing America by giving away that which belongs to unborn millions. During the adjournment, we had

a dozen congressional committees snooping around in foreign countries, creating international hatred.

The time has come that these Members look after Americans and not foreigners. These committees should have called on the starving Navajo Indians in place of squandering American dollars in Europe, and elsewhere. They should have looked after the welfare of the white-collared workers at home.

Now one of these committees insists that we form a corporation to give America away. I hope that my Republican friends have more intelligence than that. They were elected to abolish and reduce Federal agencies, not to create new bureaus loaded with bureaucrats. We are told that these new bureaucrats will be under the control of Congress. Well, if some Republicans wish to make a bureau out of Congress, then I am sure the electorate will wash their hands of the whole gang, in the next election. Congress is supposed to be a lawmaking body. It is supposed to write the laws for Americans, and not for foreigners.

I shall oppose creating any new bureau, especially an international WPA. That sounds too much like the days of F. D. R. The Republicans must not permit themselves to be misled by this international lunacy. They must wash their hands of the New Deal foreign ideologies.

I repeat, our Uncle Sam has gone delinquent. He is in his second childhood. He has deserted beautiful Miss Columbia and her 140,000,000 sons and daughters. He has become an international philanderer. He is chasing Red, pink, green, and off-colored skirts all over the world. He is squandering the wealth that Miss Columbia and her 140,000,000 sons and daughters have created.

The time has come that we appoint a guardian to protect him from his folly, and prevent him from squandering the substance of our Nation—from giving away to gold diggers that which belongs to Miss Columbia and her sons and daughters—that which belongs to unborn generations.

I know of no better guardian than a candidate for President in 1948, who believes in America first, last, and all the time, with justice to all nations, whether they be the so-called 52 peace-loving nations, or our vanquished foes. One who believes in the Stars and Stripes rather than in a mongrel flag. A candidate who knows enough to know that the one-worlders have been deflated.

I am sorry that such a candidate—such a guardian—is not yet in sight. However, on the distant horizon—in the Land of the Rising Sun—we glimpse a real statesman—General MacArthur. May he become the Moses that will lead us out of the wilderness—the foreign entanglements. Eighty percent of the American people are getting sick and tired of our Uncle Sam's behavior, and demand such a candidate—such a statesman. They know that our Uncle is the easy prey of the global gold diggers—that he is denuding our Nation. They know that he is leading us into another undeclared war.

The Republican Party was kept out of the White House for 16 years because

it had no positive program—because its candidates were me-too followers of the one-worlders—globetrotters. The Democrats met a disastrous rebuke November 5, 1946, because they, too, blindly followed blind leaders.

The time has come for both parties to adopt again the policy of our forefathers and avoid globetrotting and foreign entanglements. The time has come for my Democratic friends to adopt the doctrines of Thomas Jefferson. The time has come for my Republican friends to adopt the doctrines of Abraham Lincoln. When that day comes, it will be a glorious day for the United States of America.

Our visibility is low—the international weather is disagreeable. Our Uncle Sam's vision is very poor. Our Presidents and leaders were outgeneraled at Teheran, Yalta, and Potsdam. In place of looking for more entanglements, the time has come for Congress to repudiate Yalta, Teheran, Potsdam, and all the other commitments that are not in keeping with decency and honesty among the nations.

*Requirements estimated to be paid for in United States dollars*

[F. o. b. values in thousands of dollars]

	1948	1949	1950	1951
Participating countries:				
Petroleum requirements.....	\$482,345	\$514,823	\$531,181	\$510,483
Specialized oil equipment.....	140,161	134,747	115,016	124,866
Coal-mining equipment (including Germany).....	105,960	65,180	92,340	93,410
Solid fuel.....	369,000	225,000	126,000	54,000
Crude and semifinished steel.....	513,000	447,000	441,000	437,000
Freight and passenger cars.....	203,000	177,000	81,000	29,000
Ocean shipping services.....	570,000	460,000	265,000	310,000
Lumber, all kinds.....	95,928	92,592	87,320	75,094
Total.....	2,479,394	2,146,342	1,838,857	1,633,763

<sup>1</sup> The future fleets of the 16 participating nations are expected to be augmented by surplus vessels owned by the United States which can be sold or leased by them under the Ship Sales Act of 1946.

The fleets of the 16 nations will, after the acquisitions contemplated, consist of the tonnages shown:

[Millions of dead-weight tons]

	Dry cargo	Tankers	Total
End 1947.....	32.02	11.11	43.13
End 1948.....	33.74	12.06	45.80
End 1949.....	35.58	12.94	48.52
End 1950.....	37.39	13.76	51.15
End 1951.....	39.21	14.45	53.66

Thus the shipping of the 16 nations will be increased by 10,530,000 dead-weight tons in the next 4 years. It must be remembered that the older ships will be wearing out, and that this program involves not only replacements but new bottoms from current shipbuildings. It is assumed that part of this burden will fall on private operators or shipbuilders.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. HUGH D. SCOTT, JR.].

Mr. HUGH D. SCOTT, JR. Mr. Chairman, there are two matters I should like to speak on and one pertains to the \$60,000,000 fund for China. I know of no country which has more good will in America than China. I know of no country, other than my own, in which I personally have more interest than China. I know of no country I would rather see receive needed help than China. I know of no country which is more immediately menaced by communism than that coun-

In his armament race, in his power politics, the President is following the unfortunate footsteps of the former President. He is entering an undeclared war. All this could have been avoided, if at Potsdam, he had repudiated Yalta and taken a firm stand by telling Stalin to get back into his own country where he belongs and stay there.

*THE MARSHALL PLAN IN A NUTSHELL*

Most of the requirements of the 16 countries participating in the Paris Conference, from which was evolved the so-called Marshall plan, have been submitted by representatives of such countries.

An analysis of the reported requirements indicates that the items needed in the 16 countries are, for the most part, either in short supply here at home or soon will be critical items with the exception of ocean-shipping facilities.

Expressed in United States dollars, part of the requirements our Government is being asked either to furnish directly or pay for in cash over a 4-year period are the following:

try. I have seen pillboxes erected in Tientsin, for example, since the end of the war, for protection against the imminently expected attack of the Communists, with Russian aid, presumably, from the north. Yet when I see this \$60,000,000 inserted into the bill I cannot help but question whether or not the Chinese people are going to get the benefit of the money, and I feel impelled to give a little bit of the experience I have had for whatever it may be worth.

During a recent visit to China and to four of its principal cities I talked to some sixty-odd Americans resident there, American businessmen, and Americans in the State Department as well, in those cities. In every case where I spoke to men in the American business colonies, they were unanimous without a single dissenting voice, in saying to me, "Whatever you do, do not send any money to this Chinese Government for projects which will be designated as relief, because the money will not get to where it is intended to go. It will be lost through corruption, and it will be lost through maladministration and inefficiency." Many others quoted the Chinese proverb, with all due respect to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. Judd] and the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Vorys], who both are able to pronounce it much better than I, which goes like this: "Tien ch'i tse jiu," which means "Heaven helps those who help themselves."

My own conviction is that our Americans in China do not believe that the Chinese national government has yet presented sufficient proof of a determination to help itself. One thing I do not like in this bill is the fact that we are to have no real supervision of the expenditure of the money, of the distribution of the goods. Our American friends in China say, "Yes, they can use the money. Yes, the Chinese Government can use the money, but it should be administered by Americans down to the last dollar, because if we are misled by the appeals of the Chinese on the grounds of sovereignty, we will be respecting their sovereignty, but the people will not get the benefit of the money." So, while I am going to support this bill I hope that the \$60,000,000 for China will be deferred until a later time, until such assurances have been given by the Chinese Government, that it will be used for specific projects clearly allocated and definitely followed through under American supervision. I would prefer to see the \$60,000,000 put into the bill for general relief in Europe where I am personally satisfied that it is very greatly needed.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HUGH D. SCOTT, JR. I yield to my friend from Ohio.

Mr. VORYS. There is no requirement in the bill that any of this money will go to China. As to any relief which goes to China, they must make an agreement with the 10 strings attached as set out in section 5, so that there will be supervision as provided for the nations in Europe. The gentleman need have no fear that the money will be dissipated.

Mr. HUGH D. SCOTT, JR. If I may coin a Chinese proverb, I would suggest to the gentleman that 10 strings do not make a knot. I would prefer to see the knot there and I would prefer to see the protection provided for. I do understand that some \$60,000,000 is at least informally allocated to China. I would like to make it very clear. My own sympathies are all for getting some money to China, but I want to see the money go to China some day which will be used for the purposes which we in America intend it to be used for.

With reference to the second point, I want to point out what I think is a possible joker in this bill. We have been assured that a bill will be introduced providing that ultimately all relief expenditures will be supervised by an independently created Government corporation. All such future programs as may be considered by this Congress will be supervised by a corporation to be set up, if we can get that bill through, and to my mind it is the goal of the long-range program. Certainly such a proposal will be made to this Congress. I sincerely hope that proposal will be adopted. But such a corporation or future agency is going to have its hands tied by this bill, because I submit to you that under section 13 the provision reads:

Personnel employed to carry out the purposes of this act shall not be included in computing limitations on personnel established pursuant to the Federal Employees Pay Act of 1945.

And when that is read in connection with section 15, which provides:

The personnel, records, and funds provided for the purposes of carrying out this act shall be transferred to the administration of any organization for general foreign aid which Congress may provide—

Please note the word "shall"—if I am not very much mistaken, the President will load this particular relief organization and this particular relief distribution agency with a great many people, not all of whom perhaps will be needed. You will find when you set up this new corporation that it must accept all of the people that have been added to the Federal pay roll for the distribution of this interim relief. I submit you are walking into a trap. You are already hamstringing the operation of any future Government corporation that you plan to set up, no matter how carefully you set it up, if it must accept the personnel who are charged with the distribution of goods under this act, no matter how inefficient they may be, no matter how incompetent they may be, no matter how many of them may be old political friends from Missouri.

I am suggesting to you gentlemen that when section 15 comes up, a suitable amendment should be offered.

I would like to say in conclusion that I have seen with my own eyes these low living standards. I have recently been in the countries for which it is proposed to provide aid. I have seen conditions in Europe and in Asia. I believe the aid to be necessary. I believe it is a charitable "must."

I think that this country cannot well refuse to recognize its obligation to maintain the necessary living standards of people who will otherwise starve and will go short of the necessities of life unless we help them. I do not think we can do it forever. I do not think that we have a bottomless pit from which we can draw these resources. What we are doing will keep prices high and impose sacrifices on the American people.

I do think that a great mistake is being made in this bill by not now providing for this independent corporation and for the administration of this act by an independent set-up, headed by some American in whom all of us can put our complete trust and confidence. I believe that the emergency is being used to rush this Congress into the support of something which many of us believe to be necessary but at the same time, under the guise of emergency, a form of administration and distribution is being set up under which it is my judgment that much of the money will be wasted, all of the effect of the program will be heavily felt by the American people; prices will go up on account of it, and we are going to see the day when we will regret that we did not at this time require that it be distributed by an independent agency; that it be distributed by Americans; and that instead of these 10 strings that have been spoken of, that we throw a very strong knot around the provisions under which the distribution is to be made.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. HUGH D. SCOTT, JR.] has expired.

Mr. KELLEY. Mr. Chairman, deny aid to Europe and millions die. Curtail aid to Europe and millions die slowly. Even today death stalks among the millions, because Europe is hungry and the marks of undernourishment are on their faces and their bodies. Death will reap its harvest in due time.

The most convincing argument for aid to Europe is to see the conditions and the people there. One may talk about it, write about it, but there is nothing so convincing as actually witnessing it. A visitor to western Europe, especially Germany and Austria, will be struck by the emaciated children and the gaunt, stoop-shouldered, ill-clad mothers and fathers on the streets of the great cities. Every living moment the one thought in the minds of the people of Europe is, "What shall my family and I have to eat today?"

I had the privilege of traveling through Europe after my mission to Switzerland at the International Labor Conference was completed. I visited Italy, Austria, Germany, France, and England, and was attached to no committee. I had the advantage of going where I pleased, talking to whom I pleased, and staying as long as I pleased. I had the disadvantage of paying my own expenses while doing so. But it was worth it, for I felt that I got very close to the people, and I have a vivid mental picture of the hunger, impoverishment, and the ruination of great nations.

We people in the United States are charitable and dislike to see others suffering for the lack of the ordinary comforts of life. We cannot enjoy the comforts to which we are accustomed if we know that others are suffering for want of them. This is the humanitarian side of the picture. There is also the practical view that our withdrawal or failure in Europe would mean complete collapse of the economy of western Europe, with an accompanying impact on us. We stand to benefit by an expenditure of relief money now, and failure to do so might mean a greater loss to us economically in the future.

All of the mouthings of Molotov and Vishinsky have been interpreted in the Congress and out of the Congress as whistling in the dark. I do not interpret them that way. To me, they are an attempt to embitter their people and the people of the satellite nations against us. They are the prelude to war. How could anyone suppose that the advancement of the Communists over the nations of western Europe was for any other purpose than for a battleground? Why do you suppose that Russia is so particular about permitting anyone to view what is going on behind the "iron curtain"? To me, it means simply that they are preparing for a war. If they can advance their own interests by a cold war and communism can creep forth over Europe, all well and good in their estimation. Should that fail, they could then resort to armed warfare.

So our only hope and defense against the encroachment of communism is to protect and preserve the peoples of western Europe. In so doing we should be careful that we get credit for our efforts and that the distribution of the goods

sent is properly supervised. These have been two of our great weaknesses. Whatever we do in Europe should be done with American efficiency and businesslike methods. And we should not submit ourselves to Russian propaganda. For instance, it is proposed that to carry out the success of reconstructing western Europe 30 or 40 percent of the coal should come from Poland. We are naive if we believe this, for the Ruhr coal-mine district spells success of any plan proposed for European recovery. Unless we recognize the Ruhr as the vital point in a reconstruction program, we may as well forget any plans and save our money. However, I shall deal more fully with the importance of the Ruhr area to European recovery at a later date.

Mrs. DOUGLAS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. SADOWSKI].

Mr. SADOWSKI. Mr. Chairman, while a great many of the Members of the House were visiting Europe this summer, spending a day or a day and a half in some twenty-odd countries, some of us were back home visiting with our constituents.

I want to say to you that a great change has occurred amongst my people in the way they are thinking about many things. I have never been an isolationist. In fact, I have always been very much opposed to that throughout my whole term in this Congress. My people are not isolationists. My people probably have more immediate blood relatives living in Europe than any other congressional district in the United States. My people have immediate members of their families, uncles and aunts and cousins, very dear ones, close relatives, as I say, living in Europe. They have always been very sympathetic to all of this relief program. I have supported all of the relief programs in Congress. But something else has happened since the beginning of this program of relief in Europe. Maybe the war is over. Maybe the people do not feel the same any more. The fact is, however, that today my people say that every sandwich that leaves the United States and goes to Europe ought to carry the American flag on it. Everybody who receives a gift from the United States should know it is coming from the people of the United States. They do not want this relief passed out by irresponsible people or profiteers any more; they want this relief passed out, if possible, by church organizations, the Red Cross, established charitable organizations that will give it to the needy, to the poor, to the hungry. They do not want to see American goods sold in European black markets where it brings to us the enmity of the needy and discredits our people and our Nation in the eyes of the people of Europe. American relief supplies should not fall into the hands of black-market profiteers as has been the case in Greece and China.

The relief packages, the gift packages that are sent individually by the private citizens to the people in Europe, have done a lot of good for the United States. Those packages that have gone to the needy have been the greatest bearers of good will for the United States of America.

My people want to see that the food that we give to the needy of Europe is given freely and generously to those who really need it and who are hungry. They feel that our program of relief should be placed on a democratic, American basis; yes, on a Christian basis, coming out of the hearts of our people to the people of Europe who need it.

The other thing I was impressed with is our own economic condition at home and the condition of our own people here at home. My factory workers in the city of Detroit are earning anywhere from \$48 to \$52 a week. That seems to be about the average pay check—\$48 to \$52 weekly. They tell me this: "Congressman, on this \$50 a week that I am getting now I cannot live as well as I lived in 1939."

In 1939 the average earnings were anywhere from \$37 to \$40 a week. "Then I could live much better than I can on this \$50 a week I am getting now. This \$50 I get now hardly buys \$25 worth of food and clothes today."

If you have a family of six—four children, the husband and wife—that is, growing children attending school, you will probably use eight bottles of milk a day as I do at my home. Eight bottles of milk a day cost me \$50 a month. Now, the average factory worker in Detroit who has a family the same as I do, a family of six—four children—has to spend \$50 a month for milk, and \$50 a month for rent. That leaves him \$100 a month to buy his food and clothes, send his children to school, pay his doctors' bills, and such things as electricity, heat, and so forth. It just cannot be done; they cannot make out.

So we in the city of Detroit are faced with the problem of strikes. It is a very serious thing. It is going to come. We are all expecting it.

I talked with merchants back home. I said, "How does it look here?"

"Well," one of them said, "Congressman, you know things are high now, but the goods I am buying for next spring, the orders I am placing now for next spring are running 15 percent higher."

I said, "Do you mean that the clothes and things you sell are costing you 15 percent more at wholesale prices?"

He said, "Yes, that is exactly right."

He said, "You can expect much higher prices in the spring."

If these prices keep going up, and it looks like they will; if butter goes to a dollar a pound and eggs go to a dollar a dozen, if hamburger goes to a dollar a pound, which it looks like it will, what can I expect back home in my large city of Detroit, from those workers down there? I am going to have a lot of grief. I do not see how I can go along on a long-range Marshall program where we are going to take \$20,000,000,000 out of this country at this time. I like to be with the administration, I would like to support the administration—I have—but I have my serious doubts right now that I can go along with a long-range program where the prices at home are going to rise so high that it will be unable for our own people to make ends meet.

The most pathetic thing that hit me, however, this summer was not so much the factory workers to whom I talked as

it was the people on old-age pensions. In the 12 years that I have been in Congress I have never had so many old people come to see me as came to see me this summer and fall. What was really pathetic was old men coming in and showing me their \$30 or \$35 a month check and asking: "How can I live on \$30 or \$35 a month, Congressman? Do something for me. You have got to help me."

