

and to determine the policies of that great railroad.

No doubt the Senator from Wyoming is intimating that although there are 700,000 stockholders of the American Telephone & Telegraph Co., in all probability very few and a very small percentage of that total number of stockholders actually run the company, and the great mass of them never do anything but send in proxies which are solicited by the group which runs the company, and the great mass of the stockholders actually have no more to do with the management of that company, I dare say, than they have to do with the management of some of the labor unions which are under attack in the proposed legislation now before the Senate.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I thank the Senator from Florida for that comment. He has directed attention to one of the significant aspects of our modern corporate system.

Yesterday, Mr. President, I think it was, Mr. Robert Young testified before the Banking and Currency Committee about the evils of the Baltimore & Ohio financing practices. With respect to that matter I know nothing but I desire to call the attention of the Senate to the fact that a few weeks ago Mr. Robert Young was quoted in Time Magazine as saying that when he purchased 300,000 shares of the stock of the New York Central Railroad Co., he had acquired the control of that railroad.

Mr. President, we hear much about communistic infiltration. Here is an example of infiltration in the field of business. The control of the New York Central Railroad is held by such a small group that the leader of another railroad, by the purchase of 300,000 shares of stock out of a total of some 20,000,000 shares or more is able to assert that he has secured control.

Mr. PEPPER. If the Senator will yield, I think the total holdings of Mr. Young, as reported in some of the dispatches, were not in excess of one and a half percent of the total outstanding stock.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. That is the point. So one and a half percent of the ownership controls these big business enterprises, and we are acting as though they were normal flesh and blood people. They are not. That is the source of all our difficulty.

A curious thing happened, Mr. President. As I opened the Washington Post this morning I found an article by J. A. Livingston, who writes very wisely under the heading "Minding your business." The stock ownership of the A. T. & T. had appealed to him, and he made a very interesting comment. Having heard the statement I read, perhaps, that no one person has as much as one-half of one percent of the total stock outstanding, he said:

However, A. T. & T. is not strictly a poor man's corporation. There are 20,000,000 shares of A. T. & T. common; they are quoted at \$166 a share. One-half of 1 percent of A. T. & T. stock would be worth about \$17,000,000.

So we realize the tremendous magnitude of this institution.

Mr. President, the rest of this article is of such great interest that I ask unani-

mous consent that it may be printed in the RECORD at this point.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

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

MINDING YOUR BUSINESS

(By J. A. Livingston)

WIDOWS, ORPHANS AND WORKERS

The New York Stock Exchange has just published an eye-catching ad. On a table are hats—a broad-brimmed one of the man from Texas, the denim cap the railroad fireman wears, the crushed fedora you might associate with a newspaperman, the derby of the stockbroker, the white skullcap of the house painter, the bowler of the business man, and the hat of a naval officer.

The title of the ad is "Stockholders' Meeting," and it says: "They come from everywhere * * * from every income group, from every community. They are women as well as men, employees as well as executives, farmers as well as businessmen. They are typical stockholders, the owners of business."

"This distribution of business ownership through the whole mass of the people is an American development. A healthy and democratic development. We believe that much of the great strength of American industry derives from the depth and breadth of its ownership * * *." And so the advertisement runs on—a moving declaration of faith.

And yet, nobody—not even the New York Stock Exchange—knows just how deep down or broad across is stock ownership in the United States. All we know is that barbers and ribbon clerks are in the market along with bank presidents and industrialists. What proportion of whom is a statistical mystery.

Best and most-cited example of widespread ownership is the American Telephone & Telegraph Corp. At the end of the year, 695,660 persons, corporations, colleges, institutions had a piece of it. A. T. & T. observes that "no stockholder held as much as one-half of 1 percent of the total stock outstanding." However, A. T. & T. is not strictly a poor man's corporation. There are 20,000,000 shares of A. T. & T. common; they're quoted at \$166 a share. One-half of 1 percent of A. T. & T. stock would be worth about \$17,000,000. A widow or orphan with such a nest-egg would be highly prized in the marriage or any other market.

Though many persons are shareholders, most are not. This is borne out by the study of liquid assets made last year by the Bureau of Agricultural Economics and the Federal Reserve Board. It showed that 24 percent of United States families had no bank deposits or savings bonds at all; 29 percent had less than \$500 of savings. Thus, 53 percent of the Nation's families had less than \$500 saved. It's a safe guess that few of these were stockholders.

Guesses on the number of United States shareholders have ranged from around 6,000,000 (probably too low) to 15,000,000, which may be a bit high. SEC officials have made a tentative estimate of eight to ten million. At the topmost total, 15,000,000, only one out of every six adults could be classed as a stock owner.

What's more, the person who owns one or two shares of a stock does not identify himself with the corporation. He's strictly an absentee owner. He is gladdened by his dividends, but probably bored by the company's reports. Often he'll not show sufficient interest to send in his proxy for the annual meeting—as the rise in proxy-gathering costs of corporations attests.

The average stockholder's main interest is his job, or law practice, or grocery store, or garage. Perhaps his union. Lower prices at

the meat market probably mean more to him or his wife than the possibility of an increased dividend by General Motors or R. H. Macy & Co. The United States is still not a nation of coupon clippers or dividend collectors.

Unquestionably the Stock Exchange "ad" will ring true to big stockholders—persons who get \$250 or more in dividends a year. They are more inclined to associate themselves with corporations, with private property. But it's questionable whether the "ad" will ring the bell with workers. When they are informed that business ownership has been distributed through the whole mass of the people they're apt to wonder first why they've been left and second who are the masses, if not they.

Probably, more Americans have a property stake in industry than British, French, or Italians. And ultimately, as more and more corporations split their stocks, the distribution of ownership may increase. Yet it still seems premature to suggest that we have mass ownership of industry. Certainly we don't have mass identity with the large corporations. Indeed, we are more likely to develop a sense of ownership through profit-sharing plans than through stock ownership. For just on reason: Most persons don't save. And it takes saving—putting money aside—to own stocks. It only takes an act of the boss to say, "Here, you get a piece of the profits. This is your plant, too."

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, the leadership has indicated a desire to recess.

RECESS

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I move that the Senate take a recess until tomorrow at 11 o'clock a. m.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 6 o'clock and 4 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Wednesday, May 7, 1947, at 11 o'clock a. m.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

TUESDAY, MAY 6, 1947

The House met at 10 o'clock a. m.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O God, Thou who fillest space and time and transcends all things, we praise Thee for the one perfect flower of mankind. Grant that His judgment and devotion may be translated into our service, and through Him our national life may be made brotherly, thus enabling us to transform the individual, while duty becomes a contagion and our citizens are emancipated from misapprehension and enabled to see the best glimmering through the worst.

Dear Lord, we beseech Thee to overrule whatever has been imperfect and unwise in us, and send us forth as heralds of good will, whose duties are to maintain the high standards of Christian government. Always may character and conscience have their way in the defense of the Republic and in the perpetuity of righteous institutions. Do Thou cleanse our hearts, that they may be innocent from the great transgression; and hasten the day of brotherhood in all the earth.

In the blessed name of Jesus we pray. 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 amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 2700. An act making appropriations for the Department of Labor, the Federal Security Agency, and related independent agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the foregoing bill, requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. KNOWLAND, Mr. GURNEY, Mr. BALL, Mr. WHERRY, Mr. McCARRAN, Mr. MCKELLAR, and Mr. RUSSELL to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the President pro tempore has appointed Mr. LANGER and Mr. CHAVEZ members of the joint select committee on the part of the Senate, as provided for in the act of August 5, 1939, entitled "An act to provide for the disposition of certain records of the United States Government," for the disposition of executive papers in the following departments and agencies:

1. Department of Agriculture.
2. Department of Commerce.
3. Department of the Interior.
4. Department of Justice.
5. Department of the Navy.
6. Department of the Treasury.
7. National Archives.
8. National Archives (General Schedule No. 1, Revision A).
9. Federal Works Agency.
10. Federal Communications Commission.
11. Office of Selective Service Records.
12. Selective Service System.
13. United States District Court (Northern District of California).

The message also announced that the Senate had passed the following resolution (S. Res. 112):

Resolved, That the Senate has heard with profound sorrow the announcement of the death of Hon. CHARLES L. GERLACH, late a Representative from the State of Pennsylvania.

Resolved, That a committee of two Senators be appointed by the President pro tempore of the Senate to join the committee appointed on the part of the House of Representatives to attend the funeral of the deceased Representative.

Resolved, That the Secretary communicate these resolutions to the House of Representatives and transmit a copy thereof to the family of the deceased.

Resolved, That as a further mark of respect to the memory of the deceased the Senate do now take a recess until 11 o'clock a. m. tomorrow.

The message also announced that, pursuant to the provisions of the above resolution, the senior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MYERS] and the junior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MARTIN] were appointed members of the committee on the part of the Senate.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. TWYMAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances.

RELIEVE THE AMERICAN TAXPAYER

Mr. TWYMAN. 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 Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. TWYMAN. Mr. Speaker, the Republican Party is committed to the reduction of taxes. The American people have carried the heaviest tax burden in the history of America in the past 7 years. Time has definitely long passed when Federal expenditure and taxes should be reduced.

How can the Republican Party, Mr. Speaker, keep its pledge to the American people to reduce taxes if we vote \$400,000,000 for Greece and Turkey? I was under the impression that we are going to vote some money for the American taxpayer. Instead we are asked to vote the American taxpayers' money for Greece and Turkey, and Mr. Truman has told us that he intends to follow this same policy all around the world, and that this gift of \$400,000,000 is nothing but a first installment even for Greece and Turkey. When, Mr. Speaker, do we get around to cutting taxes? When do we get around to keeping the pledges made by the Republican Party? Are we prepared to increase the taxes of the American citizen to carry out the Truman doctrine? I, for one, am opposed to it.

COMMITTEE ON MERCHANT MARINE AND FISHERIES

Mr. ARENDTS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries be permitted to sit during the session of the House today during general debate.

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

There was no objection.

GREEK-TURKISH LOAN

Mr. OWENS. 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 Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Speaker, today we are called upon to wrestle with the Greek-Turkish problem. Some time ago we learned that Great Britain could not meet her commitments in Greece. We also learned that she had slightly more than 10,000 troops to fight the guerrillas in Greece, but that she had about 100,000 troops in Palestine fighting the Jewish people. Is Palestine more important to Great Britain than Greece, and, if so, why? Are Greece and Turkey more important to us than is Palestine? If so, why? We do not know about that, but we do know that someone is on the receiving end of a very short bill of goods, and that someone is Uncle Sam, familiarly known as Santa Claus. I believe that we should be very generous with the starving and needy people of the countries that have been devastated by

war, but we should cease to expend the lives of our people and our money in a vain effort to perpetuate foreign empires and the property of oil barons and other financial geniuses of this Nation and other nations.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

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

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks and include an editorial.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, we all seem to be concerned about the Greek-Turkish matter, and I think it is entirely proper that we are. I offer as my brief contribution to the RECORD this morning a part of an article which came out of Athens by the correspondent for the New York Herald Tribune. It is contained in an editorial which reads as follows:

A REMARKABLE DISPATCH

The Herald Tribune has also been a consistent backer of the Truman policy, but on its editorial page last week it carried a remarkable dispatch from its Athens correspondent, Seymour Freidlin, who wrote:

"It is high time that policy makers in Washington realize that the 'Greek situation' cannot even be placed on the path to solution simply by a meaningless anti-Communist policy. * * * Every [reactionary] step undertaken by the Government is explained away as having Washington sanction. * * * Proposals to suppress the opposition as traitorous are sanctified as following the example of the United States.

"The United States is in the process of granting aid to Greece. This country and its people, proud and loyal to the Allied cause, deserve every dime. Greece must be rehabilitated, her people fed, and her economy soundly grounded, but a shower of cash will be as ineffective as Britain's aid unless some concrete steps are taken to insure tranquillity, to mitigate hatred, and lay the foundation for political security. * * * Careful political readjustment will not be accomplished with long-term credit alone."

All in all, the article was a remarkable denunciation of the viciously reactionary regime in power in Greece, and it was all the more remarkable for turning up as it did, on the editorial page of a paper which is supposed to be supporting the President's program.

TURKISH LOAN

Mr. RICH. 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. RICH. Mr. Speaker, this proposal for a military alliance with the corrupt dictatorship of Turkey is the most disgraceful proposition which this House has ever been asked to rubber stamp. Have any of you gentlemen who are sup-

porting this business tried to find out anything about the Government of Turkey? If you have you know that there is a wall which keeps information from coming out of that country which makes the iron curtain look like tissue paper. What were the results of the election which was staged in Turkey in 1946? Nobody in Washington will tell you. The Turkish Embassy will not tell you. The State Department will not tell you. Even Hitler rigged up election figures and gave them out to the world but the insolent dictatorship in Turkey does not even bother to do that. No, Mr. Speaker, Turkey will take the United States for millions of dollars but they are very careful not to let the people of the United States get any information about any of the details of the workings of the corrupt and oppressive dictatorship that runs Turkey. Only last Friday the New York Times had another story about how Turkey censored foreign newsmen for trying to smuggle out a little of the truth. The Turkish dictatorship has already buried the few newspapers within that country that had the courage to hint at the truth, and that dictatorship has been ruthless in seeing that no information gets to the people of the rest of the world. Mr. Speaker, I say with all the force which I can command: Not one cent of American money for the military dictatorship in Turkey.

GREEK-TURKISH LOAN

Mr. BENDER. 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 Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, where will this proposal to pour money into every trouble spot of Europe end? Was it a deliberate policy to begin with the corrupt and oppressive governments of Greece and Turkey on the theory that if the Congress of the United States would rubber stamp the proposal to send money there that we would send it anywhere? If we send money under the guise of "relief" to bolster the ruthless and tyrannical governments of Turkey and Greece, what possible excuse will we have to refuse sending it anywhere else? Every corrupt government in the world that has fastened itself on the backs of the people will raise the cry of the threat of communism to get money from the United States to keep itself in power. This policy is one which can lead only to bankruptcy for the United States. I say: Send no money at all to the rich and crafty government of Turkey. I say: Send relief to the hungry people of Greece, but do not send them guns and tanks and try to tell the American people that this is "relief." It may be a relief to the present government of Greece that wants to shoot down all the opponents to its misrule, but it is no relief for the Greek people. No, Mr. Speaker this proposal is nothing more than a proposal for the United States to embark upon a policy of supporting in power every government in the world which does not have the support of its people.

It is the most shameless kind of hypocrisy to try to sell this program to the people of America under the guise of relief to the hungry.

GREEK-TURKO LOAN

Mr. BUFFETT. 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 Nebraska?

There was no objection.

Mr. BUFFETT. Mr. Speaker, one sure way to destroy America is to saddle an impossible burden on the backs of the American people.

The continuous hand-outs everywhere automatically resulting from the Greek-Turko venture would cost billions annually.

This deal would encourage blackmail hand-outs enabling Stalin to sit on his front porch and watch the United States bleed to death.

The Greek-Turko loan plays right into Stalin's hands.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON THE LIBRARY OF CONGRESS OF THE COMMITTEE ON HOUSE ADMINISTRATION

Mr. BISHOP. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on the Library of Congress of the Committee on House Administration may sit today during general debate for a meeting which has already been called for this morning.

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

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

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

Mr. ALLEN of California asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an address delivered by the Honorable WILLIS W. BRADLEY.

Mr. FOSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include an address by Dr. Conant of Harvard University. I am advised by the Public Printer that the cost is estimated at \$213. Notwithstanding, I ask unanimous consent that the extension may be made.

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

There was no objection.

SUMMARY OF INDIVIDUAL POLL ON GREEK-TURKISH SITUATION

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MATHEWS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring to you a little résumé of conversations I have had with people whom I have interviewed about the President's proposal in regard to Greece and Turkey.

I think it is fair to say that the majority of them fell into a certain pattern advocating three things.

First, a willingness to supply within reason food and clothing for the relief of the distressed people in other parts of the world.

Secondly, opposition—and great opposition—to military occupation and military maneuvers in those countries.

Third, a strong feeling that we should start to combat communism in this country first.

Mr. Speaker, if it be said that these people do not have all the information that they should have, is that their fault when their own government will neither give it to them or give it to us to pass on to them?

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. BRADLEY of California. 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. BRADLEY of California addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

ASSISTANCE FOR ECONOMIC RECONSTRUCTION

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, the true measure of assistance to a working world at peace is not the amount of expenditures to sustain life but the amount of assistance for economic reconstruction. The best contrast between the performances of democracy and the promises of communism, is what the United States has done since the end of the war to help war-devastated countries to rebuild their economies.