I think that is the worst thing that has happened in our own Nation, when our own old people are expected to get by on \$30 to \$35 a month at this time. That has not the purchasing power of over \$15 a month. These people are going to have to go around and beg their relatives and friends to give them shelter, food, and medicine; in a great country like the United States, a generous Nation that is to give billions of dollars to everybody else and forget about its own citizens. How are we going to say to those who are incapacitated and old, "You can go along and starve to death if you want to."

I am going to support the \$60 a month pension bill that the gentleman from New York [Mr. JAVITS] has introduced. This would increase old-age pensions to \$60 a month. It was stated by members of the Ways and Means Committee that we could not afford to put through such an old-age pension bill, that it would cost some \$2,000,000,000 to finance such an old-age pension bill. Well, Mr. Chairman, if we can give billions of dollars to Europe and the countries all over the world under the Marshall plan or any other plan, we certainly ought to be able to find \$2,000,000,000 to finance an adequate old-age pension program for our own people in the United States of America. Certainly that money will go directly into the purchasing power of our own people, that money will be spent in the United States of America, it will be spent for our own goods, for farm products raised here in the United States.

It is fine to be charitable, it is fine to be Christian, but charity begins at home. We have got to start thinking about our people. Our people today are in a desperate condition economically and that condition is going to become worse, not better. I do not know how I could go home and try to explain to my people, if living conditions are intolerable, and justify my vote for the expenditure of billions and billions of dollars for Europe and not take care of my own people.

I can see a program that is an alternative to the Marshall plan. I think our program ought to be the old American principle of doing business the way we have done for centuries, extending trade on a businesslike basis to all nations, to all people, doing business with everybody but on a business basis. All people and all nations are our friends. That was our doctrine in the past. America became strong under such a program. That is still a good program for us to follow in the future. All nations, all people are our friends, we will do business with everybody, we want to do business with everybody.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman three additional minutes.

Mr. SADOWSKI. Mr. Chairman, we had a very funny bill come before the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce the other day, introduced by our friend the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT]. True, it called for an investigation, but the purpose back of it was to cut off trade with Soviet Russia. Now, it is fine to talk about this fellow Joe Stalin if you are running for political office. You do not hurt very many Americans when you attack Joe Stalin, and certainly if I were running for the United States Senate I would want to do that in a big way. The fact remains, however, that in my city of Detroit the manufacturers who make automobiles are dependent upon metal. We have to have metal to make automobiles. When we go to making farm machinery and farm equipment, we have got to have metal for that purpose. We are getting chromium ore, nickel, and various other ores from Russia today. In some instances 50 percent of the most important ores are coming from Russia today. Now, if Joe Stalin wanted to be mean to us he would say: "Let us cut off trade with the United States and not give them any more ore."

We would be in a fine fix. I do not know just where we would get that ore to carry on with our industries in the city of Detroit. But sometimes people do such foolish things, it seems. The United States is strong because we have done business with everybody. We should continue to do business with everybody. I am sure that the metal manufacturers and the producers of metal who need this ore would make some arrangement to get that ore. If we should say, "Cut off trade with Russia," they would probably get the ore from England or some other country. England would make a deal with Russia for this ore; the ore would be mined in Russia, dumped over into England, reloaded on other ships, and brought back to the United States. The only difference would be that the recipients of that ore in the United States would pay about 25 to 30 percent more for the product because it would have to go through English brokers or Italian brokers or some other nation. So, it all strikes me that it is time to go back in our thinking to the good old way that we have been accustomed to thinking as Americans; that we want to do business with all nations and all people. You must have trade and commerce in order to have peace. If you are looking for war, if you want war and are pointing toward war, if your mind is directed in the direction of war, then you begin dropping the curtain of trade and commerce against these people, or this nation and that nation, and you bar trading with them. If you are thinking in terms of peace you will be thinking in terms of commerce and terms of trade and terms of business. Then it should not be necessary for us to burden the American taxpayers with heavy debts to finance the program for war. A program of commerce, of trade, and of peace calls for loans and credits that will be repaid to our people. It is a program of war that is causing heavy burdens to be put on the backs of our American taxpayers.

I am not going to support a program that will aim to set up east against west, Asia against Europe, or one country against another. I am going to support a program that is going to be directed for peace, for commerce, for trade, for justice, for equity amongst all peoples and all nations.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. COUDERT].

Mr. COUDERT. Mr. Chairman, I take this time solely for the purpose of making clear what I had in mind in a number of questions that I asked the proponents of the bill while they had the floor. The chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, the distinguished gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. EATON], the distinguished gentleman from Georgia [Mr. COX], and the distinguished gentleman from Minnesota, Dr. JUMP, have all taken the position on this floor that this is primarily a war measure, a defensive measure, if you will, in the cold world-wide war with Russia, a measure to carry out that policy frequently stated by our Department of State that the United States is committed to the proposition that it will meet and stop Russian aggression everywhere.

Now, gentlemen, this is either a war measure or a relief measure or nothing at all. If it is a war measure, if it is for the purpose of carrying out that policy declared by the Department of stopping Russia everywhere, then I think we have got to measure it by one standard. If it is a relief measure we have to measure it by another standard.

As a war measure, it seems to me we have to ask ourselves, Will it accomplish the purpose? We must ask ourselves further, what really is the foreign policy of the United States, because we are not dealing in a vacuum any more, we are not dealing in pleasant academic generalities. That policy is now squarely put to the test, an immediate, living crisis. Russian communism has started, and has engaged in France and in Italy, in civil war, obviously jeopardizing the lives of the existing governments. If the United States is prepared to take any and all measures, and that of course includes armed force, to sustain in power the existing governments in those two states, and the Secretary of State comes to us and says that as part of our foreign policy in what is the equivalent of war he must have \$590,000,000 for that purpose, then we are probably in the position where we have very little choice, as we had very little choice during the war itself.

It was further admitted by proponents of this measure that obviously this relatively small sum of \$590,000,000 and what it will buy is not going to be decisive in the civil wars raging in France and Italy. It is not going to sustain those governments if they are not able to sustain themselves by their own splendid efforts in their magnificent and courageous struggle against the Russian Communist aggression within their borders. If it is not able to do that, and if the Department and the President are

not willing to say to us that the United States will go all the way, maybe in the next 2 weeks, maybe even next week, then I think we are entitled to look at the amount of this bill with a questioning eye. We are entitled to ask ourselves whether this is truly a war measure and, if we find it is not truly a war measure, and that it is not calculated to achieve the purpose, then we are entitled to look upon it as a relief measure. As a relief measure the standard again must be different. As a relief measure we are certainly entitled to ask the obvious question, What is America's capacity to give relief? If it is a relief measure, we are entitled to define that capacity, as the amount, quality, and character of goods we can export for this purpose, without causing any further increase in prices and, of course, without necessitating the imposition of economic controls.

I think we have to make up our minds on this floor before we reach a conclusion on this bill as to whether it is really and truly a war measure primarily or whether it is a relief measure. As far as I am concerned, it would make some difference in the way I should vote on amendments to reduce the amount and limit the use of the money for the purchase of specific goods. As it is, I should like to see that question effectively answered.

I yield to no one in my sincere desire for the rehabilitation of two great nations, France and Italy, and in my admiration for the courageous struggle which their present governments are making. More power to them.

Mr. BUFFETT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COUDERT. I yield.

Mr. BUFFETT. Is it not reasonable to suggest if the proponents of this measure feel it is a necessary war measure or equivalent thereto that they should be willing to go all the way and vote for price controls and wage controls and all other types of regimentation that go with a war effort?

Mr. COUDERT. That is precisely my point. If this is part of a war measure, and an effective war measure, then obviously we cannot balk at the consequences. If it is not an effective and necessary war measure calculated to accomplish an immediate purpose in an immediate war, then obviously it does not justify all the sacrifices that war measures do justify.

Let me make one further point in that connection. No aid of this character, in my humble opinion, whether it be the Marshall plan or interim aid, can possibly have any chance of achieving effective rehabilitation until the political and social structure in the interested countries has been reasonably settled so that men and women can get back to business, get back to work, and devote themselves to reconstruction and rehabilitation in their own countries, and use our contributions, however great they may be, intelligently and effectively.

Mr. BUFFETT. May I commend the gentleman on the brilliant way in which he has taken this problem apart.

Mr. COUDERT. I thank the gentleman.



The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. POAGE].

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Chairman, we have heard a good many experts who have returned from Europe and who have seen the situation there. We have had some differences of opinion among the experts as to what they say. I went with the Food Committee of this House and spent some 4 weeks in western Europe during the month of September.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POAGE. I yield.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. May I say to the gentleman that he was a very, very valuable member of that committee.

Mr. POAGE. I thank the chairman of my subcommittee, and may I say to him I believe that subcommittee, under his leadership, made a serious and honest effort to see the situation in Europe. There were six of us and I expect there were six opinions when we got back. That is the usual situation.

I have already said that I made no claim to being an expert except as to one thing. I have lived all my life in the Southwest. I think I know dry weather when I see it. I think I am somewhat of an expert on droughts. I saw the situation in Europe this year, and I can say to you, that even judging by the standards of the Southwest, Europe is suffering from a very severe drought, a drought that cut their crops in many cases half in two. Remember that even under the best of circumstances when there has not been a war for 10 or 15 years, or if such a case ever happened, in 20 years; and when the weather was good, western Europe has not for 100 years been able to grow her own food. Think, then, what the situation must be after the devastation of this war and the destruction and disruption of all of their economy. Then add to that the worst drought in 100 years and you will have some picture of what Europe is facing now in regard to feeding herself. It just simply cannot be done. Those who say "Let Europe feed herself" or "Let Europe go to work" reckon without the physical facts of nature. Many of our great States could not feed themselves during the Dust Bowl drought, or at least those sections of States that did not get rain could not feed themselves although they had suffered no war damage. No nation on the face of the earth has ever been known to be able to feed itself unless the Lord allows the water to fall or unless its people are able to bring it under irrigation. Western Europe simply did not have the rain needed to grow a crop this year.

During the month of September when they should have had feed, if they are ever going to have it, I stood in Norway and with my own hands fed to a dairy cow wood pulp, and watched her eat it. We had visited a dairy and we saw rolls of wood pulp which looked like newsprint. They told us they fed it to the cows. I said, "I do not believe a cow will eat that stuff." They said, "Try it." I tore some off and I tried it and I saw those cows

eat that wood pulp. Nothing in the world but wood pulp, rolled up like newsprint. I cite that merely to show you that the situation is desperate. I know some of those who visited Europe reported that they did not see people falling on the streets. I did not either. I was in Shanghai and I saw that kind of starvation there but I did not see it in Europe. But I think it is perfectly obvious that unless somebody supplies some food during these winter months, that just that kind of starvation must happen in Europe before another harvest season rolls around.

Under those circumstances it seems to me that our Nation could hardly claim to be made up of the Christian folks we have proclaimed ourselves to be if we were unwilling to make some effort to alleviate that suffering. I do not believe that many of us would deny that kind of help to a neighbor whose house had been destroyed by fire, or where the parents had been killed in some automobile accident and the children were left on a poor and unproductive place. That is about the situation in Europe. Their homes and their factories have been destroyed. Their people have been killed. If we lay any claim to being the Christian people that we think we are, we owe an obligation to our neighbors. I do not think the American people are so selfish or so reluctant to sacrifice that they will refuse to contribute when they know that people are bound to starve unless assistance is given. I believe our people would feed the hungry even if we knew that we would reap no selfish advantage.

Now, the fact that by doing good for somebody else we may perchance improve our own economy, and will undoubtedly strengthen our military position, should not mitigate against the proposal. The suggestion has just been made on this floor that we should decide whether this is a relief measure or a war measure, and that we must make a decision and say it is one and that it cannot be the other.

My friends, the fact that you can accomplish several desirable results by the same action makes that action no less desirable, in my opinion. Certainly we know that we are doing no more than our Christian duty when we feed these people. We know we have not done it if we do not feed them. That much we all know.

There may be room for honest difference of opinion as to effect that it will have on our own economy and the effect it may have on our military security. No one can look into the future and know positively that this program will give us either military or economic supremacy but it is hardly debatable that the probabilities are that it will place us in a stronger position. I certainly can give you no guarantee, nor can anyone else give you any guarantee that if we follow this program the nations of western Europe will not fall into the Soviet orbit and become our enemies at some future time. I cannot guarantee that. Neither can anybody else. No matter how much money we spend, we cannot guarantee that, but we do know, and no one can gainsay it, that there is greater prob-

ability of a communistic government in any land where suffering is great than in the same land when there is adequate food, housing, and clothing. We know what the probabilities are and we know that there is much less likelihood of a Soviet-controlled government in these western European nations if their people have a reasonable amount of food, shelter, and warmth this winter than if they do not have it. We know that the Soviet influence will be stronger the less we do.

We saw Yugoslavia fall to the Soviet influence; we saw Hungary fall to the Soviet influence; we are seeing the pressure that is being put upon Austria, Germany, Italy, and France right now. I do not know whether it will succeed or not, but I do not see any objection to doing a Christian act simply because it may help us in the future. I do not see any valid reason for rejecting this program as a relief program simply because it may save the lives of American boys 2 years, 10 years, or 20 years hence. I can see no reason for repudiating a program simply because we may get a modified blessing in our own country from doing the things that we know we ought to do.

I do know that some kind of show-down between the free enterprise, free speech, free religion, free ballots, and free men of the West and the controlled and regimented life of communistic Russia is likely to occur sometime in the future. I do not think that war is inevitable. In fact, I do not think we will have war as long as there is little reason to believe that the forces of totalitarianism could prevail. I don't think the men in the Kremlin have any desire to commit hara-kari. If we can keep the balance of strength on our side, I believe we and the world have a fair chance of peace. If we let the balance of strength shift, I fear for freedom. There are more people in western Europe than there are in the United States. In spite of their losses, their productive capacity probably exceeds that of Russia. I want these people and this productive capacity on our side. Whether the show-down comes on the battlefield or in the council chamber, we need these people as friends rather than as enemies. The side they take may well determine the course of history and our own national existence. I cannot see how anyone can contemplate these facts and hesitate to do what we can to keep these people and these lands west of the iron curtain. Once the Communists take over in France and Italy, the police states of the Balkans will have established themselves just across the Atlantic from us—and never suppose that with such governments it will make any difference what the majority of the people want. Surely we need but look at Poland, Hungary, or Yugoslavia to see how much help we could expect from a western Europe in communistic hands.

Nor do I see any reason why we should invite economic catastrophe in our own land just because in helping ourselves, we might also help someone else—even if that other person is not 100 percent perfect. There has been too much loose talk about how this program is going to starve the American people. This kind

of talk is perfectly childish. What are the facts of the matter? You know what the figures are. You know that we grew 1,400,000,000 bushels of wheat this year. That is approximately twice the amount of wheat the United States needs for food and for seed. What are we going to do with the other 700,000,000 bushels of wheat? I know a lot of people from what they have said in the past will get up and say, "Let us feed it." I ask you: "At what price can you feed wheat?" Any of you farmers, any of you wheat men, at what price can you feed wheat? Can you feed wheat at the present price of cattle and hogs? And they are high. Can you today feed wheat at \$3 a bushel? No; you cannot feed it at \$3 a bushel, and that is the reason it is not being fed now, high though meat prices are.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Chairman, I yield five additional minutes to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. POAGE. You cannot feed wheat until you bring the price down to a point that it is profitable to feed it. Now, you cannot feed \$3 wheat, and it is just silly to talk about it unless you are willing to raise the price of beef, unless you are willing to raise the price of pork; far higher than these prices are today; and I do not think many of us want to do that sort of thing. You cannot feed wheat until it becomes an economically practical thing to do. That means, then, that if you are going to feed 700,000,000 bushels of wheat you have got to see the price of wheat drop decidedly. But some will say, "I would like to see the price drop; we want to bring prices down."

Do you? Are you so sure you want to bring prices down? Everybody wants to bring the other fellow's prices down. Everybody wants the other fellow to sell for less, we want the other fellow to sell food for less, we want the other fellow to sell manufactured goods for less, we want the other fellow to work for less, but how many of us want to lower our own prices or our own wage?

You cannot bring wheat prices down to the figure where you can feed wheat without destroying the existing prosperity in the agricultural regions of this Nation, and every farmer who grows wheat or feeds it knows it. You cannot bring the price of wheat down low enough to feed it to cows and to hogs without destroying the price of corn and without bringing the whole agricultural price structure down.

Oh, you say you would like to have that, that you want food to cost less. Do you? Your food costs much less per unit in 1932, much less, but there were 14,000,000 Americans walking the streets who could not get jobs, who could earn nothing to eat, even though beef sold for a nickel a pound. Were we so much better off in those days when the farmers of this Nation were getting 30 cents for their wheat? Some people seem to want to go back to those low prices but I do not know who was better off.

We hear all this talk about how people are in such bad shape today because the American farmer has an export market and is getting a fair price for most of

what he produces. Who is in such bad shape? Are you suffering because the farmer is doing well? The American people as a whole are eating more per capita than they ever ate in the history of America. They are buying more new automobiles than they ever bought with the exception of 2 or 3 years. They are living in good shelter. We are short of housing, but they are living in better homes than they ever lived in before, and in my country and yours there have been thousands of old shacks abandoned that should have been abandoned long ago. With the low prices of 1932, only two farms out of a hundred had electricity in my State. With the high prices of 1947, nearly two out of every three farms enjoy electricity. With 8-cent cotton, nearly every farm in the South was mortgaged for all it would carry, and the loan companies were getting them just as they were getting city homes. Today, with a good export market, not only our farm mortgages but our city mortgages are at record lows and there are no foreclosures. Regardless of what may be said, our people have not simply more money, but what is really important from the standpoint of living standards, they have more of the conveniences and luxuries of life today than they ever had in any period of low prices and economic depression—and what is more, they have a higher living standard than they can possibly have in a future depression. Russia knows this, even if some of our people are not smart enough to realize it. Russia is making her plans on the assumption that we will suffer a depression. Russia knows that you cannot maintain the American standard of living in the city or the country if you let the price of wheat break down to a dollar a bushel, six bits a bushel, or 50 cents a bushel; and who in this House can tell where, if you are going to start a spiral of deflation on a vital farm product, that you can stop it? Remember that it is not simply farm prosperity that is involved. It is our national prosperity. You cannot have full employment or handsome dividends if you do not have a prosperous agriculture, and you cannot have a prosperous agriculture if you dump half a billion bushels of surplus wheat on the market. What plan have you to put the brakes on? Where are you going to stop when you pile up 700,000,000 bushels of wheat in this country with no market? Our present farm prosperity, which is the basis of our entire prosperity, stems from our export marketing of wheat.

If you want to maintain prosperity, Mr. Chairman, on the farms and in the factory, if you want to keep our people at work, if you want to keep our corporate dividends high, if you want to keep American prosperity at a level that will enable us to pay the public debt, let us not destroy the farm prosperity as we saw it destroyed in 1920 and 1928.

Let us keep this thing moving at a level that will enable the American people to sell their crops, so that we can have a level of prosperity that will pay our national debt. You talk to me about destroying America's credit. America's credit is good as long as America's income is good. But if you destroy America's income and take it back to the level

of 1932, when it was \$39,000,000,000, then, indeed, you cannot pay anything on the public debt, and you will have it increasing year by year. You keep this income where it is today, you keep America prosperous by letting us sell our wheat abroad and give us a program that does good for Europe, that does good for America, and you will see America enjoying a prosperity that will enable us to pay our public debt. It is the only way in the world you can do it. Why should we destroy this beneficial arrangement simply because it is going to do us some good and do the world some good at the same time?

If you are really troubled about getting some of our money back, why not wipe out the tariff on those things Europe can still export? Europe still produces some of the most elegant luxury goods. There are craftsmen and factories there that are utterly unfitted for any other work. Our people want their goods. Every dollar that we spend on luxuries relieves the inflationary pressure on American essentials. Our economy would be helped, not hurt by taking these goods. Europe would not be hurt by exporting this type of goods. Her people need necessities, not luxuries. I realize that luxury goods will not pay for all the essentials we shall send to Europe, but they will help pay the bill if we will but allow them to come in. What about it, my friends? Do you really want to be paid, or do you only want to find fault? Let us take all the luxury goods, all the scarce and needed minerals that Europe can send us. Let us send to Europe the wheat that she needs. Let us not hesitate because someone else may share in our blessings. I trust the American people to do the big, the generous thing, but if you are not interested in charity, I urge you to consider our own self-interest.

Let us not kill the goose that lays the golden egg simply because she feeds on surplus wheat which we cannot use at home.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN]. [After a pause.] Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, I have attempted to yield to the gentleman two times but apparently he has not been here. There is no possibility that the yieldings will be accumulated, is there? I am yielding to the gentleman for only one speech.

The CHAIRMAN. I think the gentleman can figure that out for himself.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GAVIN].

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank my good friend for giving me this opportunity to present some of the conclusions that I have reached after our recent tour through Europe and the Arabian countries.

Our Committee on Armed Services has just completed a tour of 12 European and Near East countries, including Germany, Austria, the free territory of Trieste, Greece, Turkey, Iran, Saudi-

Arabia, Egypt, Italy, Switzerland, France, and England.

During this tour the committee met and discussed military, economic, political, and social conditions with literally hundreds of persons. We met with Army, Navy, Air, and State Department officials in Berlin, Frankfurt, Munich, Vienna, Trieste, Athens, Istanbul, Tehran, Dharan, Cairo, Rome, Paris, Geneva, and London. In addition we met with both civic and military authorities of the different governments visited.

While the main mission of our tour was to inspect American military installations and American troops in the occupied zones of Germany and Austria, nevertheless, because our overseas military missions are largely determined by social, economic, and political conditions abroad we spent considerable time investigating those conditions.

We found the morale of our troops to be exceptionally high. The leadership displayed by our officers and noncommissioned officers was outstanding. The health of our troops in general is excellent. The discipline is of the highest quality and hundreds of GI's were personally interviewed.

Facilities and installations inspected were found to be in excellent condition. A number of United States cemeteries visited revealed that these were being given every care and attention.

While the number of American troops in Europe today represents merely a token force whose mission is that of maintaining law and order and supporting the military government in the occupied zones, nevertheless, the mere presence of American troops very obviously has done much to reassure the peoples of the occupied zones that the United States is vitally concerned with their welfare and their problems.

We traveled approximately 18,000 miles and visited 12 different countries and I must confess that I am more confused than I have ever been before.

Time will not permit me to review the many countries and places that we visited. However, I do want to present for the consideration of the House some of the conclusions that I have reached after this extensive trip.

Since September of 1945 we have pumped an estimated \$20,000,000,000 into Europe of which the British received three billion seven hundred and fifty million. The other countries including Russia and the satellite countries of Russia have participated in the balance—this for relief and rehabilitation, and even in face of this gesture the result has been the steady advance of Russian influence on the continent of Europe.

For generations England strove to prevent any power from dominating the Continent. She fought Germany because the rise of German power threw its shadow over Europe.

Now, England is helpless before Soviet might and the question is whether the United States can prevent communism from engulfing Germany, Austria, France, Greece, Italy, and the few remaining European areas where some freedom and private enterprise remain.

In this connection, I might point out the warning by Herbert Hoover that "the greatest danger to all civilization is for us to impair our economy by drains which cripple our own productivity."

We cannot continue indefinitely to pour billions haphazardly into Europe without crippling and bankrupting ourselves.

Since World War II anyone who raised a question about our foreign policy has been charged immediately with being an isolationist.

In July of this year, before I made the trip to Europe I stated:

The dilemma in which we find ourselves today is the direct result of bungling after victory in World War II.

To begin with, we gave Russia every advantage. We felt that the Bear would respond to kindness. This country began its appeasement policy toward Russia even before Germany's defeat.

We dismembered Germany and put German industry out of commission. We destroyed the industrial heart of Europe.

Instead of trying to restore and rehabilitate European industry, we saw to it that most of the Continent became a poorhouse. Today Europe is a poorhouse dependent upon our charity.

How the Russians must have laughed at us behind our backs. Communism thrives on misery, hunger, chaos, and confusion.

Unless we restore the productive capacity of Europe, including Germany, there is no end to the money that can be poured into Europe without appreciable effect.

Of course, we can punish Germany. We can turn her into a pastoral nation. But the result in all Europe shows that the American taxpayer will be called upon to pay for, in one way or another, the goods that are no longer produced in Europe.

Our foreign affairs have been badly handled. Certainly, we cannot withdraw from participation in world affairs. At the same time, there must be an end to indiscriminate and wasteful spending abroad.

So far as I am concerned, any future program for European rehabilitation must deal with fundamentals and must fully protect the interests of the United States.

I think a lot of others feel the same way.

Now, I have not changed my mind to any great degree. Today the Congress is asked to appropriate some five or six hundred million dollars to prevent starvation and hardship during this winter in the war-torn countries of Europe. We will then consider a plan to appropriate an estimated \$20,000,000,000 for restoration and rehabilitation of the economic and industrial life of western Europe. Also, up for consideration will be help to Britain, Japan, Korea, China, and India.

How far we can go without bankrupting this Nation is the question. We owe two hundred and sixty billion at the present time. However, I do say, in any event, to pass legislation authorizing these appropriations to effect stability in the world without building up our national defense is to me an unsound and unwise investment.

The conditions in world affairs are more critical than ever before.

I am of the opinion that if Russia and her satellite nations were inclined to move in they could push through Europe to the English Channel just about as quickly as mechanized equipment could get them there.

Russia, I understand has some 4,000,000 men under arms and has reached

new peaks in production of military equipment.

Our military in Europe has but token forces in Germany, Austria, Italy, Greece, and Trieste. They are turning in a magnificent performance under Gen. Lucius D. Clay in Germany. The military, in my estimation, knows more about what should be done and how it should be done than all the statisticians, economists, and diplomats put together. We should be governed by their recommendations to a great extent.

As General Clay said to us in Berlin: "We fought our way in, we are dug in and we are here to stay unless ordered out."

Now, while we are talking about this rehabilitation program of the industrial and economic life of western Europe I read in Newsweek of October 27 as follows:

It ought to give "enormous momentum" to the Bizonia industrial effort. As part of the new level-of-industry plan it will "sweep away the uncertainties and fears which have surrounded the problem of reparations for the last 2 years."

With these words, spoken over Berlin radio on October 16, Lawrence Wilkinson, director of the American Military Government Economics Division prepared the Germans for the new list of 682 plants scheduled for immediate reparations dismantling. On the same day the complete book-length roster prepared by American and British military governments, officially made its appearance in London and Berlin.

The most extraordinary feature of the announcement was the intimation that the flow of reparations to the Russians would be started again. Explanations that resuming shipping German plants to the Russians might put the Soviets in a pleasant mood for the Foreign Ministers' Conference in London this month did not impress Berlin observers in view of the cold war admittedly being waged between the United States and the Soviet Union and the somewhat warmer conflict suggested by former Secretary Byrnes in his book, "Speaking Frankly."

Ruhr show-down: Fearful that their silence might prove political suicide, German party leaders had been loud and vitriolic in condemning in advance the new reparations list. But since its actual publication their threats of protest strikes and passive resistance have not materialized.

So why do we continue this appeasement policy where there is utter destruction and ruin? Why should it be necessary to dismantle these plants and then appropriate money of the American taxpayers to rehabilitate and rebuild them?

So the whole matter does not make sense. While we are asked to put up \$20,000,000,000 to give western Europe that industrial impetus to effect recovery the planners are planning to strip the last remnants of Germany's industrial life around which recovery might be organized.

Certainly we must, sooner or later, take a stand and if we tolerate such an unsound performance under existing conditions in these war-torn countries how is it ever going to be possible to get these countries back on their feet?

The utter destruction and devastation in Germany is terrific, and one has to see with one's own eyes to understand the situation.

The people are discouraged. They are disheartened. They are demoralized.

They are frustrated. They walk around aimlessly all day scrounging around in the fields for a potato or two.

Certainly some help must be given. But, we must see to it that it reaches the people for whom it is given.

Fear that we may sicken of our job and move out and the Russians move in grips the hearts of the people everywhere. One might say, "Well, they had it coming and let them have it." Yet, on the other hand, if we fail at this critical hour you can, I believe, reconcile yourselves to complete communization of Europe. The situation is a desperate one and it looks more to me like a \$50,000,000,000 job than the \$20,000,000,000 estimated.

The No. 1 problem is food to prevent starvation in parts of Europe during the coming winter months.

No. 2: Rehabilitation of the coal industry around which the whole economy of Europe moves.

No. 3: Rehabilitation of transportation.

No. 4: Rehabilitation of the steel industry.

My recommendation is, that if we undertake the job, that an administrative agency separate from any branch of Government, in liaison with military government, be set up, composed of the keenest brains in America, in finance, agriculture, coal, transportation, steel, and miscellaneous industries—men of wide experience—hard-headed, practical businessmen who understand that two and two make four—men who have been successful operators.

With such a program set up the American people should be informed as to how the plan is going to operate, where the money is going to be spent, who is going to do the spending and the results it will achieve. The whole venture is purely speculative and my guess is that it would have one chance in five of succeeding.

We might as well include it as part of our budget. Write it off, as I believe it doubtful we would ever recover a dollar; but if the gamble is made—and it is a gamble—to stop up complete communization of Europe, it might and it might not produce results and return the world to some degree of peace and stability. However, if we are just going to appropriate money for promiscuous spending, as we have in the past, it would be like pouring money down a hole and would accomplish nothing.

Now, there should be enough patriotic American businessmen who would lay aside their own business for the time being, willing to take over and tackle the job. It would require the keenest brains and ingenuity that is available. This program must be made an all-out war for world recovery. It is a job for everyone to do his part toward peace for the world just as our boys did their part in World War II.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman five additional minutes.

Mr. GAVIN. Thank you very much. I appreciate the consideration given.

It is evident that those who have been handling our affairs have not profited from the lessons of previous wars, judging from the agreements we have entered into, but have continued to put their faith in treaties with people whom they

thought were as right minded as themselves; and the result has been that Uncle Sam and the American taxpayer have taken a terrific beating without any definite results.

We should have had alert, quick-thinking, practical realists handling our affairs, men who judged the past, the present in which they were working, and anticipated what might happen in the future, instead of world thinkers. The water is over the dam as far as agreements are concerned.

We have got to get down to practical business; we must handle this program in a practical manner. No Member of Congress is against this program to feed the hungry people of the world, but we want it carefully administered to see that these foodstuffs get into the stomachs of the people who are crying for them. That is all we are concerned about.

I want to say to you that communism is on the march everywhere in Europe. I have heard some of our speakers in the past week say that communism has been reduced to a crawl. I have heard them say that communism is only in evidence here and there. It is my opinion communism is on the march everywhere in Europe; every country in Europe, whether Germany, France, Austria, Italy, Trieste, Palestine, the Dardanelles, whether Germany, France, Austria, Italy, Arabia, wherever you may go, is packed with dynamite that may explode in our faces any minute.

Now I say to the American people that we had better begin right now, along with any help we give to Europe, to build our national defense—the mightiest Army, Navy, and Air Force this country has ever known to be ready to meet any emergency that may arise.

Far be it from me to be warmongering, but as Gen. Jan Smuts so ably said, "Peace without the power to back it up becomes but an empty dream."

We fought our way into Italy and at Anzio I saw the graves of our 7,499 American dead. We are scheduled, according to agreements, to pull our forces out of Italy when we have settled nothing, and yet we are about to put millions of dollars into that country for relief, and what may happen when we pull out is anybody's guess. If we put our money in we should see that the military stays in to protect it until conditions are settled in that country.

So, the problem is one that after this extensive trip has every one very much confused.

Help is requested of us from Japan, Korea, China, India, Germany, Austria, Greece, Italy, France, and the British Isles.

We are feeding today some million displaced persons and how long we can continue to carry this tremendous burden, without finding ourselves in difficulties, is the problem which confronts the Congress.

It is quite evident that there is a lack of cooperation on the part of the Russians to unify Germany economically and it may be necessary to unify the British, American, and French zones of Germany and go it alone, if Russia refuses to work with us.

In any event, the situation is a most critical and desperate one, and all I can say in conclusion is that we should be thankful to Almighty God that we were born Americans and live in America. We seem to fail to realize how grateful we should be to live in this great land of opportunity, where freedom of speech and freedom of the press and religious and political freedom prevail, and those fundamental characteristics that have built, without question, the greatest Nation the world has ever known.

The war-torn countries of the Old World look to America for strength and leadership to return them to some degree of peace, tranquility, and stability, and I pray God will give us guidance and direction to restore order out of the chaos that now exists throughout the world.

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GAVIN. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. BONNER. The gentleman is making a fine speech and I have enjoyed it, but do you believe that the majority of this food we are going to send over there will get to those we are directly interested in, without cost? I mean for the hungry stomachs of Europe, unless there is some limit to this bill.

Mr. GAVIN. That is right; and I believe that the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN] will offer such an amendment so that we can get the desired results and so that the food for which the American taxpayer is paying will reach the stomachs of the people for whom it is intended.

Mr. BONNER. But as the bill stands now, the food will be taken over there and sold.

Mr. GAVIN. As I understand it, the gentleman is correct.

Mr. SADOWSKI. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Chairman, I yield one additional minute to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. GAVIN. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. SADOWSKI. The gentleman has made a very splendid plea for the rebuilding of Germany, but I did not hear him say anything in behalf of the rebuilding of countries whose peoples were destroyed by the Nazis. The gentleman did not do that deliberately, I am sure.

Mr. GAVIN. Certainly not.

Mr. SADOWSKI. Should not they be extended aid in the form of loans and credits?

Mr. GAVIN. I may say that I do not believe we would be able to get back of the iron curtain to give relief to those countries that may be sympathetic, friendly, and ambitious to cooperate and work with us.

Mr. SADOWSKI. But the gentleman knows those people have made these requests and they need this help and have asked for credits and loans. They want their money on a business basis, not as gifts; they just want a loan and some credit on a business basis. Is the gentleman in favor of that?

Mr. GAVIN. I certainly think we want to help any country that is friendly

and favorable toward us. If, however, they are under the domination of any communistic country, certainly we do not want to do anything to make satellite countries of Russia stronger.

Mr. SADOWSKI. Those people and those nations have all been friendly with us. They fought on our side in the last war. They were our allies, so it is not a question of their being unfriendly to us.

Mr. GAVIN. We are friendly to them without question and would be if given the opportunity to be.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has again expired.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. HAYS].

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Arkansas is recognized.

Mr. DEANE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAYS. I yield.

Mr. DEANE. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will count. [After counting.] One hundred and twelve Members are present, a quorum.

The gentleman from Arkansas is recognized.

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Chairman, I have seldom begun a speech touching foreign relations without referring with some pride to the fact that in 1944 the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. Judd] and I introduced what was called a bipartisan peace resolution. I think one of the admirable things about the discussion of the pending question is the fact that partisanship has been minimized. We can all take pride in the fact that when national security is considered in an issue so grave as this we have at least tried to forget party differences. I feel such a strong conviction upon this point that while I am a pretty good party man, loyal to my party on most domestic issues, I want to use it as a preface to what I say about this bill.

When I returned from Europe after 7 weeks, visiting many of the countries that are mentioned specifically in the bill, and talking with our ambassadors and our agricultural and economic attachés, who are doing such splendid work, the first question that I was asked was, Are the conditions as bad as pictured? Second, if the answer is "Yes," are Europe's foundations, material and spiritual, preserved, or will the money we expend be wasted? Finally, if the answer to both of these questions is "Yes," can America do the job without exhausting herself, for I agree with everyone who has said that it is of utmost concern to the world as well as America that our great productive system be held intact. The worst misfortune that could befall the world is for America to be impaired.