Based on a study prepared under the direction of the Assistant Secretary of State, Hon. Willard L. Thorp, from the office of Under Secretary Will Clayton, entitled "American Economic and Technical Aid to Foreign Countries Since Mid-1945," a summary of which appears in the Appendix, I estimate the United States expenditures since VJ-day at about \$6,000,000,000 in long-term credits and grants, exclusive of the British loan of \$3,750,000,000 being used partly for food and partly for reconstruction. This sum is an investment in peace, in trade, and in health. Our expenditures since VJ-day include loans and technical assistance, vast war installations transferred, agricultural and industrial "hard goods" of permanent benefit to the recipient countries distributed through UNRRA, and special bilateral financial arrangements. Though no nation on earth has ever done as much to help other peoples to help themselves in peacetime, it represents but a little over 6

percent of 1 year's production of our economy. It is not our lifeblood, as many would have us believe—nor do the peoples we help want it to be. On the contrary, a healthy and prosperous world holds not only the promise of peace, but the promise of greater well-being for us in common with other nations. Such a world can make possible for the United States an aggregate annual production of \$250,000,000,000, opening up new vistas of economic security and culture to all our people. Our Nation whose productive machine could almost double its output for war from about ninety billion, the peacetime top, to one hundred and seventy billion, can reach new heights of production in One World. As a result of American credits and grants, technical services, transfers, settlements, allocations, and surplus-property sales, many countries on every continent have a greater share of roads, hospitals, air-fields, libraries, machinery, sanitation, cargo ships, and other tools of a civilized economy.

(Mr. JAVITS asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a summary of a report.)

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks and include therein a letter to the deputy managers by Gen. Omar Bradley.

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

There was no objection.

[Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts addressed the House. Her remarks appear in the Appendix.]

GRECO-TURKISH LOAN

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. 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 Ohio [Mr. SMITH]?

The was no objection.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, the United States stands on the precipice of bankruptcy and collectivism. Today the Congress is deliberating whether or not to push it off the cliff into the bottomless pit. Let us not be deceived in believing the move we are being asked to make is anticommunistic for it is the contrary. If executed, the forces of communism within our Nation will in any event be strengthened. The further drain upon our resources and the additional deterioration of our finances and economy that will inevitably supervene, war or no war, will blight what little hope remains for saving our country from the curse of totalitarianism. May God help us in this hour of great decision.

COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Agriculture may sit today during the general debate.

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

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks in the Appendix.

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

There was no objection.

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

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. SPRINGER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial from the Indianapolis Star.

Mr. ANGELL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks on two subjects and include an address in each.

Mr. CROW asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include an address by Senator MARTIN, of Pennsylvania.

Mr. MERROW asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and to include an editorial from the Carroll County Independent entitled "The Only Way To Be Prepared."

Mr. RAMEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in regard to the one hundred and fifty-sixth anniversary of the adoption of the Polish Constitution, and that in the permanent RECORD it may appear in the proceedings of yesterday with regard to the anniversary celebration.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. VORYS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD by including NAM recommendations to the international financial policy of the United States.

Mr. HART asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include an address by the commander in chief of the Veterans of Foreign Wars.

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include an editorial from the Saluda Sentinel on Colonel Bonham and Colonel Travis, of the Alamo, both of whom were born and raised in the district it is my honor to represent in this Congress.

And may I add also, Mr. Speaker, that in these times of seniority in the armed forces and elsewhere, it is an inspiration to the youth of this country to know that Colonel Travis wrote the most heroic letter in American history at the age of 27.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. BATTLE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD with regard to the efforts of the Alabama Department of

the Veterans of Foreign Wars to raise funds for the erection of a suitable State headquarters in the State capital of Alabama.

Mr. CELLER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix on two subjects.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD in two instances, in one to include in the event it has not already been inserted the address made by President Aleman, of the United Mexican States, on April 30 at the Pan American Union; and in the other an article appearing on May 1 written by Marquis Childs, entitled "Growth of the Industrial Monopoly."

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

There was no objection.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I desire to submit two requests, one in reference to the extension of an article dealing with reciprocal-trade agreements. I have had an estimate by the Printing Office and find it exceeds the limit and will cost \$372.75. Notwithstanding the excess I ask unanimous consent that the extension may be made, and that I may include the remarks of Dr. John Lee Coulter against the reciprocal-trade agreement.

The SPEAKER. Notwithstanding the excess, without objection the extension may be made.

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, and to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include a newspaper article.

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

There was no objection.

[Mr. REED of New York addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

COMMITTEE ON NEWSPRINT

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, as chairman of the Select Committee on Newsprint and Paper Supply, I ask unanimous consent that the committee be permitted to sit during sessions of the House this week while general debate is in progress.

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

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. JARMAN. 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 Alabama?

There was no objection.

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

(Mr. JARMAN asked and was given permission to include as a part of his

remarks an editorial from the Washington Post.)

WALLACE, STASSEN, AND THE RED PARADE

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, if we desired to befuddle the public mind of Europe as to what Democrats and Republicans in this country think, I know of nothing that we could do that would contribute more to that end than sending Henry Wallace to London and Harold Stassen to Moscow, unless we could have brought them to New York on May Day and let them witness that Communist parade under the Red banner of Moscow.

In that parade they carried placards denouncing me personally, which I consider a compliment. They hate me because of my fight against the Communist menace in this country.

They carried placards denouncing the House Committee on Un-American Activities, the one committee of Congress that is doing more to stop their infamous activities in this country than any other committee in either House.

They also denounced both the Congress and Harry Truman, the President of the United States.

The Committee on Un-American Activities has moving pictures of that Red parade which we are going to show the Congress at an early date. I wish every American could see it.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has expired.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. JENISON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include an article from the current Liberty magazine entitled "Navy Versus Air Force on How to Fight the Next War."

THE AMERICAN NATIONAL RED CROSS

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (S. 591) to amend the act of January 5, 1905, to incorporate the American Red Cross.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, will the gentleman explain the bill for the RECORD.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Speaker, this is a bill to amend the charter of the American Red Cross and except for technical amendments the principal one is to change the governing body from 18 to 50. At the present time the board is selected six by the President, six by the original incorporators, and six by the chapters. This bill provides for a board of 50 to be selected; 8 by the President, 30 by the chapters, and 12 by the governing board itself.

Mr. Speaker, this is the result of an unanimous report of an advisory com-

mittee appointed by Chairman Basil O'Conor to make the representation of the Red Cross more democratic. The reason for speed is that the national meeting of the Red Cross is to take place early in June and they are most anxious to have the meeting take place under the provisions of the new charter. It is important, therefore, that they get out word for the selection of delegates in this more democratic way.

I might say that this bill has nothing to do with and does not in any way affect the Red Cross emblem. A subcommittee of three of the Committee on Foreign Affairs consisting of Mrs. BOLTON and Mr. KEE, and myself as chairman, has gone into the matter very thoroughly and unanimously reported to the Foreign Affairs Committee. The full committee reported it out unanimously. It was reported unanimously by the Senate Committee and passed the Senate unanimously. Due to the stress of work of the Committee on Foreign Affairs we have been unable to get to it until recently, and we therefore hope it can now be speedily passed in order to take care of the annual meeting in June. There are two technical amendments which have no opposition and I know of no opposition to the bill.

Mr. RAYBURN. I withdraw my reservation of objection, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, further reserving the right to object, this does not affect any other organization except the Red Cross, does it?

Mr. VORYS. No.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Further reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, when the gentleman says that the matter does not involve the Red Cross emblem, does he mean to say it does not affect in any way those private concerns which might be using the Red Cross emblem in their businesses?

Mr. VORYS. It does not affect in any way the present legal status of the emblem problem. It does not affect the private concerns that are using it, the Red Cross, or anyone else. It has nothing to do with that.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the act to incorporate the American National Red Cross, approved January 5, 1905, is hereby amended by inserting the following paragraph immediately following the second paragraph of the said act:

"Whereas the said treaty has been revised and extended by a treaty or convention for the amelioration of the condition of the wounded and the sick of armies in the field, signed at Geneva, July 27, 1929, and adhered to by the United States of America, effective August 8, 1932; and"

Sec. 2. The fourth paragraph of the act to incorporate the American National Red Cross is hereby amended to read as follows:

"Whereas a permanent organization is an agency needed in every nation to carry out the purposes of said treaties, and especially to secure supplies and to execute the humane objects contemplated by said treaties, with the power to adopt and use the distinctive flag and arm badge specified by said treaties, on which shall be the sign of the Red Cross, for the purpose of cooperating with the Comité International de Secours aux Mili-

taires Blessés' (International Committee of Relief for the Wounded in War); and."

Sec. 3. Section 2 of the act to incorporate the American National Red Cross, approved January 5, 1905, is hereby amended to read as follows:

"Sec. 2. That the name of this corporation shall be 'The American National Red Cross', and by that name it shall have perpetual succession, with the power to sue and be sued in courts of law and equity, State or Federal, within the jurisdiction of the United States; to have and to hold such real and personal estate as shall be deemed advisable and to dispose of the same, to accept gifts, devises, and bequests of real and personal estate for the purposes of this corporation hereinafter set forth; to adopt a seal and the same to alter and destroy at pleasure; and to have the right to have and to use, in carrying out its purposes herein-after designated, as an emblem and badge, a Greek red cross on a white ground, as the same has been described in the treaties of Geneva, August 22, 1864 and July 27, 1929, and adopted by the several nations acceding thereto; to ordain and establish bylaws and regulations not inconsistent with the laws of the United States of America or any State thereof, and generally to do all such acts and things as may be necessary to carry into effect the provisions of this act and promote the purposes of said organization; and the corporation hereby created is designated as the organization which is authorized to act in matters of relief under said treaties and under any other treaty or convention similar in purpose to which the United States of America may hereafter adhere. In accordance with the said treaties, the delivery of the brassard allowed for individuals neutralized in time of war shall be left to military authority."

Sec. 4. Paragraphs "First" and "Second" of section 3 of the act to incorporate the American National Red Cross, approved January 5, 1905, is hereby amended to read as follows:

"First. To furnish volunteer aid to the sick and wounded of armies in time of war, in accordance with the spirit and conditions of the conference of Geneva of October 1863, and also of the treaties of the Red Cross, or the treaties of Geneva, of August 22, 1864, and July 27, 1929, to which the United States of America has given its adhesion, and also of any other treaty or convention similar in purpose to which the United States of America may hereafter give its adhesion.

"Second. And for said purposes to perform all the duties devolved upon a national society by each nation which has acceded to any of said treaties or conventions."

Sec. 5. The act to incorporate the American National Red Cross, approved January 5, 1905, is hereby amended by adding thereto a new section 4a to read as follows:

"Sec. 4a. That membership in the American National Red Cross shall be open to all the people of the United States, its Territories, and dependencies, upon payment of the sums specified from time to time in the bylaws.

"The chapters of the American National Red Cross shall be the local units of the corporation within the States and Territories of the United States. The regulations with respect to the granting of charters to the chapters and the revocation of the same, the territorial jurisdiction of the chapters, the relationship of the chapters to the corporation and compliance by the chapters with the policies and rules of the corporation, shall be as determined from time to time by the Board of Governors. Such regulations shall require that each chapter shall, in the election of the governing body of the chapter and in the selection of delegates to the national convention of the corporation,

adhere to democratic principles of election as specified in the bylaws."

SEC. 6. Section 5 of the act to incorporate the American National Red Cross, approved January 5, 1905, is hereby amended to read as follows:

"Sec. 5. That the governing body of the corporation in which all powers of government, direction, and management of the corporation shall be lodged, shall consist of a Board of Governors numbering 50 persons, to be appointed or elected in the manner following, namely:

"(a) Eight Governors shall be appointed by the President of the United States. Of the Governors so appointed, one shall be designated by the President of the United States to act as the principal officer of the corporation with such title and such functions as may from time to time be prescribed in the bylaws; and the remainder shall be officials of departments and agencies of the Federal Government, whose positions and interests are such as to qualify them to contribute toward the accomplishment of Red Cross programs and objectives. Of these at least one and not more than three shall be selected from the armed forces.

"(b) Thirty Governors shall be elected by the chapters. The Governors so elected shall be elected at the national convention under procedures for nomination and election which shall be such as to insure equitable representation of all the chapters, having regard to geographical considerations, to the size of the chapters and to the size of the populations served by the chapters.

"(c) Twelve Governors shall be elected by the Board of Governors as members-at-large. The Governors so elected shall be individuals who are representative of the national interests which it is the function of the Red Cross to serve, and with which it is desirable that the corporation shall have close association.

The term of office of all Governors shall be 3 years, except that the term of office of any Governor appointed by the President of the United States (other than the principal officer of the corporation) shall expire if and when such Governor shall retire, prior to the date on which his term as Governor would otherwise expire, from the official position held at the time of his appointment as Governor.

"Of the first Board of Governors to be selected hereunder, those Governors to be elected pursuant to subsection (b) of this section 5 shall be elected at the first national convention following the enactment of this act, those Governors to be elected pursuant to subsection (c) shall be elected as soon as practicable following such first national convention, and those Governors to be appointed pursuant to subsection (a) shall be appointed so as to take office at the same time. The Governors so elected pursuant to subsections (b) and (c) shall be divided by lot into three classes, the terms of which shall expire at the end of 1, 2, and 3 years, respectively, so that thereafter one-third of the members of the Board of Governors elected pursuant to subsections (b) and (c) will be chosen at the time of each national convention, and shall take office at such time or as soon as practicable thereafter.

The President of the United States shall fill as soon as may be any vacancy that may occur by death, resignation, or otherwise in the office of the principal officer of the corporation or in the membership of the Board of Governors appointed by him. Any vacancy that may occur in the Governors elected by the chapters pursuant to subsection (b) or in the Governors-at-large elected by the Board of Governors pursuant to subsection (c), shall be temporarily filled by appointment made by the Board of Governors, such appointees to serve until the next national convention.

The Board of Governors shall have power (1) to appoint from its own members an executive committee of not less than 11 per-

sons, who, when the Board of Governors is not in session, shall have and exercise all the powers of the Board of Governors, and (II) to appoint and remove, or provide for the appointment and removal of, all officers and employees of the corporation, except the principal officer designated by the President of the United States.

The annual meeting of the corporation shall be the national convention of delegates of the chapters, which shall be held annually on such date and at such place as may be specified by the Board of Governors. In all matters requiring a vote at the national convention, each chapter shall be entitled to not less than one vote. The number of votes which each chapter shall be entitled to cast shall be determined according to allocation by the Board of Governors, which shall be established on an equitable basis giving consideration both to the size of the membership of the chapters and to the size of the populations in the territories served by the chapters. Such allocations shall be reviewed at least every 5 years.

Voting by proxy shall not be allowed at any meeting of the Board of Governors, or at the national convention, or at any meeting of the chapters: *Provided, however,* That in the event of any national emergency which in the opinion of the Board of Governors makes attendance at the national convention impossible, the Board of Governors may permit the election of Governors by proxy at the national convention."

SEC. 7. Section 8 of the act to incorporate the American National Red Cross, approved January 5, 1905, is hereby amended to read as follows:

"Sec. 8. That the endowment fund of the American National Red Cross shall be kept and invested under the management and control of a board of nine trustees, who shall be elected from time to time by the Board of Governors under such regulations regarding terms and tenure of office, accountability, and expense as the Board of Governors shall prescribe."

Sec. 8. The corporation now existing as The American National Red Cross under the act of January 5, 1905, as amended, shall continue as a body corporate and politic in the District of Columbia. The first national convention after the enactment of this amendatory act shall be convened and held under rules and regulations prescribed by the governing body of the corporation as presently constituted. After such first national convention, the Board of Governors of the corporation from time to time shall constitute the associates and successors of the incorporators named in the said act of January 5, 1905, and neither the said incorporators nor any associates or successors theretofore designated by them or by their successors shall have any powers or duties.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 8, line 13, strike out all after the word "treaties" down to and including the word "adhere" in line 15.

Page 9, line 4, after "1905", insert "as amended."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PRIVATE CALENDAR

The SPEAKER. This is Private Calendar Day. The Clerk will call the first individual bill on the Private Calendar.

DIXIE MARGARINE CO.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 354) for the relief of the Dixie Margarine Co.,

a Tennessee corporation, Memphis, Tenn.

Mr. DOLLIVER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

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

There was no objection.

ADOLPH PFANNENSTIEHL

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1585) for the relief of Adolph Pfannenstiehl.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

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

There was no objection.

LT. COL. ORVILLE E. McKIM

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 559) for the relief of Lt. Col. Orville E. McKim.

Mr. POTTS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

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

There was no objection.

JAMES HAROLD NESBITT

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 334) for the relief of the legal guardian of James Harold Nesbitt, a minor.

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

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of \$1,000 to the legal guardian of James Harold Nesbitt, a minor, of Big Sandy, Tex., in full settlement of all claims against the United States for personal injuries, medical and hospital expenses sustained as the result of an accident involving an Army vehicle at the intersection of Church and Gilmore Streets, Big Sandy, Tex., on July 4, 1944: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this Act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

REGINALD MITCHELL

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 385) for the relief of Reginald Mitchell.

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

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin and Mr. POTTS objected, and, under the rule, the bill was recommitted to the Committee on the Judiciary.

CLAUDE R. HALL AND FLORENCE V. HALL

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 407) for the relief of Claude R. Hall and Florence V. Hall.

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

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized

and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of \$4,024.65 to Claude R. Hall and Florence V. Hall, in full satisfaction of their claims for damage to their property at 1233 Sunset Avenue, Santa Rosa, Calif., caused by United States Navy airplane; bureau No. 06307, on October 2, 1944: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with these claims, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 5, strike out "\$4,024.65" and insert \$1,491.15."

Page 1, strike out all of line 7, and insert, "settlement of all claims against the United States for damage to personal property."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read a third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ELWOOD L. KEELER

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 765) for the relief of Elwood L. Keeler.