I overheard a young man talking to the Ambassador's secretary in Copenhagen. He asked, "How can I join the American Army? I want to get to America. I want to be a part of America." I thought that was a rather typical conversation, because I found generally an admiration for and interest in America, an appre-

ciation of our institutions. Yes; I know there were critical, even cynical, comments—I heard them—but wherever there was correct information about America there seemed to be a high regard for us. Certainly at one stage of the war we were the world's best loved nation. It is a worthy thing for us to want to remain continuously in that exalted position. We will strengthen that position by this measure.

Yes; conditions are as bad as they are pictured. One-half of all the babies that have been born in Europe since the war have died from malnutrition or undernourishment. I saw the wheat fields of northern France. They looked a good deal like the drought-stricken parts of the Southwest, of my own State, in 1930, when great suffering was prevented by outside help. I was amazed to read a businessman's statement in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the other day in which he said that on the boulevards of Paris and in the cafes he saw no sign of hunger, no lack of food. But he paid black-market prices for his meals, and if he had examined carefully the actual conditions that exist in France, even in Paris, he would have found suffering and deprivation. Without any doubt, conditions are bad, and they will get much worse unless we help.

Now, I believe America should rise to this challenge even if it were not for the threat of the Communists, and I hope that when the debate is concluded it will be apparent that we are engaged in saving something as well as defeating something. If it were not the Communists capitalizing misery, it would be some other revolutionary group. There are always people of violence to prey on hunger and distress.

The French people have perhaps not been as gifted, at least not as effective, as the American and British in the science of government. But they are a great people and there is still a devotion to freedom. And while, as the gentleman from Texas pointed out, no one can guarantee that this venture will be successful, that the results which we hope for can be assured, we know what the answer will be if the help is not given. We also know that it will not be because a majority of the people of France prefer a totalitarian government. It will be because a vicious, a violent, an unscrupulous and unprincipled minority will seize upon that situation and climb to power. There must be an opportunity for the people of France in their distress to register their majority will. They are going to be hungry this winter and they are going to be cold unless we can give this substantial aid, and I reiterate that we can do it without damage to our own resources.

A lady in France said to me that America still could not understand France because we have not suffered. I believe I had the right answer for her. It is partly because we have suffered, some of our people have suffered greatly, that we are determined to do something about the world's present ills. It is because we do know what war means.

The economic problems of France today are not primarily due to any widespread disinclination to work on the part

of the rank and file of the French people; not at all. Work stoppages are Communist inspired. Let us remember, too, that here was a nation with 40,000,000 population that lost one and one-half million men in the First World War. Herbert Hoover rightfully said, "They have not recovered from it." Perhaps they never will in our lifetime. The war that was fought upon their soil took 25 percent of their industry, and almost wrecked their transportation. And following the war, the two worst droughts in the history of France came upon them. Not since 1815, when the first weather records were kept, have there been such droughts as in 1945 and 1947. The people of western Europe have suffered the greatest devastation in two tragic wars and they have suffered from the century's worst weather.

Many are asking if our action in giving aid can be carried out without the impression that we are thinking in terms of war. That is an important question, and the gentleman from Texas [Mr. POACE] handled it exactly as it ought to be handled. Here is an identification of interest. Surely, there is enough danger potentially in the communistic expansion to make us aware of the fact that our own interests are involved, and the other element, the more positive one, is also here. Inevitably this question of our Christian character as the leading nation in the world comes into the discussions. It ought to be said without apology. I know there is a shying away from reference to America as a Christian nation for it might have a creedal and narrow aspect. Not at all. Our forefathers were not embarrassed about it. They said, "This is a Christian nation" because it is a free nation, with the right of every man, whether he be a Christian or otherwise, to worship as he pleases. Ultimately that is our hope, to achieve freedom in the world. There is a clear identification of interest between the French and our people, if the French who are trying to preserve freedom and stabilize their Government are in the majority, and I think they are. I cannot believe there is doubt about the outcome of this debate. We are going to pass this bill. There will be some minor amendments perhaps, and incidentally I hope there will be a full discussion on the Andresen amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Arkansas has expired.

Mrs. DOUGLAS. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 10 additional minutes.

Mr. HAYS. I think we ought to discuss the possibility of the use of some funds and the extent to which aid might be given through the nongovernmental agencies that have done such good work, though I have reservations on that score. No one believes more than I do in the work of the church committees, for example. I want to say just a word about that, for the work of the Society of Friends and of the Church of the Brethren, to mention two in reestablishing some of the foundation dairy herds, is impressive.

I hope, therefore, as we talk about these political problems that have such grave aspects, we can also point out that

America has been doing this other non-governmental relief job, and we need to coordinate the two so that the world understands really what we are about. From the standpoint of policy, our purpose is to stabilize the governments of the western rim of Europe so that if a conflict comes they will be our friends and not be on the side of the opposition. From the standpoint of human relief, it means we are not going to disappoint the millions who have only America to look to. This is the initial stage of what ought to be a reconstruction process, culminating, I should hope, in the Marshall plan, representing maximum self-help by the European people.

In spite of our differences over governmental patterns, even with the free part of Europe, it is obvious that there is enough congeniality to justify this effort to save the free governments.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAYS. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Will the gentleman discuss his opinion as to furnishing money or food to a country that is indulging in the use of slave labor 2 or 3 years after the war contrary to international law?

Mr. HAYS. Will the gentleman be as specific as possible so I will be sure I understand him?

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. I am sure the gentleman understands me, because he knows that one of the countries about which he is talking at the present time has thousands upon thousands of German prisoners, who may be just as innocent of all wrong as any man in this room ever was, and they are kept there at the present time by the French Government as slaves, if you please. I should like to have the gentleman, with his background, explain his position when it comes to supporting a government that is willing to use slave labor as it has 2 or 3 years after the war.

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Chairman, this illustrates very well the complexities of the problem. I think it is a good illustration of the point I made, that we do not have to underwrite, indeed, we cannot underwrite all of the policies of the existing Governments of France and Italy in order to support enthusiastically the efforts to bolster the stable governments as they now exist, by the choice of free people. I think it would be asking a good deal of me to give them a bill of health on the gentleman's proposition.

Mr. JARMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAYS. I yield to the gentleman. I assume that the gentleman from Alabama wants to speak more directly to that point.

Mr. JARMAN. I am wondering if these unfortunate prisoners to whom the gentleman referred are not, even with all the scarcity of food in that country of which the gentleman is speaking, really faring a great deal better than if they were in their own country, Germany.

Mr. HAYS. Probably they are. The point can be made. Yet may I say to my

friend from Alabama, it indicates that we cannot measure the situation by their material welfare. I believe there would be sound arguments against France on that particular point. France was perhaps eating better under German occupation than since the liberation. Yet France was miserable and unhappy. That is the reason I have said there is so much more involved than food and fuel. Freedom is really the goal that we are talking about, which we are trying to preserve. However, I thank the gentleman for making that point. I think he has answered in one respect the statement made by the gentleman from Wisconsin. Yet the gentleman from Wisconsin is right in saying that wherever we exert our influence, we must exert it in behalf of sound principles, and above everything else human freedom. I agree with him thoroughly as to that.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAYS. I yield.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. I want the RECORD to show the high respect I have for the gentleman from Arkansas, and I want to explain to him what prompted me to ask that question. I wish that somebody some time would tell me why everything that the Italians do is fine, as if they were one of our allies in this war, and why they say the German people should be crushed down for all time. I wish somebody would answer that question sometime here on the floor of the House.

Mr. HAYS. May I say on that point, again that is a good illustration. I am for aid to the Italian Government, because we will thereby give to Italy a new opportunity to work out in much better fashion than they have in the past, a pattern of real democracy.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. They started this dictator business, however, I will say to the gentleman, did they not?

Mr. HAYS. All right. The Italians themselves must provide the final answers. I am trying to be consistent. If I allowed my emotions to rule, I might support a condition in the bill that every minority religious group in Italy might have the same kind of guaranties for religious freedom that we have in America, which I know they do not have. I am not making an issue of that. I think it would be inappropriate. I am using this as an illustration of the fact that we cannot write out the kind of government that others are to have, and neither can we correct all the evils in existing governments. We have to make a decision. I hope that the Congress will decide that there is enough stability in western Europe to assure us a perpetuation of that degree of freedom and of self-government that they have enjoyed in the past, thus giving us some hope of maintaining a peace based upon respect for human rights.

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAYS. I yield to the gentleman briefly.

Mr. MITCHELL. With reference to the gentleman's statement regarding re-

ligious freedom in Italy, I wish to make a correction of the RECORD, because I checked on that today and in article 14 of the Italian Constitution, it is pointed out very specifically that all people shall have freedom individually and in groups in religion.

Mr. HAYS. The point is that some insist they have only freedom to worship and not the right to propagate their faith.

Mr. MITCHELL. They do have the right to propagate their faith. I read the constitution today, and I got it from the Italian Embassy, so the gentleman should check on that.

Mr. HAYS. I thank the gentleman. The point I am making, however, is that we would achieve nothing by trying to impose by pressure our ideas upon the people of Italy. I have faith that the people of Italy will sometime work this out so that religious groups, and I am not promoting any particular religious group, will have no basis for complaint.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAYS. I yield to the gentleman. Mr. POAGE. Several of the questions have intimated that these governments in western Europe are not what we would like to have, and the questioners were not satisfied with the way they were running things at the present time. Neither am I satisfied with everything.

Mr. HAYS. Exactly.

Mr. POAGE. But do the gentlemen labor under any illusion that conditions would be better, and that these prisoners of war would be better treated, and that they would have greater religious freedom or any other kind of freedom if we allowed these governments to fall under communistic and Soviet rule?

Mr. HAYS. The gentleman makes a supremely important point. It is a question of alternatives.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. HAYS] has again expired.

Mrs. DOUGLAS. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman one additional minute.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. HAYS. I yield.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. I would like to ask this: Are we to understand from the Foreign Affairs Committee that the prisoners of war are better off in slavery with the French than they are in the American zone in Germany?

Mr. HAYS. I do not think the gentleman could infer that; I cannot agree that a man well fed in a prison is better off than a man poorly fed outside the prison walls. I am sure that was not implied, and I am glad the RECORD is clear on that point.

Mr. Chairman, I hope that the pertinent remark of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. POAGE] can have the emphasis in the closing moments of my contribution. The alternatives are clear. There is enough left, culturally, morally, and spiritually in the life of free Europe as we have known it in the past, particu-

larly among the peoples with whom we have fought for freedom in the past, to justify this monumental effort to relieve hunger and distress for a few months, so that the world can live again in hope and peace.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Arkansas has again expired.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the distinguished gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CHIPERFIELD].

Mr. CHIPERFIELD. Mr. Chairman, after the most careful consideration of all the evidence presented to the Foreign Affairs Committee, I reached the conclusion that the President's estimate of \$597,000,000 for interim aid to France, Italy, and Austria was excessive and could not be justified. I therefore offered an amendment in committee to reduce this amount to \$489,000,000—a cut of \$108,000,000—by proposing the following four reductions:

First. A \$74,000,000 cut in the allowance of wheat for Italy. This was based on information furnished our committee by the agricultural consultants of the Select Committee on Foreign Aid, that actual allocations to Italy would probably only be 618,000 metric tons as against 1,145,000 metric tons estimated earlier by the State Department. This involved a cost differential of about \$74,000,000, to which I just referred.

In calculating the grain needs of Italy, the State Department used as a basis the Italian Government's forecast of their 1947 grain crop which it had underestimated by approximately 1,000,000 tons. Therefore Italy has on hand 1,000,000 tons more wheat than had been counted upon by the State Department.

Second. I made another reduction of a similar character amounting to \$17,000,000 applicable to the estimated wheat requirements of France. This was brought about by a cut in the probable allocation for France from 770,000 tons of wheat with a value of \$111,000,000, to 650,000 tons with a value of \$94,000,000 as the State Department recognized the grave possibility that there would not be available the larger estimate for export.

The Herter committee thought there would only be available 500,000 tons of wheat with a value of \$74,000,000. However, I allowed for France a safe margin of 150,000 tons or 5,550,000 bushels.

Third. Another reduction of \$20,000,000 was made on the grounds the United States need not cover French payments due Belgium and Brazil on commercial accounts.

Fourth. I also included in my amendment a reduction of \$13,000,000 against the initial request for fats and oils for Italy now considered to be unnecessary.

These four reductions reduced the total by \$124,000,000. I added \$16,000,000 to replace Austria's funds earmarked under Public Law 84 for the children's fund, which had been included in Austria's requirements, but which are not now available, making a total reduction in the amount originally requested of \$108,000,000.

The following chart gives a breakdown of these items:

<i>Summary of suggested reductions or additions</i>	
[In millions]	
Amount requested for interim aid (report of the Secretary of State, Nov. 10, 1947).....	\$597
Suggested reductions or additions:	
Reduction of Italian wheat requirements.....	-74
Reduction of French wheat requirements.....	-17
Disallowance of French payments to Belgium and Brazil on commercial accounts.....	-20
Reduction of fats and oils to Italy.....	-13
Total.....	-124
Additional requirements for Austria.....	16
	-108
Balance of allowed requirements after suggested reductions and additions.....	489

This amendment which I sponsored was adopted by the Foreign Affairs Committee but was later reconsidered and a reduction of only \$67,000,000 was approved.

The committee also later added \$60,000,000 for China.

Taking into consideration that the Italian wheat crop was 1,000,000 tons more than estimated by the State Department, and the availabilities of wheat from this country for export to France and Italy are much less than originally estimated by the State Department, it is my conviction that this committee could and should reduce the \$597,000,000 requested by the President to \$500,000,000 or less. In doing so it would in no way jeopardize the proposed program.

It is difficult to arrive at an exact figure, as the State Department's figures, both as to requirements and availabilities, change from day to day, like a chameleon. But no matter how they juggle the figures, they always manage to get the magic total of \$597,000,000 requested by the President.

It is well to keep in mind that the \$597,000,000 figure is not based on the food requirements of the recipient countries but is based on balance of payments. An estimate is made of all the imports required for a country not only for food but for such items as coal, petroleum, cotton, and so forth. Then their assets from exports are subtracted from this amount and we are requested to make up the deficit.

Along with a large majority of my colleagues I want to feed hungry people where there is real need. I feel very strongly, however, that we should do so only when that need has been justified and only to the extent recipient countries cannot take care of themselves. Nor should we drain our natural resources and materials in short supply any more than is absolutely necessary.

It is a disservice to promise aid beyond our ability to perform. Such a promise would do more harm than good not only to ourselves but the countries promised such aid.

Furthermore we should not be required to give assistance unless the people of the recipient countries are doing everything possible to help themselves and preserve democracy. I want to stop the spread of communism in western Europe and China as much as anyone but I have grave doubt if it can be done with dollars.

It is a well-known fact there is considerable hoarding of wheat in Italy and France. Why should we use American taxpayers' money to force or induce the farmers of France and Italy to bring their grain to market when they are unwilling to voluntarily do so for the welfare of their own country.

The gentleman from New York, Representative BUCK, put the situation tersely when he said, "The Lord helps those who help themselves. We are not called upon to outdo the Lord."

Mr. JARMAN. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. JARMAN. As the debate began, the ranking minority member of the committee, following the lead of the chairman of the committee, stated that at least half of the time—I do not know whether he yielded it then or whether he stated it would be available for those in opposition to the bill. No one so far who is in opposition to the bill has requested time on this side. But we have only 44 minutes of the 3 hours in favor of the bill. My parliamentary inquiry is whether the ranking minority member still has control of that 3 hours that he promised to the opposition, if they want it.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. REEVES). The Chair regards the rule which was adopted by the House as giving the ranking minority member of the committee 6 hours to dispose of as he sees fit. The Chair accordingly regards the situation as giving the ranking minority member of the committee control of all of the remaining time on his side.

Mr. JARMAN. I thank the Chairman.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. SMITH].

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, the Republican leaders in Washington may be unwittingly leading the party into a cunningly devised New Deal trap.

It mostly goes back to the servile bipartisan foreign policy adopted by the Republican leaders which in its very nature virtually committed the party to the multi-billion-dollar lend-lease program, called the Marshall plan—even before New Deal strategists released it.

Both party leaderships are jittery about the effect inflation will have on their chances for getting control of the Government next November. Each is looking for some political trick to pull it through. It may well be that the New Deal crowd has beaten its opponent to the draw.

Its scheme is simple. New Deal strategists are whipping up with all their might the worries being suffered by the people from ever-mounting prices.

This is done to frighten them into supporting their program for restoring the OPA with all its evils.

In addition they flood the country with propaganda that price and wage control, rationing, and so forth, are absolutely necessary to carry out the Marshall plan, that without such controls the further scarcity of goods which the plan would produce would drive domestic prices still higher.

If I judge correctly the sentiment of the Republican Members of Congress, there is strong support for carrying out this plan of regimentation.

There are a number of Republican Members that will accede to all of the New Deal demands. A much greater number say "some" controls have to be put back, which can mean only that all controls would in due time be restored. There can be no such thing as a half-way OPA.

But here is the trick. Once the administration is given the controls sought, it will use them as sparingly as it can—at least until after the election—to keep the good will of the voters.

Meanwhile it will so manipulate foreign shipments and transactions under the so-called Marshall plan as to have the least amount of effect in further raising domestic prices.

And be it not overlooked that the Marshall plan will provide it with a powerful weapon to effectuate that purpose. The New Deal high command hopes that this scheme will succeed in maintaining a high degree of prosperity without raising prices sufficiently to cause the voters to rebel. If it succeeds, the New Deal Party will again proclaim itself savior of the country by virtue of the powers granted it to ration commodities, control prices and wages, and regiment the people in general.

If the New Deal succeeds in putting the so-called Marshall plan through and having the wartime controls restored—both being integral parts of the same scheme—the end of what is left of the Republican Party and this Republic may well be in sight.

Mrs. DOUGLAS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 7 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BELL].