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

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Elwood L. Keeler, Los Angeles, Calif., the sum of \$5,000. The payment of such sum represents reimbursement for the loss sustained by the said Elwood L. Keeler on account of the payment of a fine of a like amount which was covered into the Treasury of the United States prior to the time the President of the United States granted to the said Elwood L. Keeler a full and unconditional pardon with respect to the offense for which he was convicted in the United States District Court for the Southern District of California and sentenced on December 1, 1941, to imprisonment for 2 years and to pay such fine of \$5,000. Such pardon was granted on the ground that the evidence did not support the conviction of the said Elwood L. Keeler: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 6, after "\$5,000" insert "in full settlement of all claims against the United States."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CHARLES W. TAYLOR, JR.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 821) for the relief of Charles W. Taylor, Jr.

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

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of \$11,735.14 to Charles W. Taylor, Jr., of San Francisco, Calif., in full settlement of all claims against the United States for personal injuries, medical and hospital expenses, and other losses sustained as a result of being struck by a trailer attached to a United States Navy vehicle at the intersection of El Camino Real and Willow Avenue, Burlingame, Calif., on October 14, 1944: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 5, strike out \$11,735.14" and insert "\$5,735.14."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

RUSSELL F. TAYLOR

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 889) for the relief of Russell F. Taylor.

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

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Russell F. Taylor, Greensboro, Ga., the sum of \$1,000, in full settlement of all claims against the United States for personal injuries sustained by him as the result of an accident when his automobile was struck by an Army vehicle in Atlanta, Ga., on August 14, 1944: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 6, strike out "\$1,000" and insert "\$500."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

FRED PITTELLI

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1015) for the relief of Fred Pittelli.

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

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of \$25,000 to Fred Pittelli, of Oakland,

Calif., in full settlement of all claims against the United States for personal injury, medical and hospital expenses, and loss of earnings sustained as a result of being struck by a traveling crane of the United States Navy at pier 5, at the foot of Seventh Street, Oakland, Calif., on March 3, 1944: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 5, strike out "\$25,000" and insert "\$10,000."

Line 6, after "California," insert "for exclusive use."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

S. C. SPRADLING AND R. T. MORRIS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1067) for the relief of S. C. Spradling and R. T. Morris.

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

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to S. C. Spradling, of Durham, N. C., the sum of \$308.01, and to R. T. Morris, of Durham, N. C., the sum of \$118.44. The payment of the sum of \$308.01 shall be in full settlement of any and all claims against the United States arising out of damages sustained by the automobile of the said S. C. Spradling when a United States Army truck collided with his automobile on August 27, 1944, on Buchanan Road, Durham, N. C. The payment of \$118.44 shall be in full settlement of any and all claims against the United States arising out of damages sustained by the automobile of the said R. T. Morris when a United States Army truck collided with his automobile on August 27, 1944, on Buchanan Road, Durham, N. C.: *Provided*, That no part of either of the sums appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with the claim settled by the payment of such sum, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ESTATE OF JOHN F. HOPPERTON

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1788) for the relief of the estate of John F. Hopperton, a minor, deceased.

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

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of \$10,000, to the estate of John F. Hopperton, a minor, deceased, late of Cleveland,

Ohio, in full settlement of all claims against the United States for the death of the said John F. Hopperton, a minor, who was shot with a Smith and Wesson .38-caliber revolver by George H. Sagel (554727), seaman second class, United States Coast Guard Reserve, aboard the steamer *O. S. McFarland*, a freighter operated by the Columbia Transportation Co., of Cleveland, Ohio, on April 27, 1943, while the steamer was moored at the dock in Port Washington, Wis.: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 5, strike out "\$10,000" and insert "\$5,000."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PAUL GOODMAN

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1866) for the relief of Paul Goodman.

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

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Paul Goodman, of New York City, the sum of \$722.37, for reimbursement for funds expended in replacing funds of military personnel delivered to him as a class A agent officer, and lost in the course of duty through no fault of negligence on his part: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 6, after "\$722.37", insert "in full settlement of all claims against the United States."

Line 10, strike out "of" and insert "or."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

HUGH C. GILLIAM

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1956) for the relief of Hugh C. Gilliam.

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

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Hugh C. Gilliam, of Highland Park, N. J., the sum of \$2,825. The payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of any and all claims against the United States arising out of personal in-

juries received by the said Hugh C. Gilliam in a collision between the automobile he was driving and a United States Army truck which occurred on October 12, 1944, near Stelton, N. J., at the intersection of Route 27 and Plainfield Avenue: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 6, strike out "\$2,825" and insert "\$1,000."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SOUTHEASTERN SAND & GRAVEL CO.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2257) for the relief of Southeastern Sand & Gravel Co.

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

Whereas the Southern Bitumen Co. herefore contracted with the United States to build an outfall sewer in the city of Anniston, Ala., the contract being designated as Federal Works Agency project No. Ala. 1-160 (F); and

Whereas Roberts Blount became the guarantor on said contract; and

Whereas the Southern Bitumen Co. defaulted on its contract and Roberts Blount arranged for the completion of said contract by the Southeastern Sand & Gravel Co., and the same was so completed in 1943; and

Whereas the Federal Works Agency withheld from the contract price the sum of \$13,685 on account of liquidated damages for delay in completion and on account of an alleged defect in workmanship resulting in excess seepage of water into the sewer main, which said defect has since proved in actual use for nearly 3 years to be of no material consequence; and

Whereas the sum of \$3,053.88 has been paid to the Southeastern Sand & Gravel Co. as assignee of the Southern Bitumen Co. in part payment of the sum of \$13,685 due under said contract: Therefore

Be it enacted, etc., That the Administrator of the Federal Works Agency is hereby authorized and directed to pay to the Southeastern Sand & Gravel Co., or its assignee, the sum of \$10,631.12 in full satisfaction of all claims of the Southern Bitumen Co., the Southeastern Sand & Gravel Co., and Roberts Blount arising out of the construction of the afore-mentioned sewer at Anniston, Ala., under project No. Ala. 1-160 (F).

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ADOLPHUS M. HOLMAN

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 619) for the relief of Adolphus M. Holman.

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

Mr. DOLLIVER and Mr. POTTS objected, and, under the rule, the bill was recommitted to the Committee on the Judiciary.

NORMAN ABBOTT

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 770) for the relief of Norman Abbott.

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

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Norman Abbott, Baltimore, Md., the sum of \$7,500. The payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims of the said Norman Abbott against the United States for damages resulting from personal injuries sustained when he was struck on March 26, 1944, while standing at the intersection of Patapsco Avenue and Ninth Street, Baltimore, Md., by a United States Coast Guard automobile: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 per centum thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 6, strike out "\$7,500" and insert "\$3,500."

Line 8, strike out "damages resulting from personal injuries" and insert "personal injuries, medical and hospital expenses, and loss of earnings."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ROBERT HINTON

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1954) for the relief of Robert Hinton.

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

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Robert Hinton, Santa Barbara, Calif., the sum of \$7,500. The payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims of the said Robert Hinton against the United States on account of personal injuries, sustained on September 23, 1944, when the automobile which he was driving was struck at the intersection of Valero Street and Chapala Street, Santa Barbara, Calif., by a United States Marine Corps truck: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 6, strike out "\$7,500" and insert "\$2,000."

Line 9, after "injuries", insert "medical expenses, and loss of earnings."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

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

time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CHARLES F. BARRETT

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2631) for the relief of Charles F. Barrett.

Mr. CARROLL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

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

There was no objection.

HERSCHEL V. JOHNSON

The Clerk called the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 86) to authorize Herschel V. Johnson, Deputy Representative of the United States to the Security Council of the United Nations, to be reappointed to the Foreign Service.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the joint resolution, as follows:

Resolved, etc., That notwithstanding any provision of law to the contrary, Herschel V. Johnson, Deputy Representative of the United States to the Security Council of the United Nations, may continue in such office and be reappointed as a Foreign Service officer, in the class of career minister, and such reappointment may be effective as of November 25, 1946: *Provided*, That the total compensation to be paid him as a Foreign Service officer of the class of career minister and as Deputy Representative of the United States to the Security Council shall be that provided by law for a Foreign Service officer in the class of career minister or that provided by law for Deputy Representative of the United States to the Security Council, whichever is the higher.

The joint resolution was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

LT. COMDR. PAUL A. SMITH

The Clerk called the bill (S. 874) to authorize the President to appoint Lt. Comdr. Paul A. Smith as alternate representative of the United States to the Interim Council of the Provisional International Civil Aviation Organization or its successor, and as representative of the United States to the Air Navigation Committee of the Provisional International Civil Aviation Organization, without affecting his status and perquisites as an officer of the Coast and Geodetic Survey.