Mr. BELL. Mr. Chairman, we are discussing today a measure which I think every Member of this House recognizes to be of very, very far-reaching importance. It has been said today that this measure has a twofold purpose: First, the relief of suffering of humanity; and, second, the preservation of our line against the onrush of communism. I expect to vote for the bill.

Mr. Chairman, while I am thinking about this bill and all of its implications, for a moment I just want to comment on one or two things that have come to us in the picture of Europe today. In France we see a nation divided against itself. Forty percent of its people belong to the Communist Party. In Italy we see a nation torn with turmoil. All of eastern Europe is gone. In every country of Europe we see the hand of communism reaching into the body politic, confusing, destroying, rotting, and decaying, having a large effect upon not

only the economy but upon the struggle of those countries to maintain liberty.

A distinguished gentleman standing here this morning said that communism is everywhere. I think that we as Americans should recognize that communism is in the United States the same as it is in every other country in the world. For instance, today there are more Communists in America, people who admit they belong to the Communist Party, than there were in Soviet Russia at the time of the Russian revolution.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman four additional minutes.

Mr. BELL. Mr. Chairman, as I said a moment ago, the agents of the Politburo for the last 20 years have been carrying on an unremitting cold war in every country in the world. It is evident from the conditions in France and Italy and in numerous other countries that we could name that those countries have not set up an effective defense against that sort of a war. Here in America those of us who love our country have for many years been deeply concerned at the progress of communism here. Every time an American gets up and condemns communism or makes some remark about it, the stock phrase is that he is a "Red baiter" or a "witch hunter" or something of that sort. A great many people have been intimidated in just that manner.

The other day I received a copy of a speech delivered before the United Nations by a distinguished Filipino, Vicente Sotto, in which he described the efforts of the Filipinos during the last 20 years to combat communism in that country. He told how some years ago they arrested and convicted some 34 Communists who were in the pay of Moscow, who had been to Moscow for instructions, and were back in the Philippines well financed from Russia. He then sets forth in his speech a number of paragraphs from a bill which he has introduced in the Philippine Senate. This afternoon when we go back into the House I am going to ask permission to insert that speech into the RECORD. I do it for this reason: The best brains in America should be exerting themselves to find ways and means of stopping the advance of Communist influence in this country. I think that a study of Senator Vincente Sotto's bill will offer some helpful suggestions to you gentlemen who are considering the problem as to how we are going to combat communism here. I am not saying that Senator Sotto's bill is necessarily the answer to our problem, but it is worth study. Shall we outlaw communism as a party? Shall we recognize communism for what it is? Personally I think every Communist in America is an agent of the Politburo and the quicker that we as Americans recognize that fact the better off we are going to be. I think that every Communist in America is at heart a traitor to his country, and I think the quicker we recognize that fact the safer we are going to be in America. It is evident that the course that we have taken in the last 20 years has not solved this problem any more than it was solved in France by saying, "Yes, they are a political party and they have a right to say what they

please." It has been said again and again in this country that we have no constitutional right to deny a man the opportunity and right to belong to the Communist Party. But, gentlemen, I do not believe that our forefathers when they wrote our Constitution intended that our Government should be so weak, so supine, so helpless, that it could not stamp out traitors within its own midst.

SPEECH OF SENATOR VICENTE SOTTO, DELEGATE TO UNITED NATIONS FROM PHILIPPINES, ON WARMONGERING AMONG NATIONS

I should like to discuss the stirring question raised before the General Assembly of the United Nations, that is, Who are the real warmongers, the Soviets or the Americans? Without considering the Balkan case, in which it has been factually established that the Soviets, through their clever intrigues and machinations are the real conspirators against the territorial and political integrity and independence of Greece; without considering the case of China, where it is likewise an established fact that the Soviets are the ones giving material and moral aid to Chinese Communist hordes in order to overthrow the Chinese Republic; and without considering the case of Korea, where it is also a proven fact that the Soviets have no plan of ever evacuating this unfortunate country, because they have ulterior motives of incorporating that territory to their ever-expanding empire, I should like to call and draw the attention of the world toward my far-away country, the Philippines, where for more than a year already peace and order in two or three Provinces of Central Luzon have been perturbed by bandits known notoriously as "Huks," who are none other but unlettered peasants and misguided elements led by Communist agitators under the pay roll of Moscow.

In making this observation I am not speaking through my hat. Documentary proof which tends to demonstrate conclusively that the Soviets and their agents are mainly responsible for the present disturbances in my country obtain in the national archives of the young Philippine Republic.

According to this evidence, long before the last World War, the Soviets financed the trip to Moscow of a certain Crisanto Evangelista and other notorious unemployed labor leaders, in order to further train in Communist tactics and propagating the vile seeds of discontent and Marxism in our islands with a view to overthrowing the legally constituted Government through force and violence. In effect, when these leaders of the Philippine proletariat returned to my country, with funds and instructions from Moscow, they immediately commenced active propaganda work among the ignorant and gullible masses. Under different names, they organized labor and peasant organizations; they established night schools where each enrolled laborer or peasant was paid 10 cents per attendance for learning the precepts and principles of Soviet communism; they printed and distributed extensively communistic handbills and pamphlets; incited laborers and peasants to strike against their employers and the landowners; and held meetings and rallies, where violence and force were preached as means to attain their objective of establishing a new government after the Soviet pattern. They also entered the political arena by putting up candidates for different elective positions, but all of them met with dismal defeat. This defeat at the polls angered them and incited them to redouble their efforts to agitate discontent and seditious acts against the constituted democratic government of the Philippines.

After our Government discovered the subversive and insidious objectives of the Communist leaders, 34 of their number were



forthwith brought before the pale of the law and accordingly indicted on charges of sedition and organizing an illegal association, and nearly all the accused were found guilty and sentenced accordingly to suffer imprisonment and others to banishment to provinces far from the capital of the Philippines. Our supreme court, where their cases were appealed to, handed the decision holding that the Communist Party of my country was an unlawful association, because both its platform as well as the public act and utterances of its organizers and leaders were predicated upon the principle that violence is necessary in order to overthrow the Philippine Government. Some time afterward the then American Governor Frank Murphy granted executive clemency upon the Communist convicts.

This is how communism was nipped in the bud in the Philippines before the last war.

During World War II, however, the Filipino Communists, ever with the aid and financial support of the Soviets, came back to life again, disguised under another name. Now they have adopted the name of Huk, and with the arms supplied by the American forces of liberation in order to fight against the Japanese invading the Philippine Republic, alleging imaginary agrarian injustices or inequalities, but all they really wanted was to wrest the control of the government of the Philippines and establish a new order after the Soviet pattern under the leadership of an irresponsible agitator named Luis Taruc and others of his ilk, paid with money subsidized from Moscow and aided by Chinese Communists, some of whom have already been deported by our energetic President Manuel Roxas.

Such is the insidious work of the Soviets and Soviet agents in the Philippines. And I should like to point out categorically that in making this observation I do not refer to Russia or to the Russian people. In Russia, where there is no freedom of speech, only God knows what the Russian people think.

Recently, motivated by the desire to contribute what little I could do to stem the tide of subversive ideologies in our country, I, in my capacity as member of the Philippine Senate, filed a bill amending our penal code with the following explanatory note:

"Disturbance of peace and order in our Government may impair its operation—nay, lead to its destruction. Acts leading to this effect are covered by book 2, title 3, of our revised penal code, and defined as 'rebellion,' or 'insurrection or sedition.' But there are certain utterances and overt acts which, even though not constituting any of the mentioned crimes, are a serious threat to peace and public order and a menace to the stability of our democratic institutions. They pertain to ideologies and doctrines antagonistic and subversive to those of our democracy, which has been proved to be the only safeguard of human rights and freedom against the barbaric abuses of totalitarian rule.

"This bill qualified such overt acts and utterances as crimes punishable for their commission. Associations and organizations whose purpose tends to propagate subversive ideologies to gain world power, such as nazism, fascism, the Falangist movement in Spain, and communism, are to be outlawed in this country. Evident proof that those ideologies already have gained foothold in our young Republic are the present disturbances of peace and order occurring in some provinces of central Luzon and are spreading to some areas in the Visayas. This deplorable situation is due to the nefarious activities of the members of a certain subversive organization known as the Hukbalahap, the purposes and objectives of which are similar and identical to the Russian system of government. Hence, the necessity that the Hukbalahap organization be outlawed.

"We must preserve our Republic and our democratic institutions not only for ourselves, but also for all generations to come. We should not for a moment allow totalitarian tendencies and ideologies to undermine the very foundations of our Republic."

My bill, which will most probably be debated during the next regular session of our Congress, contains the following provisions:

"ART. 142-A. Any person, who by means of speech or writing, or who by means of emblems, cartoons, banners, or any other means of information or publication suggests, preaches, or propagates ideologies, doctrines, or theories of government in favor of totalitarianism or communism and against democracy, and any person endorsing, subscribing, or adhering to them shall upon conviction, suffer the penalty of prison mayor and pay a fine not to exceed 10,000 pesos. In addition to the above penalties, if the offender is a Filipino he shall be deprived of all his political rights and shall be perpetually disqualified to hold public office; and, if the offender is a naturalized Filipino citizen or an alien, he shall be deported to his country of origin and all his rights to property shall be forfeited to the Government.

"As used in this article, 'democracy' means a government by the people; a form of government in which the supreme power is retained by the people and exercised either directly or indirectly through a system of representation and delegated authority periodically renewed, as in a constitutional representative government or republic.

"Totalitarianism' means, within the purview of this article, a system of government which is controlled by a political group and which allows no recognition of or representation to other political groups, as was in Fascist Italy, or Nazi Germany, or in Falangist Spain.

"'Communism' means a system of social organization involving common ownership of the agents of production and providing for a dictatorial form of government controlled by the proletariat.

"ART. 142-B. 'Fascism,' 'Nazism,' 'Falangism,' and the 'Hukbalahap' organization are, for purposes of this article, subversive organizations, whose purposes and aims are to substitute the totalitarian and dictatorial form of government for that of the present democratic government of the Philippines, and, therefore, their existence is prescribed and prohibited."

Now, with these indisputable facts before us, the civilized world may judge who are the real warmongers: The Soviets or the Americans?

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, I desire at this time to make an announcement because many Members have inquired as to the program.

Originally, in announcing the program as we expected to carry it forward in the consideration of this bill, I said that general debate would begin today and continue for such time as might be fixed by the Rules Committee; that if it were not concluded on Friday we would meet on Saturday in order to conclude general debate and that the reading of the bill would begin at the opening of the session on Monday and continue through that day and such further days as might be necessary to complete consideration of the bill and bring it to a vote. In view of the fact that we are progressing with the general debate, it being expected that general debate will continue for some little time yet this afternoon, and in view of the fact that the House has already agreed to come in at 10 o'clock tomorrow, and it being thus apparent

that general debate can be concluded tomorrow, I think it will serve the best purposes of all of us to announce that we will continue general debate tomorrow until the time is concluded or until all of those desiring to speak have had such an opportunity to speak.

The first section of the bill then can be read for amendment. The committee will rise and, of course, if there is other business to be taken care of, it can be done at that time. It is my hope that the House can then adjourn over until Monday, at which time the reading of the bill will continue.

Many Members have asked me as to whether or not there will be a vote Monday evening or whether they could have an assurance there would be no vote on Monday evening. I have told them that I could give no such assurance but if I were to guess about it, from the number of amendments that I have heard talked about and from my experience here in connection with the 5-minute rule, I might be inclined to hazard the guess that the vote will not come on Monday.

However, I wish to make this clear for the guidance of the Members: The reading of the bill will continue on Monday until a reasonable hour in the evening. If at that time the reading of the bill is completed and we are ready for a vote, the vote on final passage will be had on Monday evening. If at such a reasonable hour in the evening the reading of the bill is not completed, then, of course, further consideration will go over until Tuesday.

On Monday we shall determine whether or not, in order to expedite consideration, it is desirable to have the House meet earlier than the usual noon meeting hour. It will be our purpose to have the House meet at noon on Monday.

Mr. CHIPERFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. HINSHAW].

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Missouri has pointed up a very important fact. If you were living in western Europe today, as are so many millions of people, you would feel very much as they do there, "between the devil and the deep blue sea," the deep blue sea being the Atlantic Ocean. Those people are heartsick, they are afraid. Fear is written all over their faces. Many of them have taken communism to their bosom, so to speak. Why? Because they are afraid. They have seen what happened to patriots like Petkov, they have seen what happened to Nagy of Hungary, Mikolajczyk of Poland, and many others. They know that if the United States pulls out of western Europe today or even in the near future the void will be filled by Soviet troops, as it is already being partly filled by their Gestapo agents. They are afraid to say things in support of democracy or the United States for fear their words would be taken down and used against them in the future.

I doubt that very many of those people, even among those who carry a Communist card, are in favor of it. I doubt it because they have seen the ravages of communism. They have talked with

those of their fellows who have escaped through the iron curtain, and they do come out at the rate of several thousand a day. They really know the conditions that lie behind the iron curtain. If you wish to see the most abject fear in the faces of people, take a look at those who walk the streets of Berlin. There is fear of the deepest kind written on the faces of these people. Why? Because they know that the mere presence, temporary as it may be, of a few thousand Americans, a few thousand British, and a few thousand Frenchmen, is all that keeps them from being completely submerged within the iron curtain. Berlin is 165 miles behind the border line between the Soviet zone and the British and American zones. Berlin is merely a relatively free spot inside the iron curtain. They do not complain that they have been bombed into ruins. That they accept as the fortune of war. The fear is the fear of the hunted.

The people of Europe need our help. They need our help temporarily because of hunger on the part of those who are unable through their own diligence and work or because of their age and infirmity to earn the barest living. I hope these funds we are appropriating may be so applied as to reach those who need it so badly.

But, first of all, those countries need to recover from the ravages of war. We can go on pouring money into this part of the world for years to come, but if we do not satisfy their need for industry and commerce and help them achieve some measure of prosperity, the entire fund we will have appropriated will have been thrown down the well-known rat hole. Therefore, while I support this pending legislation, I hope and trust that the agencies in the executive department, as well as the committees of Congress, will take the earliest practicable and possible steps toward the recovery of western Europe—to reinstate there some modicum, at least, of prosperity.

The one thing that communism fails against—that great rock upon which it dashes itself to pieces—is prosperity. It is chaos upon which it feeds most heartily. Therefore, to do something about the reconstitution of the industry and the commerce of those countries is the first order of business following this bill, I should say. The first necessity, as everyone who has been there will declare, is the stabilization of currencies and the resumption of trade and commerce. That part of the world is an industrious part of the world. The people are intelligent. Most of them have been honest, although the black markets they are caused to deal in by virtue of price control and the rationing system that exists there today force them to be criminals in a sense. Fundamentally, they are fine, honest people. They are the near relatives of millions of like people in America. We hope, therefore, that our executive officers and our committees of the Congress will take immediate steps to stabilize their currencies. Second in importance and probably equal to the first is the reinstatement of transport in that part of the world. It requires transport to carry coal and other supplies in order to have the proper dis-

tribution of these things among the people and industries where the people work. That is the second great requirement for that part of the world. When the currency has been stabilized and commerce and trade have been resumed, which I hope will be soon, then that part of the world should be able to take care of itself. Then it need no longer be a burden upon the United States. If we do not do that, and if we do not do our utmost to stabilize the currencies and reinstitute transportation and help get their industries started again, then they may well be a burden upon us for a long time to come, and force us down the same highway to destruction upon which they are presently traveling.

I think there are many problems that come into that question which we might discuss here, but time is too short.

I have just come back myself, not having been there in the business of investigation but on matters related to international civil aviation. We went to Germany for a few days at General Clay's invitation and visited him in Berlin. Then we went down to Frankfurt and Wiesbaden and drove by automobile through the French zone on our return journey to Switzerland. It is a very sad state of affairs, as anyone who has been there knows. We must give western Europe the opportunity to thwart chaos by restoring some modicum at least of their prosperity and happiness. I was particularly struck with one little fact. Those people are short of cigarettes, as everybody in the world knows. Cigarettes sell for more per pound over there than anything else that you can think of. On the current black market cigarettes are worth ten to fifteen dollars per carton. That is a tremendous and terrific price. At the same time, the Government of Great Britain has shut off the imports into Great Britain of tobacco from the United States, and we are about to have a terrific tobacco surplus, while in Europe there is a terrific tobacco shortage. I do not know how people feel about that, but if there is one great big black market that you want to break in Europe, just ship about 100,000,000 cartons of cigarettes over there, and you will bust it wide open. Incidentally, you will be giving some people who feel the shortage of cigarettes very badly some degree of contentment. The same is true about coffee, and the same is true about soap. Those commodities sell for higher prices on the European black markets in proportion to their value in the United States than practically any other items.

To conclude, communism being a real threat to freedom, and freedom being of vital importance to us, the best place to stop communism is in Europe. To do that we must defeat chaos and confusion by restoring order and production and distribution, trade and commerce. To me this bill is a temporary stopgap. The really important steps have to do with resumption of production, trade, and commerce. Uncle Joe knows that too, because he tries his best to defeat us and western Europe through strikes and disorders.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. COLE].

Mr. COLE of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, last week I received a letter from a resident of Mound City, Mo., who is now at Columbia, Mo., and I believe is a student at the Missouri University. I do not know the author of this letter, therefore I do not know whether he is a Republican or a Democrat. However, I hope that it will soon be my privilege to meet him, because I admire his profound thinking and his ability to express his thoughts. His letter pertains to the matter now under discussion and is worthy of consideration by this Committee, so I have requested this time to read it to you. I quote:

DEAR MR. COLE: Please bear with me if my letter does not conform to the best rules of how to write your Congressman. I feel compelled to voice my opinion on the aid-to-Europe program.

I am urging you for five good reasons to oppose the Marshall plan, at least the long-range plan.

First, and most distasteful, is the power politics applied by the administration in backing of its pet scheme. Long before the plan was advanced to the public in general the Government bought up huge quantities of wheat that could not be resold in case the plan were defeated by Congress. The reason, of course, is similar to the potato deal that we're all so familiar with. And, by advertisement, sentimental appeal and applying nearly every principle known to the propagandist, the Administration has taken immense liberties in the underwriting of this plan.

Secondly, the detrimental effect that will result in this country will hasten disaster on this country. We've already been given the warning by the President, himself, in his appeal for powers that proved so distasteful but bearable in wartime. His appeal will have a lot more weight when the effects of this program begin to be felt. Once the heavy yoke of this power is instituted on the United States, it will be many, many years after Europe is back in full swing for us to rid ourselves of this yoke. This is manifested now by the immense number of bureaus in Washington that were war-born and are still with us even though the guise that gave them birth has been entirely removed. It has been proven time and again that once the Government is allowed to enter a field, i. e., rent control, export control, price control, etc., it takes virtually a revolution to expel them. And even if the Government is allowed these powers, I honestly doubt the degree of their success. It's just terribly hard to repeal the old economic laws by an act of Congress. Should they fail and should chaos come to this country comparable to that of the thirties I doubt that our way of life will survive. This is food for thought, Mr. COLE. Since 1915 the Communist Party has been building in this country and waiting for its chance. I don't think it was ready in the thirties, but should they catch us in such a predicament again, revolution could easily result. You, as well as I, know the Reds thrive on chaos and confusion. Let's preserve our country and way of life.

Thirdly, one might doubt the actual good that might come of this gratuitous aid. If we impose conditions on the use of our aid, we might easily be called Uncle Shylock with grounds because such a program cannot be administered by a half-baked plan or ill-trained personnel. Just take a look at the difficulty of welding control over such an organization as our Army or Navy with supposedly competent administrators. Even if it were well administered, though, the least grateful will be the Europeans themselves.

Due to ancient and deep-seated rivalries in Europe, we'll be inextricably involved in the mire of European politics. And if we don't

impose any conditions on our aid, even less good will be done. With my limited knowledge of Communist control in Europe, it's hard for me to say how or to what extent the Communist program will be directly aided by our money. But, however closely the European appeals are scrutinized, I'll guess that a lot of our aid will materially aid and abet the Red cause more than ours.

Fourth, if their need is so dire, why is the foreign capital in the United States not withdrawn and invested in European countries. If they are not willing to help themselves, why should we? Not only that, but our own price level which least of all needed a boost, has been considerably upped by the presence of this money.

Fifth and most important, after we've once committed ourselves to such a long-range program, it will be next to impossible to pull out regardless of the near-future developments in this country. A person in your position has, no doubt, seen the far misses of economists' and planners' guesses. At a poor second best, I'd recommend a year-by-year program that is easily removable. This is the very least Congress can do in their altruistic attempt to bankrupt this country. And with things so unstable as they are at the present, it is quite likely that such a contingency that would make necessary suspension of aid, transpire. Given a couple of years, I believe our economy could be stabilized. Delayed 4 or 5 years by such as the Marshall plan and with demand stifled by control for this extended period of time, disaster will surely envelop us with industry at an extremely high pitch for the partial supply of Europe and the United States. At the lapse of our aid, the demand could be satisfied in a period of perhaps a year and an economic break-down could easily result. Furthermore, the cost of the program plus the cost imposed by economy control at home will lead us further into debt when it is gigantic already. Only the shortsighted cannot see the danger of such a huge national debt. Right now the interest cost alone of our debt amounts to more than 10 months of the cost of the GI bill.

Now certainly is the time for the Government to get out of debt if it is ever to do so and not to increase the cost of government by a rigid, distasteful economy control.

I hope that I don't appear as an alarmist but from where I sit, now is the time for protection—protection from our own foolishness. For these reasons, I beg of you to wield your influence to forestall this idealistic, Wallacian dream.

A constituent,

E. M. WRIGHT.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Missouri has expired.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN].

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] is recognized for 10 minutes.

The gentleman from Michigan is again recognized for 10 minutes.

The gentleman from Michigan apparently is momentarily absent.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, during the momentary and no doubt unavoidable absence of the gentleman from Michigan, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MUHLENBERG].

Mr. MUHLENBERG. Mr. Chairman, permit me to observe that I am not in any way substituting for the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN], who has been called for but has not yet responded.

Mr. Chairman, I am quite anxious to bring this discussion back to earth, for it seems to me that we have wandered a

good deal during the afternoon. We have talked about a great many things other than the particular matter we have come here to discuss today, which is the question of interim aid to Europe.

We can, it seems to me, regard this problem only on three bases. One, of course, is the economic angle. On that, I believe, there are only three possible plans, three possible points of approach. It must be observed, first, that Europe is without present resources and that the only place from which those resources can be obtained in quantity is the United States of America, almost the only country in which there is a degree of prosperity and in which there is a degree of plenty. In that case we must either, first, continue our buying abroad so as to give them an opportunity of obtaining dollars with which they can continue their buying here, or, second, we must give or lend the substance to Europe with which it can make these purchases here, or, third, we can withdraw altogether from the whole proposition and shut the door, refusing to allow them to withdraw our goods in order to build up here a country which within its own borders is self-sufficient.

It seems to me that the third one of these probabilities would be very tragic in its impact on world history. I do not believe the method we are considering today can include any such possibility.

Let me then approach the second one of these angles—that is from the standpoint of the military. Certainly it is common sense, if we are thinking in terms of national defense, to put our border as far away from the eastern and western seaboard as it is possible. If we can push that border 3,000 or 4,000 miles away from our seaboard certainly that is just plain common sense, it seems to me. If aid to Europe in this economic crisis will help that, if it will help to build up a group of like-minded and strong people who may defend our philosophy of free men, then I think it is worth while. The third and last point is that of the humanitarian angle, and from that standpoint, too, it seems to me that we will be following the humanitarian principles of the American people when we grant interim aid that is so desperately needed under the degree of impoverishment and the degree of undernourishment that exists in Europe today.

We are not talking about the Marshall plan today; we are talking about interim aid, and I am entirely in accord with the desire of the committee that the action of the Congress, under the safeguards that are within the bill, shall grant that degree of aid from this country to the impoverished people in Europe stipulated within the bill; and that I believe the American people want us to give.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. LANDIS].

Mr. LANDIS. Mr. Chairman, I hope that the membership, before they vote on this bill or any other foreign-aid bill, will read the national-resources and foreign-aid article in the Krug report. I also notice that this legislation has called

attention to the forgotten Indians in Arizona. I think they are going to do something about the American Indians right away. I hope also it will be some benefit to getting recognition for the old people of America so that we may give the old people of America a decent pension before we go into these foreign-aid programs.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LANDIS. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. HINSHAW. There is one more category we might take into account and that is our American internees in the Philippines and our American prisoners of war in Japan and China.

Mr. LANDIS. That is correct, sir. I thank the gentleman for his contribution.

Mr. Chairman, under the proposed Marshall plan we are to furnish European countries food, fertilizer, coal, steel, timber, and machinery for the next 4 years. This plan will cost the United States approximately \$17,000,000,000.

Before we appropriate more billions for Europe, we should examine our productive capacity and see that enough of what is produced remains in the United States to avoid unemployment of millions of our workers. Unless the dividing is done wisely we will go down and the whole world will go down with us. The American people must have some assurance that their resources are not being depleted.

Since the start of World War II, United States has given or lent the world a net outlay of \$58,206,000,000. United States has given approximately \$20,000,000,000 to 59 countries since the fighting stopped. France has received \$1,950,000,000; Italy \$538,000,000; and Austria \$63,000,000. However, the largest single item went to England, a \$3,750,000,000 loan which is almost used up.

These lend-lease agreements turned out to be neither loans nor leases, but outright gifts. Apparently we are a Nation of givers who ask nothing in return. We must first find out how much we have left to give before we go completely broke and crash through inflation, strikes, and hunger at home. A crash at home would mean Communist-led strikes and hunger marches ending in revolution. The time has come to stop communism in America. First we need a law to punish individuals who advocate the overthrow of the Government of the United States by force. Next, Russian immigrants to this country should be restricted in proportion to the number of Americans authorized admittance to the Soviet Union.

During the past 12 months ending June 30, the United States has exported 19,200,000 tons of food at a cost of approximately \$2,300,000,000. Sixty percent of this food went to Europe. The Friendship Train gathered approximately 2,000 tons of food for shipment to Europe. For a comparison of the amount of food exported to Europe last year, the total shipment equaled 11,609,000 tons or the equivalent of 5,804 trainloads the size of the Friendship Train.

Food sent to Europe included 611,000,000 bushels of grain, 500,000,000 pounds

of meat, 7,000,000 pounds of butter, 40,000,000 pounds of oleomargarine, 233,000 tons of fats and oil, 493,000 tons of dairy products, 181,000 tons of dry beans and peas, 82,000 tons of fish, 9,000 tons of chickens, 238,000 tons of eggs, 289,000 tons of vegetables, 385,000 tons of potatoes and sweetpotatoes, and 976,000 tons of fruits and nuts.

If you want to know why prices have increased and why you did not get an automobile, a tractor, a truck, or other essential products, just take a look at some of the exports from the Krug report.

1946

Industrial machinery, \$1,076,000,000; farm machinery and tractors, \$158,367,000; passenger cars, \$125,173,000; motor trucks and busses, \$240,264,000; railroad locomotives, \$143,634,000; railroad freight cars, \$40,551,000; chemicals and allied products, \$500,100,000; 1,059,000 passenger-car tires; 1,406,000 truck tires; cotton cloth, 1,200,000,000 yards; leather, 9,434,000 pounds; lumber, 600,000,000 board feet; coal, 47,000,000 tons.

1947

Oil and gasoline, \$308,445,000; boots and shoes, 7,200,000 pairs; agricultural products, \$1,753,012,000.

After reading the Krug report from the Interior Department, I want to submit the following questions:

First. How can we export \$1,800,000,000 worth of steel and steel equipment when the shortage of steel is our chief bottleneck to maintain or increase production? Certainly you do not want to stop the manufacture of automobiles, farm machinery, coal cars, tank cars, steel pipe, electric refrigerators, and electric washing machines. The manufacture of automobiles will be delayed 2 more years because of our present steel shortage. Surely you would not want to create unemployment in the United States of America. No; we have about 60,000,000 Americans employed and we had better keep them on the job.

Second. How can we export \$500,000,000 worth of oil when it is becoming scarcer owing to the slowing up of the rate of discovery and the depletion of developed reserves? I am certain we do not want to start gas rationing.

Third. How can we export 500,000,000 bushels of wheat when we will only have a surplus of about 200,000,000 bushels? We certainly do not want to create a bread shortage in the United States next year. We must keep a wheat reserve, because our 1948 crop will be short about 300,000,000 bushels. If we do not feed part of our wheat to livestock and poultry, we will have a meat famine next year.

Fourth. How can we export \$300,000,000 worth of coal when we only have enough coal cars to keep our mines working 3 or 4 days a week, and only produce enough coal to supply the United States and Canada? This is not a resource problem but primarily a transportation and production problem.

Fifth. How can we export \$100,000,000 worth of lumber when we have an acute housing shortage in the United States? Most of our best timber has been cut and hauled away. An increase

in lumber exports now would be at the expense of domestic consumption.

Sixth. How can we export nitrogen fertilizer unless special measures are taken to expand its production, for the present supply will only be enough to fill domestic requirements.

## SIXTY-FOUR-DOLLAR QUESTION

All of us would like to know the answer to the \$64 question, "Is it fair to ask our people to sacrifice and save grain to export in order for foreign countries to have 71,000,000 bushels of grain to make alcoholic beverages?"

The situation with respect to industrial products sent to Russia is as follows:

## EXPORTS TO RUSSIA

Exports to Russia should be stopped. The Truman administration can stop the shipment of goods to Russia because they control the export license to sell goods abroad. I did my best to stop the sale of scrap iron and oil to Japan many years before the Roosevelt administration placed an embargo in 1941.

During the first half of this year, exports to Russia averaged about \$15,000,000 a month—about half of it lend-lease and UNRRA goods.

During September we shipped \$3,000,000 worth of exports to the Soviet Union. Following is a list of what we sold: 3 generators worth \$53,292; 9 transformers, \$953; switchboard panels and parts, \$9,177; 10 oil circuit breakers and switches, \$107,103; 14 stationary motors, \$994; starter equipment and parts for industrial machinery, \$26,623.

## MACHINE TOOLS

Mining machinery and parts, \$44,120; pumps and parts, \$3,718; two automatic chucking lathes, \$54,711; four lathes which could be used for artillery and ammunition, \$113,214; two precision-boring machines, \$49,000; two excavators, including power shovels, \$148,860; one crane, \$15,106; two gear-cutting machines, \$11,000; six drilling machines, \$131,500; one gear-tooth grinding machine, \$23,200; three broaching machines, \$72,000; two gear-honing and lapping machines, \$13,000; forging machinery and parts, \$224,400. Three new passenger cars, \$4,237; farm machinery and implements, \$34,984; 60 railway cars of over 10 tons, \$339,000; railway car wheels, \$202,500; laboratory instruments and supplies, \$23,180.

## OIL AND GREASE

Three million pounds of sisal, cord, and cordage, \$403,000; 686 barrels of red and pale lubricating oil, \$8,059; 1,409 barrels of lubricating oil for steam refined stocks, \$16,601; 4,766 barrels of other lubricating oils, \$77,600; 162,000 pounds of lubricating greases, \$13,000; carbon or graphite products, \$31,600—items listed in Washington Daily News of November 14, 1947.

## POLAND GETS SHIPMENT OF UNITED STATES LOCOMOTIVES

One hundred locomotives are being shipped to Poland as part of a United States effort to speed up deliveries of Polish coal to western Europe. Also being shipped with the locomotives are spare parts, railroad tracks, bridge construction materials and machine-shop

equipment. Poland is buying the locomotives and other materials with a \$40,000,000 loan granted by the Export-Import Bank 18 months ago.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. BRADLEY].

Mr. BRADLEY. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate that this bill will pass the House in one form or another, and I have no desire to attempt to delay it in any way. However, there is one phase of the matter which has not yet been covered and which I think should be a matter of record.

There will be large quantities of material shipped from the United States to various foreign governments under this interim plan, and it is probable that there will be much greater quantities shipped in the future under some further developments of a European-aid project. All of this brings us to one of our old and difficult problems—the maintenance and operation of an adequate merchant marine under the United States flag. As you know, the American merchant marine has gone through violent ups and downs during the course of our history, and while just now it is on a reasonable plane of prosperity, it seems to be distinctly on the down grade. So the question arises in my mind today as to how the goods covered by this bill will be transported to foreign nations—will they be sent in American ships or in foreign bottoms? I can appreciate that in this stopgap-aid program it is hardly practicable to delay shipments so as to set forth any specific percentages or quotas which must be carried in American ships, but I believe that that recognition should not in any way dim the fact that the record of this debate should show the belief by at least some Members of the House that American ships should receive their just share of cargoes sent by this Government.

During World War II our overseas carrying trade was built up to a very high level, with practically all of the ships owned by the United States and operated either through charter or under general agency agreements. It has been our endeavor, since the end of World War II, to modify this system, and we are now getting the merchant marine back into private operation, either through private ownership of the ships concerned, or through the chartering of those vessels from the Maritime Commission. However, during recent months, the number of ships under charter has decreased considerably due to the entry into the carrying service of new ships under foreign flags of former American vessels purchased abroad and now operating under other flags, and also due to the dollar shortage abroad. We should do nothing which will encourage the further decrease in the carrying trade by the American merchant marine, but rather, we should use our every effort to build up that merchant marine as an outlet for American investments, as a means for furnishing employment for American seamen, and as an indispensable adjunct of the national defense.

In comment regarding the Marshall plan many statements have been made,

coming from reputable sources, that there is an intent on the part of the administration to turn American ships over to foreign nations in order that they may be manned by alien crews and so reduce the costs of transporting goods under our foreign-aid program—this with the idea that such a practice will result in a betterment of American economy as a whole. I consider such reasoning to be completely fallacious because not only should the American merchant marine be maintained for the transportation of goods and the employment of men but also because, without an adequate merchant shipping, we cannot carry out overseas operations which might be necessary in the event of further hostilities.

The very fact that in this debate it has been maintained that the principal purpose of this interim-aid plan is to prevent a possible war with Russia would seem to be an impelling reason to reserve the shipment of goods for the benefit of American flag vessels, and thus build up our own merchant marine.

Mr. Chairman, one reason for the failure of America to hold its own in the merchant service is our differentiation between Americans who go to sea and Americans who remain ashore. To my mind it would be just as logical to invite foreign workmen to come to the United States and operate our idle factories, take over establishments now in the hands of the War Assets Administration for disposal, and there to turn out relief goods for foreign lands, as it is to advocate turning American ships over to foreign governments for the purpose of carrying American relief supplies. The American who goes to sea has just as much right to the protection of his job by the Government as has the American who stays ashore, and we shall never be successful in our operation of a merchant marine until we recognize that fact. There cannot be two classes of American workingmen, but, rather, for the strength of the Nation we must treat all alike.

In the consideration of the bill now proposed I note that the House version would not permit of the use of interim aid for the purchase of American ships by the beneficiary nations. However, I find no such provision in the bill as passed by the other body, and it is my intent to offer an amendment at the proper time which would preclude the use of relief funds for the purchase of American vessels. I do not expect to have the amendment adopted, but I shall offer it for the purpose of impressing upon our conferees the fact that the bill, as passed by the other body, would permit of such purchases, whereas the House bill will not, and that for our own protection we should see that the House version is maintained. To some of you this may seem like a strange and possibly foolish precaution, but when one considers that this actually happened in the use of lease-lend funds, insofar as the present 96 American ships now operating under the Russian flag are concerned, I may say that it is no idle gesture to guard against a recurrence under the present legislation.

In concluding, may I express the hope that in the shipment of American goods abroad under this interim-aid program, the percentage we are now handling will not be reduced and, that under any conditions, the administration will see to it that at least 50 percent of American goods shipped to Europe under this program are carried in American flag vessels.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. SMITH].