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

Be it enacted, etc., That notwithstanding the existing provisions of law or any rules or regulations issued thereunder, the President is authorized to appoint Lt. Comdr. Paul A. Smith, an officer in the Coast and Geodetic Survey, as alternate representative of the United States to the Interim Council of the Provisional International Civil Aviation Organization or its successor, and as representative of the United States to the Air Navigation Committee of the Provisional International Civil Aviation Organization, and his appointment to, acceptance, and service as such alternate and representative shall in no way affect any status, office, rank, or grade he may occupy or hold in the Coast and Geodetic Survey of the United States or any emolument, perquisite, right, privilege, eligibility for promotion or retirement, or other benefits incident to or arising out of any such status, office, rank, or grade: *Provided*, That during the time he holds the office of alternate representative of the United

States to the Interim Council of the Provisional International Civil Aviation Organization or its successor and representative of the United States to the Air Navigation Committee of the Provisional International Civil Aviation Organization he shall have the rank of rear admiral (lower half) of the Coast and Geodetic Survey, and shall receive such compensation and allowances as the Secretary of State shall prescribe payable from appropriations made by law for the Department of State: *Provided further*, That so long as he remains alternate representative of the United States to the Interim Council of the Provisional International Civil Aviation Organization or its successor, and representative of the United States to the Air Navigation Committee of the Provisional International Civil Aviation Organization he shall retain his permanent rank and grade or such rank and grade to which he may be promoted by reason of his position on the lineal list of the Coast and Geodetic Survey.

Sec. 2. In the performance of his duties as alternate representative of the United States to the Interim Council of the Provisional International Civil Aviation Organization or its successor, and as representative of the United States to the Air Navigation Committee of the Provisional International Civil Aviation Organization, Lieutenant Commander Smith shall be subject to no supervision, control, restriction, or prohibition other than would be operative with respect to him if he was in no way connected with the Coast and Geodetic Survey.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MARY LOMAS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1742) for the relief of Mary Lomas.

Mr. DOLLIVER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. This completes the call of the Private Calendar.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

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

The SPEAKER. Obviously a quorum is not present.

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

A call of the House was ordered.

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

[Roll No. 49]

Abernethy	Fellows	Lane
Barden	Fletcher	Latham
Bell	Fuller	Lesinski
Bennett, Mich.	Gallagher	McConnell
Bland	Gifford	McDowell
Boykin	Gillie	McGarvey
Buckley	Gregory	McGregor
Bulwinkle	Halleck	Madden
Chelf	Hand	Maloney
Clark	Harless, Ariz.	Mansfield, Tex.
Clements	Harness, Ind.	Meade, Ky.
Cole, Kans.	Harris	Mitchell
Cole, N. Y.	Hartley	Morrison
Cooley	Hébert	Nixon
D'Alesandro	Hess	Nodar
Dawson, Ill.	Hinshaw	Norrell
Dingell	Howell	O'Toole
Doughton	Jenkins, Pa.	Pfeifer
Ellsworth	Kearns	Philbin
Elsaesser	Kefauver	Poage
Elston	Kelley	Powell
Fallon	Kunkel	Rabin

Reed, Ill.	Sikes	Trimble
Richards	Smathers	Van Zandt
Rivers	Smith, Maine	Vinson
Rooney	Somers	West
Scoblick	Taylor	Wood
Scott, Hardie	Thomas, N. J.	
Short	Towe	

The SPEAKER. On this roll call 343 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

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

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. O'HARA asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances and include excerpts.

ASSISTANCE TO GREECE AND TURKEY

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 205 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That 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 consideration of the bill (H. R. 2616) to provide for assistance to Greece and Turkey, and all points of order against said bill are hereby waived. That after general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and continue not to exceed 9 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. 2616 it shall be in order to take from the Speaker's table the bill S. 938 and to move to strike out all after the enactment clause of said Senate bill and to insert in lieu thereof the provisions contained in H. R. 2616.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the ranking minority member of the Committee on Rules, the gentleman from Illinois [MR. SABATH].

Mr. Speaker, this rule makes in order the consideration of H. R. 2616, a bill to authorize the expenditure of some \$400,-000,000 for relief, rehabilitation, and certain military purposes in Greece and Turkey. The rule provides for 9 hours of general debate, following which the bill will be open for amendment under the 5-minute rule.

I might interpolate to say I will support this rule because I believe in majority rule, and the Committee on Rules did report this rule.

Never in my experience have I encountered a legislative measure concerning which so many people know so little. We have been told that this is a bill to feed the hungry and to clothe the destitute in Greece and Turkey; and to provide for the rehabilitation of those countries. We are also told that this is a bill for military purposes—to stop the spread of communism and the march of the aggressor..

There is no doubt of the need for food and clothing, medicine and housing, reconstruction and rehabilitation in war-torn, tragic Greece. But no such situation exists in Turkey, where food and clothing are abundant, and the people have grown fat on the profits of war. There is no suffering, no destitution, no wreckage of war in Turkey—for Turkey was neutral in World War II. So, while there may be need for additional funds to help Greece—funds greater than those already being furnished under our general European relief program—surely the only purpose behind the Turkish loan is a military one.

No one in this House knows how much the new foreign policy we are embarking upon will cost, or when that cost will end. No one knows how many other countries will demand aid of us to stop the spread of communism; or to drive back the aggressor. No one knows whether the enactment of H. R. 2616 will result in war or in peace. No one knows whether this is the best way or the worst way to accomplish our desired purpose of bringing peace, liberty, and freedom to the peoples of the world. Little or no real information has been given us by those who favor this bill.

So in the belief this is one of the most far reaching and important measures ever to come before the Congress—for it establishes a new American foreign policy from which we cannot easily turn aside—I opposed the granting of the rule until we could first hear from Secretary of State Marshall and ask for answers to many of the questions which are now giving us such grave concern.

I do not know where this legislative step—if we take it—will lead. I do not believe anyone knows. I do not know how long we will have to continue furnishing aid to Greece and Turkey to stop the spread of communism in those lands, or if we start, what the full cost will be. I do not know what other peoples or countries will be appealing to us for money, munitions, and men with which to combat the spread of communism. I do not know whether this is the road to peace or to war.

However, there are some things I do know. I know that 30 years ago we entered a great war—the World War we called it then—to save democracy by destroying kaiserism, and that we expended billions of dollars and many thousands of lives in that cause. We helped to win that war, but with the victory came disillusionment, and less democracy and freedom than prevailed before the struggle began.

I do know that of the tortured and decaying remains of a war-torn Europe there arose an even greater autocracy than that which prevailed under the kaisers and the czars. Fascism, nazism, and communism spread their cancerous growths across the continent and into the far reaches of Asia. As the strength of these political ideologies grew, human liberty lessened and disappeared. The sound of military boots was heard everywhere. Force, violence, and a total disregard for the rights or dignity of man became the order of the day. Then suddenly the growing monsters reached out

to take the land, the property, and the lives of weaker peoples. Italy seized Ethiopia and Albania. Russia wrested territory from little Finland, from Lithuania, Estonia, and Latvia. Germany marched into Czechoslovakia and Austria, and divided Poland with Russia. Later came the invasions of Norway, France, Belgium, and Holland, and of the Balkans, and Greece. Once more the cry came for America to save democracy. First we extended credit and loaned our money. Then we sent our guns and ships—and last our men.

Finally the eagles of victory perched upon our war banners. Hitlerism was destroyed. Treacherous Japan was defeated. We had fought and won two conflicts on opposite sides of the earth—two great victories at the cost of more than 300,000 dead, 700,000 wounded, and nearly five hundred billions of dollars.

Once again we had saved the world for democracy. The Four Freedoms would live, we were told. Yet even before the victories were won in what we know as World War II, the seeds of a third great world struggle were being sown—planted at Cairo, Tehran, and Yalta—yes, even at Potsdam.

Now it is communism we must fight. We find it here at home, as well as in almost every other part of the globe. Now we are being told once more that we can save the world with our money, with our food, with our tools—all short of war. However, we are not being told the whole story. Are we to fight the spread of communism only in Greece and Turkey? What about France and Italy, and Egypt, Palestine, and Iran, Iraq, and Saudi Arabia, India and the East Indies, China, Korea, the Philippines, and all the rest of the world? What about communism here at home? Are we to oppose it elsewhere and permit it to thrive unopposed here in America?

Must we fight another war? I believe that answer will be given by Russia, rather than by ourselves. If another war does come it may matter little whether we win or lose, for civilization cannot stand another world conflict. The United States cannot stand the winning of another great victory. As certainly as I speak here, if another world war does not mean the end of civilization, it will, at least, mean the end of representative government, and liberty and freedom for the average individual.

After every war there is always less liberty and less freedom, and more hunger and greater suffering. If it is not to be war, how long can the 140,000,000 people here in the United States feed, finance, and police the world, or any great portion of it?

If this new proposed foreign policy is to cost the fifteen to thirty billion dollars many estimate it will; if we are to continue to furnish the food, the clothing, the machinery, and the equipment the world needs and demands; if we send hundreds of thousands, and perhaps millions, of our young men to police humanity's danger spots; there is a strong likelihood we shall so weaken ourselves here at home as to fall an easy prey to those Communists and radicals within our own ranks who even now are attempting to destroy our representative

government, and to set up in its stead some sort of a socialized state here in America.

Two years ago the nations of a war-weary world sent representatives to San Francisco to endeavor to work out some means of preventing a third world war. Asking, in every tongue, the guidance of divine providence the delegates to the San Francisco Conference labored and brought forth a new international organization—the United Nations. Its purpose was to preserve the peace of the world and to protect the territorial and political integrity of the smaller nations.

In less than a year the first real test of that organization came, when Russia, who had insisted upon being given the veto power in the Security Council as the price for her joining the United Nations, broke an agreement to withdraw her troops from Iran, and insisted upon keeping them in that oil-rich land. The United States did not move as an individual nation to force withdrawal of the Russian troops from Iranian territory. Instead an appeal was taken by the Iranian Government to the United Nations and with the support of the delegates from this country, and from almost every other freedom-loving nation on the face of the earth, the United Nations organization was able to marshal public opinion throughout the world and, through it, to force the withdrawal of Russian troops from Iran. It was a great victory for the United Nations. It augured well for the future.

Yet, here a year later, when no Russian troops are in either Greece or Turkey, we propose by this legislation to ignore and bypass the United Nations, to lay ourselves open to the false charge of imperialism and to take upon ourselves the single-handed responsibility of stopping the spread of communism in those countries.

Let me say to you, in all sincerity, by the enactment of this bill we shall drive a dagger into the very heart of the United Nations. We shall destroy it. We shall make certain of its death. How much wiser it would be if we were to appeal to the United Nations to aid Greece and Turkey in protecting their political and territorial integrity, while we serve and help the hungry and destitute of Greece. How much better it would be were we to loan our strength to the support of the United Nations in solving the Greco-Turkish situation, rather than to risk it on a single game of pitch and toss in the Mediterranean. How much better if we would furnish most of the financial aid, the goods and the men, to the United Nations, and then, under the auspices of that organization, and with the moral support of the other liberty-loving peoples of the world, make a united stand against the spread of communism and the threats of aggression.

No, my friends, if you really believe in world peace, if you want to stop the spread of communism and the march of the aggressor, you will not by-pass the United Nations, but instead will strengthen and use it as the one vehicle by which the great goal we all seek can be gained.

Let us test the sincerity of Russia. Let her join with the rest of the peace-loving nations of the earth in making the United

Nations work in preserving the peace, and in protecting the territorial and political integrity of the weak. Or, if she chooses, let her refuse to cooperate and give her the opportunity to withdraw from the United Nations, or to be expelled if she does not wish to keep her solemn promises and pledges as made at San Francisco. If that last final step becomes necessary, then let the peace-loving countries of the earth ostracize Russia from the society of decent nations. Let diplomatic and commercial relations be severed. Let the iron curtain become effective both ways.

It is with the firm conviction that not until the United Nations and the ostracizing of Russia have failed, should we, as an individual Nation, take upon ourselves the responsibilities of either feeding, financing, and policing the whole world, or of fighting another world war.

Therefore, at the proper time I shall offer or support an amendment which would refer this whole matter to the United Nations, while, in the meantime, we can move to relieve the sufferings of our friends in Greece.

MR. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 7 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. Cox].

MR. COX. Mr. Speaker, some of the 1-minute speeches made here on the floor this morning, including the speech of my friend the gentleman from Ohio who just yielded the floor, pain me very much. It is difficult for me to realize that they represent the sound and informed judgment of their authors. Some of them are speeches that you would expect to hear in a political campaign addressed to a complacent and uninformed constituency. Make no mistake about it, they are the kind of speeches that will pierce the iron curtain drawn by Russia.

Mr. Speaker, I indulge no false illusions about what is here proposed. To me this is a solemn moment. We are here called upon to make a decision that will affect for good or evil the entire world. Following the policy of appeasement, we have come to the brink of disaster. Our situation is somewhat like that of the eagle observing the arrow that had pierced his heart that was heard to say, "With our own feathers, not by others' hands, are we now smitten." We have done much which we must now undo.

The whole world is divided into two camps—Russia on one side and the United States on the other. There is no intermediate ground upon which people can long stand.

There are those who hesitate to support this resolution because of its military aspects and for them I have great sympathy. The resolution is military in character and for that reason, and that alone, I give it my wholehearted support. While it is a defense measure, it is also a declaration to the world that for the preservation of liberty we will war, and that America shall never be fed into the greedy maw of Russia.

That we are forever abandoning our historic doctrine of no entangling alliances with other peoples, I concede, but remember that when that doctrine was

promulgated we were a small and weak nation. We were protected from foreign aggressions by the Atlantic to the east of us and the Pacific to the west, but this is no longer the case. This is a new age and a new world in which we now live. We now move forward or else we perish. We are in the hands of fate and must do her bidding. Our time for world leadership has come and we must not falter.

Men whose hearts have surrendered to fear and whose hopes grovel in the dust may seek refuge in the torn-down house of isolationism, but those of lofty souls and stout hearts, taking account of realities, will go forward in the determination that liberty shall not perish from the face of the earth.

MR. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

MR. COX. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

MR. RANKIN. I want to correct one error made by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Brown], when he said a while ago that at San Francisco the delegates prayed to Almighty God. The only prayer we heard during that entire conference was the prayer of Harry Truman, President of the United States, in his broadcast to the conference.

MOST IMPORTANT LEGISLATION EVER PRESENTED HOUSE

MR. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 10 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, we are today considering, as I view it, the most important legislation that has ever been submitted to this House. The gentleman from Georgia [Mr. Cox] who preceded me—and I know he is sincere; I know he is honest—told us that this legislation is military in character. I was fearful of that. The people of this country on every occasion when they have had the opportunity have shown they are against war. The polls now show they still are against war. Are we today by passing this legislation going to declare war? I hope to God that we will not bring about such an eventuality.

Mr. Speaker, a few days ago the press reported that I voted against this rule. Yes, I did vote against it, although I did not give out that information. I believe that my vote was in the right direction. I voted to postpone consideration for a few days so that the Members and the country would have an opportunity to familiarize themselves with this great and important matter on which we were about to grant a rule.

MANY WELL-INFORMED WITNESSES NOT CALLED

We have in this country, Mr. Speaker, many outstanding and completely loyal men who are better informed, by personal knowledge and investigation, than the small number who appeared before the Foreign Affairs Committee, and on whose judgment the committee acted.

Mr. Speaker, I had hoped that we might have the benefit of the direct views of such disinterested and personally informed individuals as Secretary of State Marshall, Former Secretary of State Hull, former Secretary of State Byrnes, former Under Secretary of State Sumner Welles, former Ambassador Joseph Ken-

nedy, former Ambassador Joseph Davies, former Governor Harold Stassen, Col. Elliot Roosevelt, and above all of Paul Porter, former Price Administrator and lately head of the American Economic Mission to Greece and as such the President's personal ambassador.

I am satisfied that it was not the intention of the President to recommend this legislation as a war measure.

I have the utmost confidence, and the country has the utmost confidence, in President Truman.

He is honest, sincere, and patriotic, and he has always at heart the best interests of this great country and the masses of the people.

PRESIDENT LED ASTRAY BY FALSE ADVISERS

I am fearful only that the President may have been imposed upon and led astray by officials and advisers in whom he has reposed undeserved trust who are actually dominated by Wall Street finance and certain oil interests.

Such men almost inevitably confuse their private interests with the public interest, to put it in the best light; and some deliberately work for their private interests, knowing they are in direct conflict with the public good. Their environment and their conditioning and their affiliations make the distinction difficult even when the motives are pure.

Certainly I should not undertake to reflect on the honesty and sincerity of the Honorable Dean Acheson or of the Honorable Will Clayton. Yet Mr. Acheson was, prior to his appointment as Assistant Secretary of State, a partner in a prominent Wall Street law firm, and his family connections are with the conservatives inclined to think that wealth can do no wrong.

Mr. Clayton, a man of great ability, is a senior partner of the greatest firm in the cotton industry, intimately associated with uninhibited bigness of holdings, volume, and world-wide interests. He is a big man, and associated with big men, and in viewpoint is unavoidably in sympathy with Wall Street financial groups.