#### A BANKRUPT FOREIGN POLICY

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, when H. R. 4604, the bill now before the Committee, was reported out, I was constrained to vote against it. To vote against a majority of my colleagues on the committee was an unpleasant duty for me. Loyalty to my committee, however, must yield when it is opposed by clear convictions. It was my intention to vote for any kind of bill which would alleviate conditions of hunger and suffering. I agree with my distinguished colleague from Minnesota [Mr. JUDD] that this bill is not designed to meet the call of suffering humanity in western Europe. It is the first step in the long-ranged Marshall plan and I believe the members of our committee will not deny that statement.

Mr. Chairman, the people of this country have been hoodwinked again. For weeks the press and radio have been telling the people that this is a bill to relieve suffering humanity—and they are willing to respond to such a call—but now comes the great disillusionment. Passage of this bill will not aid hungry people or give them clothing or shelter originally anticipated.

Mr. Chairman, the Republican Party is on notice; and let it not be said 6 months from now that this bill was the President's program. Today our party carries the ball, and that spells responsibility. Make no mistake about it.

Mr. Chairman, this brings into sharp focus the kind of leadership we have had since the end of the war. During the debate on the Greek-Turk aid bill last spring I called attention to the deplorable state of affairs under the Democratic administration and indicated where it would lead if we followed it. We are in a more confused state of affairs today and they worsen each succeeding day. American military victory has been followed by American political frustration. In this postwar era we have followed bankrupt foreign policies which threaten the very basis of our Government.

Mr. Chairman, instead of freedom from want and from fear we find in Europe and in Asia fear and want on a scale heretofore unknown in the history of civilization. Everywhere, including our own country, there is the haunting fear of a Third World War and in some places the hope that it will come soon in order to relieve the present desperate situation. This hope is whispered among the millions of miserable people who have lost everything they had because of territorial changes accompanied by mass expulsions and the setting up of tyrannical dictatorships.

Mr. Chairman, let us recall the first three clauses of the Atlantic Charter:

First. Their countries seek no aggrandizement, territorial or other.

Second. They desire to see no territorial changes that do not accord with the freely expressed wishes of the peoples concerned.

Third. They respect the right of all peoples to choose the form of government under which they will live; and they wish to see sovereign rights and self-government restored to those who have been forcibly deprived of them.

Tell that to the million and more people who were deported from eastern Poland to the Soviet Union, those of them who have survived the ordeal of transportation in cattle cars and subsequent slave labor. Tell that to the hundreds of thousands of Poles, Letts, Lithuanians, Estonians, Ukrainians, Yugoslavs, Russians who have been dispersed as fugitives all over Europe. Tell that to the Germans who formerly lived in east Prussia and the territory between the Oder-Neisse border and the former German frontier—to those of them who are still alive as beggared refugees after undergoing orgies of pillage, rape, and murder.

Mr. Chairman, our foreign policy during the war was largely in the hands of ungifted amateurs who seem to have made the gravest international decisions on much the same basis as hunches, or perhaps lucky numbers, which, we are told, determined financial policy in the early years of the New Deal. Four principal assumptions on which American wartime diplomacy was based have proved to be costly mistakes. These were:

First. That Russia, after a victorious war, would be a cooperative do-gooder or at least a passive factor in the international scene. It was assumed, with truly amazing naïveté, that Soviet foreign policy would continue to be restrained when every element of check and balance in Europe and Asia had been smashed.

Second. That the way to get along with Stalin was to give him everything for which he asked. Curiously enough, the advocates of this policy were often the most violent critics of concessions to Hitler. The aftermath of the Yalta and Potsdam agreements proves that an appeasement policy is always in the red, because it is invariably interpreted by a dictatorship as an invitation to new aggression.

Third. That Germany was the sole source of international evil—past, present, and to come; that no country except Germany had waged an aggressive war in the past or would wage one in the future. This highly emotional judgment overlooked the historical evidence that the strongest military nation in Europe habitually yields to the temptation to abuse its power. It was childish oversimplification to confront the problem of aggressive war with a crude formula for destroying Germany.

From a practical standpoint this assumption that only Germany could be an aggressor was extremely harmful. For it discouraged any attempt to come

to an agreement with the forces in Germany which were working for the overthrow of Hitler's dictatorship. How much more hopeful the outlook would be if, instead of a destitute, broken, divided Germany, we could today deal with a united western-oriented Germany, under the leadership of the men who took part in the anti-Nazi rising of July 20, 1944.

Fourth. That America could completely destroy the balance of power in Europe without, as a sequel, facing a bitter choice of alternatives. These alternatives are either to throw America's full weight into the scales to help create a new balance of power, or else to watch all of Europe slide bit by bit into dependence on the single strong land power which existed at the end of the war, namely, the Soviet Union. Whichever horn of this dilemma is chosen, the result will be continuous nervous tension and unprecedented drain on our national resources.

As for me, Mr. Chairman, I do not propose to follow the kind of leadership that has given us Tehran, Yalta, and Potsdam, and I plead with my fellow Republicans to remember what has transpired in the past so that it will guide their actions in the future.

Mr. Chairman, this administration, in addition to Tehran, Yalta, and Potsdam, has also given us UNRRA, lend-lease, Bretton Woods, the Morgenthau plan, and other crackpot New Deal ventures. It now seeks the power to set up a world spending program—the Marshall plan—to be owned and operated by the same crowd.

We have heard a great deal about setting up a "superduper" corporation to administer the program envisaged by this bill. I have the highest esteem and regard for the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. HERTER], who is responsible for this suggestion. If he were to be selected to head the organization I would be for it. But this would merely result in giving the New Deal billions of dollars to play with and we would get the same kind of administration as we are getting today.

If we are really interested in doing something constructive for the needy people in Europe and Asia we might rely upon existing agencies which have been doing that kind of a job for hundreds of years and it will cost the taxpayers of this country very little. I refer, Mr. Chairman, to the churches, the Salvation Army, and the American Red Cross. Take this job out of the hands of the politicians at home and abroad. Of course, the politicians will protest and I realize that any amendment that might be offered to effectuate that purpose would be defeated on this floor, because that would eliminate political power.

Mr. Chairman, if we turned the relief measures set up under this bill over to these existing agencies it would save millions of dollars in administrative costs and we could be sure that whatever aid we gave would go directly to the people who need it without graft or political pull. I am informed that the Salvation Army has a trained force of 30,000 men and women who can do this job. Today

that organization is operating in many countries with a total of 16,000 posts. Here is skilled manpower at our command at our asking.

Mr. Chairman, I have today received a letter from a prominent constituent along this very line. She says in part:

I am making a suggestion that has met with amazing enthusiasm among a widely assorted group of people—really generous Americans who want to help starving Europeans and Chinese, but Americans who have become completely disillusioned by the incompetency, waste, and complete inability which Government has shown in distributing the billions expended in Europe and Asia with little or none of these billions reaching the starving poor.

She adds:

The money and food should be distributed through the missionary societies and charitable organizations already organized.

Certainly, this is the only way it should be handled and I intend to offer an amendment to that effect. These organizations publish literature in every language and they have the respect and confidence of the people everywhere. Let the people do this job; they can and will if governments, as such, will only get out of the way. There was no showing in our committee, Mr. Chairman, that our food and supplies will get to the needy and I am certain no showing will be made during this debate. Whatever we give will go to the respective governments and from there on out to the ultimate consumer; it is a cash transaction. By no stretch of the imagination can that be considered as beneficial to the hungry people in Europe or Asia.

Mr. Chairman, the people of this country must understand that adoption of this legislation means a continuation of high prices and a continued scarcity of consumer goods. The productive capacity of this country is wholly inadequate to meet the needs of all the world. At this time we are caught in a spiral of inflation which could easily wreck this country. The President has said that if the Marshall plan is adopted it must be implemented by a series of price controls and allocations. Is this what the American people want? I do not believe so. The cry today is for lower prices and a stable economy. The people are sick and tired of governmental confusion and ineptitude. They are demanding that this Congress bring order out of chaos and not a continuation of it. Furthermore, Mr. Chairman, our constituents will accept no excuses, be he Democrat or Republican. The time has come for resolute action on domestic problems; that is our chief responsibility today. Let us meet it without equivocation.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. JACKSON].

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Chairman, I also yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. JACKSON].

Mr. JACKSON of California. Mr. Chairman, again the Members of this body find themselves confronted with a reluctant choice, a choice on the one hand of appropriating nearly \$500,000,000 for aid to several countries of Europe

and one country in Asia. The second choice with which we are confronted is that of turning our backs upon the rest of the world and withdrawing ourselves within the confines of our own country. That naturally infers and actually means a complete withdrawal from all of the other countries of the earth. There can be no leaving of occupation troops in Germany, there can be no further participation by this country in Austria, because to leave those isolated groups of Americans in the face of a Red tide which is as certain as day and night to surround them and eventually engulf them would be madness of the first order. So the choice, as I see it, is a choice between two very clear alternatives, the alternative of complete withdrawal or the alternative of continuing such aid as proposed in this program.

Those who advocate the program of aid give several reasons for their endorsements. They say, first of all, that it is for humanitarian reasons, that we cannot as a Christian Nation stand aside and see starvation, nakedness, and want move slowly across the face of the earth. That is one highly laudable reason for giving aid.

They say also that we must aid in the economic and physical reconstruction of the lands that have been devastated by war. Some of them add that we should also do it in defense of our own country.

I do not believe, Mr. Chairman, that we can completely justify to the American people any participation in this aid program on the first two points, that of humanity and that of economic rehabilitation. But I think that we can and we must approach this great problem on the basis of our own welfare—the national security of the United States of America. Perhaps my thinking on this matter is colored by 10 years of military service and perhaps that is the reason why I personally look at it from the standpoint of national defense. What I have said, Mr. Chairman, is not to infer in any way that the factors of hunger and want can or should be disregarded in our approach to the problem, for we are never going to arrive at any lasting solution to the problems that beset the world today so long as hunger is a major factor in the political decisions being made abroad. There are those who will quite correctly point out that we have hunger here at home. There are, in many parts of our country, people who are unquestionably hungry tonight. So it is not enough to justify the program on the basis of avoiding hunger abroad.

Some say that there are people in our land who do not have proper housing. I contend that we cannot properly submit that we are doing this for the building of homes abroad or for any other of the many excellent humanitarian reasons which might be properly advanced by the opponents of this program. But I do submit, Mr. Chairman, that there will be no hunger to match the hunger of our own economy in a great many ways if all of the avenues of approach to the Old World, if all of our lines of communication to the things we so vitally need are severed, as severed they

must and certainly will be if the iron curtain lifts to engulf and cover western Europe, the Middle East, Africa, and Asia.

We can build, Mr. Chairman, a million combat aircraft, we can build a million heavy tanks, we could make this country an armed camp, and we could cover our coast lines with defenses that would be impregnable to attack. We could do all these things and become a bristling arsenal of defense—except for one important factor. We are, today, a have-not nation with respect to oil. "Oil" is a dirty word. It has often been said that oil is an unsatisfactory period at the end of an unsatisfactory paragraph. That may be largely true, but until such time as science develops a substitute for that viscous liquid our peacetime economy and any possible war economy must operate on oil. We have enough for only a year or 15 months of total all-out war as we knew it in the late conflict. Then, what happens on the day that the pipe line gives out, that queer sucking sound which means that there is no more oil in the pipes? What about our national defense then? Where do we go from there? Some of the gentlemen may say that we shall never save the world from communism on these programs of aid. Perhaps that is true. But, whether or not we save the world from communism is secondary to the basic question of whether or not we save our lines of communication and our avenues of access to things we cannot do without; I put in that category such things as tin, manganese, nitrates, and nickel, all of which are in extremely short supply here at home. There is a score of such vital minerals and ore which we do not produce here but which are found only in other portions of the world. Certainly, there is no one naive enough to believe that if the rest of the world comes under the domination of the Soviet Union that we are going to get anything at all in the way of those things which will be essential for our own self-defense in a world in which every hand will inevitably be turned against us.

Let us look at this question for a while from the standpoint of not what we are doing for the rest of the world but what we are doing for our own welfare and for our own national integrity. What good is it going to do to sit on 5,000,000,000 tons of wheat if you do not have the Diesel oil to power the trucks and the trains that must convey it. That may not be too important, though, in a world, the markets of which are gone.

One of the most frequently heard complaints relative to our aid deals with the containment of aggressive communism. Have we succeeded in containing communism? Much has been said here today about that. Some gentlemen have said that the world is in worse shape today than it was on VJ-day. Well, I do not know. I also made a trip during the recess. I am a little hesitant to talk about that because in some quarters such a statement carries the connotation that one considers himself an authority on foreign affairs. Someone once said here that if a member of a committee flew over Paris he immediately became

an authority on French economy. So, I am a little hesitant to point out that I spent almost a month in Greece, one of the countries which was given aid under the program of assistance to Greece and Turkey. But I will say that during the past year the voices of free peoples and free men have actually increased in volume. You are hearing them today where you did not hear them a year ago, and you are also listening daily to a great outpouring of hope. Italy, France, Denmark, Belgium, England—every one of those countries in going to the polls in recent months has shown a definite and unmistakable desire to swing away from the left. This has all developed in the past few months.

Has our material assistance, has the food we have poured in, the medical supplies, the clothing, have all of these things had anything to do with this new expression, the first indication of a revulsion toward international communism and the first indication of a worldwide gathering of free men? I am inclined to think it has had a great deal to do with it. I believe that the impetus behind the swing of the pendulum is a direct result of the aid rendered to these nations by the United States.

I do know that in Greece when the gentleman from Texas [Mr. TEAGUE] and I rode through the northern provinces in a jeep we were surrounded in every hamlet and village by hundreds of men and women, some of them with tears running down their cheeks, and I know that they literally kissed our hands because we were Americans and because they knew where their help had come from. So much for the statement that they do not know in Greece from whence comes the food that feeds them. The people I talked to knew where it was coming from, and they knew it very well. What is more, they were grateful. We found a great reservoir of good will for the people of the United States.

Speaking of the governments of Europe: it is no simple matter to solve all of the many complex postwar problems with which they are faced today. You can compare it to living in a gas-house-gang neighborhood where the bullies and the thugs run around with clubs. It is not easy under those circumstances to speak your mind. It is not easy to voice your opinions as to freedom and those abstract things we talk about. But there are men and there are governments today in western Europe who are doing just exactly that: Schuman in France, Sophoulis in Greece, De Gasperi in Italy, Inonu in Turkey. There are men who are standing up manfully against the pressures being directed against them in the form of strikes and riots. Every conceivable type of pressure is being used against them to try to break down those governments. It is hard to keep a mill running or to keep wheels in the mill turning when vandals bent on destruction of the property riot through the buildings and throw monkey wrenches into your machines. But that is precisely what is happening in these governments under attack.

Mr. Chairman, I do not interpret the new demonstrations of violence in France

and Italy as representing an increase of communism, but rather they bear a remarkable resemblance to the actions of a cornered rat. These are outward and violent expressions of desperate men who fear only one thing, and that the success of economic rehabilitation. I think they fear that more than they fear anything else in the world, for communism hates order and lawful processes as the devil hates holy water. I think that at the source of the riots and the strikes can be found the germ of an idea that on the wall there is the faint outline of future hope for the country. Communism can no more exist in an atmosphere of hope than the sun can shine in the middle of the night.

I should like to ask anyone who says that our program of aid to Greece and Turkey has failed to give me evidence for his statement. We spent a month there, and to the contrary, we found that every indication pointed to the fact that had the United States not gone in there when it did the Communists in Greece, aided and abetted by their allies in Albania, Yugoslavia, and Bulgaria, would have taken over the country of Greece 90 days ago. One of the most plaintive cries of the Athens Communists is that the assistance and aid rendered by the United States to the Greek Government has prevented the establishment of a dictatorship by the proletariat.

Turkey? Turkey has one of the most stable governments in Europe. To those who say that Russia can overrun all of Europe in 24 hours I must say that I cannot agree. The Turkish Army is tough; it is ready. Anyone who attempts to overrun Turkey is going to find that it has a tartar on its hands, and it is going to take a much longer period of time than 24 hours to bring about the downfall of the Turks.

As to when Russia will take over western Europe or take over Asia, I think it is enough to say that they will take over step by step, foot by foot, as we step back. The bayonets of the Red Army will fill the void created by our retreat. It may be a cold war, but when a country is overrun and when it is brought to its knees by political infiltration or by economic stress, the end product is exactly the same as if a foreign army had marched in. So cold wars or hot wars or lukewarm wars are just terms and relative expressions. I have the feeling that we are very much at war. There is no shooting going on, but the atmosphere is much the same as if we were on a field of armed combat.

So far as the charge is concerned that we are being blackmailed into furnishing aid by threats of going communistic, I should like to say that in the eight countries we visited in Europe I did not hear one individual say "If you do not do this, we will go communistic." We did hear a constant fear expressed that there might be forceful occupation by military aggression of several of the countries we visited. That is quite a different thing from saying "If you do not send us \$100,000,000,000, we are going to go communistic tomorrow." I cannot term the expression of a real and living

fear "blackmail." In short, and in conclusion, Mr. Chairman, the military commander who commands troops in a bivouac area who does not post outguards and local security when in the presence of an enemy is guilty of unbelievable stupidity. He should be and is relieved of his command. The same is true of a naval task force commander who does not put out a screening force to protect his main body.

I contend, Mr. Chairman, that our outposts are on the shores of western Europe and on the shores of China. If we voluntarily pull in, we can expect no outer perimeter of defense to exist when needed. We can expect to take our stands on the docks of Hoboken and San Francisco when and if the fateful hour comes. I consider it is folly to seriously contend that when Soviet Russia has completed the conquest of the rest of the world she is going to say, "Well, that is all. It is a good day's work. We are finished, and we will live together in peace and harmony." That, to me, is the ultimate in folly. It was said today that this program has only one chance in five of succeeding. For my part, if it only had 1 chance in 10, yes, 1 chance in 100, to succeed, I should still feel inclined to support it. The alternative, to my mind, is the eventual destruction of America. I cannot accept that alternative. I believe that we are holding and containing the tide of militaristic aggression. I cannot agree with those who would leave a void to be filled by the Soviet as it most certainly will be filled. Five to one is not too long a shot for today.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. MICHENER, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that the Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 4604) to promote world peace and the general welfare, national interest, and foreign policy of the United States by providing aid to certain foreign countries, had come to no resolution thereon.

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. DAWSON of Utah (at the request of Mr. GAVIN) was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

#### TANKERS FOR TRANSPORTATION OF OIL

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the chairman of the Committee on Armed Services, the gentleman from New York [Mr. ANDREWS], I file a privileged report on the resolution (H. Res. 383).

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the resolution.

The Clerk read as follows:

*Resolved*, That the Secretary of the Navy be requested to furnish the House of Representatives full information in their possession relative to tankers under their control used in the transportation of oil whether full use is being made of the tankers and how soon additional tankers being received from the United States Maritime Commission will be put into operation.

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the report be printed in the RECORD at this point.

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

There was no objection.

(The report is as follows:)

#### REQUESTING INFORMATION CONCERNING THE NAVY'S USE OF OIL TANKERS

Mr. ANDREWS of New York, from the Committee on Armed Services, submitted the following adverse report:

The Committee on Armed Services, to whom was referred the House Resolution 383, requesting the Secretary of the Navy to furnish to the House of Representatives full information relative to the Navy's use of oil tankers under their control, report it back to the House and recommend that the resolution do not pass.

The action of the committee is based upon the following letter to the chairman of the Committee on Armed Services from the Honorable W. John Kenney, Acting Secretary of the Navy, which letter contains the information requested in the resolution insofar as practicable:

THE SECRETARY OF THE NAVY,  
Washington, December 3, 1947.

Hon. WALTER G. ANDREWS,  
Chairman of the Committee on Armed Services, House of Representatives.

MY DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Your request for the information called for by House Resolution 383 has been received. The information required by that resolution is set forth below:

The Navy owns and is now operating a total of 36 fleet-type tankers. Of this total, 12 are assigned to the Pacific Fleet, 8 to the Atlantic Fleet, and 16 to the Naval Transportation Service. All of the Naval Transportation Service tankers are regularly employed in transporting petroleum products from sources of supply to Navy or other military storage installations where those products are required. Tankers assigned to the two fleets are also made available monthly for that purpose in numbers depending upon the requirements of the fleet to which attached and the intra-area distribution needs for which the fleet commanders are responsible.

The Navy has only two large tankers laid up in its reserve fleet. These vessels were especially equipped with heavy lift cranes for particular purposes during the war. To reconvert them for use as petroleum carriers would not only be time consuming and costly but would also deprive the Navy of two specially fitted ships for which a definite need would exist in the event of another emergency.

By an agreement among the services the Navy is responsible for providing the bulk ocean transportation requirements for all three services on a world-wide basis. To carry out this responsibility the Navy not only uses all 36 tankers previously mentioned but also charters tankers from the Maritime Commission on a voyage basis. An average of 45 tankers monthly must be so chartered from the Maritime Commission to meet the petroleum transportation requirements of the armed services which exceed the capabilities of the Navy's own tanker fleet.

It was long recognized by the military services that a serious petroleum transportation problem would be presented by the expiration of the Maritime Commission's authority to operate tankers under general agency agreements. That authority, unless again extended, is due to expire on February 29, 1948. In late September a plan was accordingly developed in the Navy Department to acquire a certain number of tankers from the Maritime Commission and operate them under a service form of contract with one or

more commercial operators. While this plan was under consideration a meeting was called on October 1, 1947, at the White House by Mr. Steelman to discuss means of meeting the predicted shortage of petroleum products for the civilian economy during the approaching winter.

The plan agreed upon at the above meeting which received Navy Department approval was to recondition for the earliest possible use of the military services 50 tankers then laid up in the Maritime Commission's reserve fleets. Appropriation considerations made it mandatory that the cost of reconditioning the 50 tankers be divided between the Maritime Commission and the Navy Department. The agreed-upon division of vessels resulted in the Navy Department undertaking the reconditioning of 26 tankers and the Maritime Commission the balance of 24.

The program of readying for service the above 50 tankers is now in full progress. Two ships already have been completed and have sailed for loading ports on the west coast. By the end of December it is expected that a total of 16 ships will be in service. By late January or mid-February 1948 all 50 tankers are expected to be in active operation. It is important to note that as these vessels become available the requirements for tankers now obtained on a charter basis from the Maritime Commission will be correspondingly decreased, thus releasing those ships either for sale or to meet the needs of the domestic economy if continued in operation under the existing authority of the Maritime Commission.

Sincerely yours,

W. JOHN KENNEY,  
Acting Secretary of the Navy.

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the resolution be laid on the table.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GAVIN. I yield.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I appreciate very much the interest the gentleman has taken in this problem. He is always helpful. The information requested in my resolution was given by the Secretary of the Navy to the Committee on Armed Forces. A great deal of work must be done on the fuel problem because our people are cold, as a result of the shortage of coal and oil. I am introducing a resolution today which calls for an embargo on the tankers being sent by the Maritime Commission to foreign nations. Those tankers are needed in order to bring oil to the United States from countries which produce oil. An embargo should be placed on the sending of tankers abroad until this country is assured of being kept warm at least for this winter. I believe they should be kept for the United States anyway.

I note in tonight's paper an embargo was placed by the United States on soft-coal exports. I am also requesting that an embargo be placed on the exportation of oil until the shortage is over. I am introducing a resolution for that purpose. The United States has the power to embargo oil and the tankers, but the resolutions would insure their doing it.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GAVIN. I yield.

Mr. MICHENER. I have received letters from my district within the last few days stating that they are unable to get



fuel oil. Would the resolution referred to here help that situation?

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. This resolution simply gives the number of tankers that the Navy has. The resolutions which I have introduced would place an embargo on tankers going to foreign countries and would decidedly help our situation. Also, the embargo on oil would help our situation.

Mr. MICHENER. In voting on a resolution of this kind I think we all want to know that it is going to get some results. I shall support the resolution if there is any hope of helping to furnish oil at this time to people needing it. There are apartment houses right here in Washington that are cold now. They do not have hot water. The heat is being rationed, so I am informed. Hot water for bathing purposes is being rationed, the same as it was during the war. The hotel in which I happen to live has not adopted anything like that as yet, but I do think the country ought to give consideration to matters of this kind right now.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GAVIN] to lay the resolution on the table.

The motion was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the letter sent by the Secretary of the Navy may be included as a part of the gentleman's remarks.

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

There was no objection.

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. TOLLEFSON asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

Mr. ROSS asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an address delivered by Hon. JOSEPH W. MARTIN, JR.

Mr. SCHWABE of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include certain extraneous matter. The matter exceeds the limit prescribed and I have an estimate from the Public Printer to the effect that the cost will be \$177.50. Notwithstanding the additional cost, I ask unanimous consent that the extension may be made.

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

There was no objection.

Mrs. DOUGLAS asked and was given permission to extend her remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD in five separate instances and to include certain extraneous matter.

Mr. MacKINNON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include a speech by Gardner Cowles.

Mr. VURSELL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I have two requests: First, that my colleague the gentleman from Missouri [Mr.

BELL] may extend the remarks he made earlier by including a speech delivered by Hon. Vicente Sotto, Delegate to the United Nations from the Philippines; and second, that my colleague the gentleman from California [Mr. KING] may extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a newspaper article.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the requests of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. JUDD asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

Mr. BUTLER (at the request of Mr. VORYS) was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

#### ADJOURNMENT

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 27 minutes p. m.) the House, pursuant to its previous order, adjourned until tomorrow, Friday, December 5, 1947, at 10 o'clock a. m.

#### EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1131. A letter from the Acting President, Board of Commissioners, District of Columbia, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to provide that compensation of members of the Alcoholic Beverage Control Board of the District of Columbia shall be fixed in accordance with the Classification Act of 1923, as amended; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

1132. A letter from the Under Secretary, Department of Agriculture, transmitting a report on cooperation of the United States with Mexico in the control and eradication of foot-and-mouth disease; to the Committee on Agriculture.

1133. A letter from the President, Commission on Licensure, Healing Arts Practice Act, transmitting a report showing the activities of the Commission for the fiscal year which ended June 30, 1947; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

1134. A letter from the Administrator, Federal Works Agency, transmitting reports of funds received during the fiscal year 1947 for the rental of buildings and lands acquired as sites for the future construction of public buildings; to the Committee on Public Works.

#### REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 386. Resolution for consideration of H. R. 4604, a bill to promote world peace and the general welfare, national interest, and foreign policy of the United States by providing aid to certain foreign countries; without amendment (Rept. No. 1153). Referred to the House Calendar.

#### ADVERSE REPORTS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII,

Mr. ANDREWS of New York: Committee on Armed Services. House Resolution 383. Resolution requesting the Secretary of the Navy to furnish the House of Representatives full information relative to tankers un-

der their control used in the transportation of oil, whether full use is being made of the tankers, and how soon additional tankers being received from the United States Maritime Commission will be put into operation (Rept. No. 1154). Ordered to be printed.

#### PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. COLE of New York:

H. R. 4632. A bill to provide for a reevaluation of the strategic need for national defense posts, stations, bases, and other land or floating facilities beyond the continental limits of the United States, in Alaska, and in the Canal Zone, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. SIKES:

H. R. 4633. A bill to provide for the conveyance to Escambia County, State of Florida, of tracts of land now under the jurisdiction of the Army Department; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. WOLVERTON:

H. R. 4634. A bill to amend section 16 of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. MILLER of Nebraska:

H. R. 4635. A bill to amend section 11 of an act entitled "An act to regulate barbers in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

H. R. 4636. A bill to amend an act entitled "An act to regulate the practice of the healing art to protect the public health in the District of Columbia," approved February 27, 1929, as amended; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. GRANT of Indiana:

H. R. 4637. A bill to encourage increased production, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MILLER of California:

H. R. 4638. A bill to provide for a Division of Research and Development in the Post Office Department; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. WALTER:

H. R. 4639. A bill to amend the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, as amended, to provide homes for veterans, through veterans' homestead associations, and the public facilities essential therefor; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. BUTLER:

H. R. 4640. A bill to provide additional compensation for employees in the field service of the Post Office Department to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. HOLIFIELD:

H. R. 4641. A bill to prescribe the procedures of investigating committees of the Congress and to protect the rights of parties under investigation by such committees; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. FERNANDEZ:

H. R. 4642. A bill to provide for disposition and use of tribal funds of the Navajo Tribe of Indians; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. SADLAK:

H. R. 4643. A bill to extend the time within which persons who served honorably in the armed forces of the United States during World War I, World War II, and certain other periods may file petitions for naturalization; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DEWART:

H. J. Res. 269. Joint resolution to rescind certain orders of the Secretary of the Interior establishing Indian reservations in the Territory of Alaska; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. VAN ZANDT:

H. Con. Res. 120. Concurrent resolution providing for the printing as a House document of the pamphlet entitled "Manual Explanatory of the Privileges, Rights, and Benefits Provided for Persons Who Served in the Armed Forces of the United States During World War I, World War II, or Peacetime (after April 20, 1898), and Those Dependent Upon Them, With Special Reference to Those Benefits, Rights, and Privileges Administered by the Veterans' Administration"; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. BEALL:

H. Res. 390. Resolution for the relief of Lucy Rhind; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. JENSEN:

H. Res. 391. Resolution authorizing the printing of the publication entitled "The Hoover Dam Power and Water Contracts and Related Data" as a House document; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. KING:

H. Res. 392. Resolution to instruct the Banking and Currency Committee to undertake study of the effects of rent-control laws and formulate legislation granting financial relief, in the form of subsidies, to landlords of residential rental units suffering financial loss from effects of inflation and rent ceilings; to the Committee on Rules.

H. Res. 393. Resolution to instruct the Post Office and Civil Service Committee to formulate legislation reducing postal rates on private relief packages sent overseas by individuals, churches, or welfare agencies of the United States; to the Committee on Rules.

#### PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII,

Mr. BOYKIN introduced a bill (H. R. 4644) for the relief of E. Brevard Walker, trading as E. B. Walker Lumber Co., which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

#### PETITIONS, ETC.

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

837. By Mr. GRAHAM: Petition of 31 residents of Beaver County, Pa., urging the passage of legislation establishing a system of universal military training; to the Committee on Armed Services.

838. Also, petition of 52 members of Col. Joseph H. Thompson Post, No. 261, American Legion, of Beaver Falls, Pa., urging passage of legislation establishing a system of universal military training; to the Committee on Armed Services.

839. By Mr. HALE: Petition of Redbank Village Tenants Council, South Portland, Maine, that Congress of the United States pass the necessary legislation to extend the period of time in which war housing must be disposed of for at least 2 years beyond the time specified in the Lanham Act; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

840. By Mr. HOPE: Petition of Herschel Louthan and 16 other residents of Hopewell, Kans., and vicinity, against H. R. 4278, a bill to enact the National Security Training Act of 1947; to the Committee on Armed Services.

841. Also, petition of Mrs. D. B. Martin and 59 other residents of Sterling, Kans., against H. R. 4278, a bill to enact the National Security Training Act of 1947; to the Committee on Armed Services.

842. Also, petition of Miss Olive Speck and 59 other residents of Hoisington, Kans., against H. R. 4278, a bill to enact the National Security Training Act of 1947; to the Committee on Armed Services.

843. Also, petition of Rev. Paul F. Holmes and 41 other residents of Satanta, Kans.,

against H. R. 4278, a bill to enact the National Security Training Act of 1947; to the Committee on Armed Services.

844. Also, petition of C. O. Burford and 14 other residents of Fowler, Kans., against H. R. 4278, a bill to enact the National Security Training Act of 1947; to the Committee on Armed Services.

845. Also, petition of Paul Hindman and nine other residents of Minneola, Kans., against H. R. 4278, a bill to enact the National Security Training Act of 1947; to the Committee on Armed Services.

846. Also, petition of Mrs. Amanda Schirmer and 23 other residents of Harper, Kans., against H. R. 4278, a bill to enact the National Security Training Act of 1947; to the Committee on Armed Services.

847. Also, petition of Mrs. Edwin Johnson and 39 other residents of Caldwell, Kans., and vicinity, against H. R. 4278, a bill to enact the National Security Training Act of 1947; to the Committee on Armed Services.

848. Also, petition of Rev. George W. Richards and 54 other residents of Bazine, Kans., against H. R. 4278, a bill to enact the National Security Training Act of 1947; to the Committee on Armed Services.

849. By Mr. GOFF: Petition signed by 30 students of Midway High School, Lewisville, Idaho, asking that further exportation to Russia of heavy farm machinery and scarce commodities be prohibited; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

850. By Mr. HOPE: Petition of Zita Darling and 23 others, of Alden, Kans., stating that an emergency situation exists among our Navajo Indian Tribe in the Southwest, threatening many with starvation, and petitioning immediate action to investigate these conditions, that steps may be taken to remedy the suffering of these neglected people; to the Committee on Public Lands.

851. By the SPEAKER: Petition of D. N. Norton and others, of St. Petersburg, Fla., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to enactment of the Townsend plan, H. R. 16; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

852. Also, petition of Oscar L. Williams and others, of Tampa, Fla., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to enactment of the Townsend plan, H. R. 16; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

853. Also, petition of E. G. Warren and others, of Tampa, Fla., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to enactment of the Townsend plan, H. R. 16; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

854. Also, petition of Mrs. F. B. Turner and others, of Miami, Fla., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to enactment of the Townsend plan, H. R. 16; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

855. Also, petition of D. R. Johnson, Lake Worth, Fla., and others, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to endorsement of the Townsend plan, H. R. 16; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

856. Also, petition of Townsend Club, No. 22, of Miami, Fla., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to completion of signing of Discharge Petition No. 7, relative to the Townsend plan; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

857. Also, petition of Tampa Townsend Club, No. 1, Tampa, Fla., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to completion of signing of Discharge Petition No. 7, relative to the Townsend plan; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

858. Also, petition of Greater New York CIO Council, New York, N. Y., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to requesting immediate relief from high prices; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

859. Also, petition of American Communications Association, CIO, Local 10, New York, N. Y., petitioning consideration of their reso-

lution with reference to requesting immediate relief from high prices; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

860. Also, petition of the Council of the City of New York, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to approval of the Marshall plan; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

## HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

FRIDAY, DECEMBER 5, 1947

The House met at 10 o'clock a. m.

The Reverend John F. McCadden, College of the Immaculate Conception, Washington, D. C., offered the following prayer:

We pray Thee, O God of might, wisdom, and justice, through whom authority is rightly administered, laws are enacted, and judgments decreed, assist, with Thy holy spirit of counsel and fortitude the President and the Congress of these United States, that their administration may be conducted in righteousness and may be eminently useful to Thy people, over whom they preside, by encouraging due respect for virtue and religion by a faithful execution of the laws in justice and mercy, and by restraining vice and immorality. Let the light of Thy divine wisdom direct the deliberations of this Congress and shine forth in all its proceedings and in the laws it frames for our rule and government, so that they may tend to the preservation of peace, the promotion of national happiness, the increase of industry, sobriety, and useful knowledge, and may perpetuate to us the blessings of equal liberty.

Enter into our hearts, O God, and remain with us. Teach us what we are to do, and grant us the strength to do it well. Show us what we must accomplish in order that, with Thy help, we may be able to please Thee in all things; and be Thou alone the author and finisher of all our judgments. Suffer us not to disturb the order of justice, Thou who lovest equity above all things; let not ignorance draw us into devious paths, nor partiality sway our minds; neither let respect of riches nor persons pervert our judgment, but unite us to Thee, that we may be one in Thee and never forsake the truth. Inasmuch as we are gathered together as representatives of Thy people, so may we in all things hold fast to justice tempered by mercy so that in this life our judgment may in no wise be at variance with Thee, and in the life to come we may attain to everlasting rewards for deeds well done. Amen.

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

#### MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

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

H. R. 4469. An act to amend the act of July 7, 1947, so as to authorize the Commis-