The close connections of John Foster Dulles, the Republican adviser to the State Department, with international finance and cartelism, with the Nazi-Fascist governments, and with the ruthless exploitation of Big Business, are so well-known and have been so widely publicized they need not be repeated. Suffice it to say that his law firm found it easy and advantageous "to do business with Hitler."

CONFIDENCE IN GENERAL MARSHALL

I have thorough and great confidence in the judgment of Secretary Marshall in guiding and safeguarding the interests of our own country, and accordingly I have been favorably impressed by his expression of belief that there is a real and potential opportunity to effect an amicable adjustment of the differences between the United States and Russia, thereby assuring peace not only to our own country but to the whole sick world.

As I may not have another opportunity to speak on this legislation, I appeal to the membership to read the full text

of General Marshall's report to the people, and of the interview between former Governor Stassen, of Minnesota, who resigned that great office to enter the service of our country as a naval commander and served with distinction in the war against nazism, and Generalissimo Stalin.

Remember that Stalin told Commander Stassen: "I want to bear testimony to the fact that Russia wants to cooperate."

Just yesterday you saw the headlines in the Washington Star, "Stassen says arming of Greek regime will be tragic mistake."

I should have liked, Mr. Speaker, to insert the full text of that interview at this point; but because of the length I insert instead the summary of the interview published in the Christian Science Monitor, which is concise and fair:

(By Roscoe Drummond)

WASHINGTON, May 3.—Harold E. Stassen, Republican Presidential aspirant, has brought home from Prime Minister Joseph Stalin words of promised cooperation on a wide range of issues, from world atomic control to exchange of students, which continue to divide the United States and Russia.

From the verbatim transcript of the 80-minute exchange which Mr. Stassen had with him at the Kremlin and which Mr. Stassen has now issued in full text, it develops that the Russian Premier offered to his visitor these views:

1. Stalin said he believed it is possible for Russia's Communist economy and America's free-enterprise economy to exist together in the same world in harmony.

COOPERATION

2. He held that cooperation between the two systems which was possible could not be realized unless both sides "wish to cooperate," and he told Mr. Stassen that he wanted "to bear testimony to the fact that Russia wants to cooperate."

3. He argued that if Americans will stop calling Russia "totalitarian" and if Russians stop calling America "monopolist," there will be a good chance of achieving cooperation. "We must start," he said, "from the historical fact that there are two systems approved by the people."

4. Stalin thought it would be difficult for Russia to dispense with censorship.

5. He "hoped" there was a "reasonable prospect" of working out agreements for world control of atomic energy, and used the words: "I think we shall succeed in establishing international inspection and control. Things are leading up to it."

6. He revealed interest and concern over the possibility of an economic crisis in the United States. Twice he asked Mr. Stassen this question and referred to the fact that "magazine analysts and the American press carry open reports to the effect than an economic crisis (in the United States) will break out."

The record of the interview shows that Mr. Stassen replied that he did not think a depression would develop. To the specific question "Do you expect a crisis?" Mr. Stassen answered:

"I do not. I believe we can regulate our capitalism and stabilize our production and employment at a high level without any serious crisis. But it is the main problem to avoid a depression in our economic system. With wise policies in Government and through learning the lessons of 1929 and the 1930's, we should have a successful, regulated, but not monopolistic, capitalism with which we can avoid an economic crisis."

Stalin himself volunteered this explanation of America's development and favorable postwar position:

"Things are not bad in the United States. America is protected by two oceans. In the north there is a weak country, Canada, and to the south a weak country, Mexico, and so you need not be afraid of them. After the War of Independence the United States did not have another war for 60 years, and that was a great help to the rapid development of the United States of America. America's population is made up of such people as fled from monarchy and tyranny and kings and landed aristocracy, and that was also a great help, and that is why America developed in leaps and bounds."

Mr. Stassen's interview took place on April 9 in Moscow, where he was visiting during the course of a 2-month trip to study economic and political conditions throughout Europe.

MOLOTOV PRESENT

Present at the interview were Foreign Minister V. M. Molotov; Messrs. Pavlov, Russian interpreter; Jay Cooke, Philadelphia Republican leader, war veteran, and associate of Mr. Stassen on his journey; and Robert Matteson, of St. Paul, Minn., war veteran and research assistant on Mr. Stassen's staff.

The transcript was prepared from Mr. Mateson's notes in English of the entire conference and reviewed with interpretation of Mr. Pavlov's transcript in Russian, copy of which was obtained upon request.

Permission to release the transcript was requested and obtained from Prime Minister Stalin at the conclusion of the conference.

ALEMAN PLEADED FOR PEACE

You have heard also the stirring appeal of President Miguel Aleman, of our friendly sister Republic of Mexico a few days ago, when he appeared before us, for world peace and justice and freedom.

You heard him say, in part:

Amity between governments is short lived, unless it be the outcome of a genuine desire of their people to cooperate. Were we to limit the efficacy of good neighborliness to the covenants to safeguard the theoretical equality of all states, the respect of territorial integrity, the principle of nonintervention, as well as the joint defense of the continent, we would still be defrauding some of the most cherished hopes of our peoples. The fact that nearly 300,000,000 people live side by side in our hemisphere involves not only juridical problems and not alone problems of military strategy. As much as in the political solutions—and perhaps much more than in the political solutions—those millions are concerned not only with assistance to ward off foreign aggression, but also with common efforts to overcome the dangers of poverty and despair in the difficult years of the peace.

The true significance of good neighborliness is cooperation. It springs from the democratic tenets that bind us together. It surpasses the scope of diplomacy. It goes beyond the exchanges of military staffs. It brings our peoples closer to one another, holding fast to their inalienable rights, those very rights your Declaration of Independence sets forth as supreme goals—life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.

NOT PRESENTED AS WAR MEASURE

The witnesses who appeared before the committees of the House did not state, as my colleague from Georgia has said, that this is a war measure, but, Mr. Speaker, if I could persuade myself that this is not a war measure I should gladly support it.

Mr. Speaker, I certainly have no objection to helping the needy and tragic peo-

ple of the countries devastated by the horrible Nazi war against humanity.

There can be no possible doubt of my position on that, for I have explained it over and over.

I voted to provide \$350,000,000 for foreign aid in Europe, and I am willing to vote for any additional millions necessary to feed the starving or to help rehabilitate the war-devastated areas, but I am unwilling to vote any millions for foreign military operations in peacetime when our direct interests are not affected.

At this point I want to make my position equally clear on another point.

I am not in favor of permitting Russia to expand in a way which would affect our legitimate interests anywhere, or which would jeopardize world peace, and I am opposed to any unjustified and aggressive Russian expansion at the expense of the freedom of any smaller nation.

TURKEY NOT IN NEED

As for Turkey, I have heard no convincing arguments that she is in any need of financial or military aid. Her economy is in good shape. Her agricultural economy is the best she has ever known.

Turkey fought against the Allies in the First World War, and in the Second World War, notwithstanding her promise to join the United Nations, she remained friendly with Hitler and flirted with both sides.

All through the war, far from suffering, Turkey fattened on bribes from England and the United States.

Official figures show that Turkey already has received more than \$100,000,000 from the United States in subsidies or bribes to keep her out of the war.

Turkey's on-the-fence attitude during the war caused the United Nations great anxiety, and in addition to those huge bribes we had to keep armies ready for action if she joined Hitler.

Turkey continued negotiations with Von Papen, Hitler's emissary, all through the war.

Nobody with whom I have talked feels that Turkey deserves any aid.

As it has been stated, all that Turkey needs is help to equip her standing army of 600,000 men. Is that for the purpose of enabling the Turkish Army to kill off the remaining Christian Armenians, as has been the national custom in Turkey for generations past?

For the Under Secretary of State, Mr. Acheson, to say, as he is reported to have said, that Greece and Turkey are democracies is ridiculous.

I have no doubt that there has been some improvement over the days of the Sultans; but Turkey is still the "sick man of Europe." Her huge standing army is a constant drain on the national economy and on her manpower.

Greece is little better. The monarchy is German, imposed by British bayonets. Religious and political persecution there is reported to be about as bad as in Nazi Germany, and it is said that people are imprisoned or executed without trial merely on suspicion of criticism of the existing government.

UNITED STATES ABANDONED LEAGUE OF NATIONS

Twenty-five years ago we foredoomed the League of Nations to failure by refusing to join our great power and strength with other peace-loving nations.

Are we now going to let another great effort at world peace go by default by by-passing the United Nations?

The people of the world have pinned all their hopes on the United Nations to bring a just and lasting peace.

Shall we dash those hopes by embarking on a one-nation war of nerves to save the investments of financiers and oil cartels in the Middle East?

It is my belief that had we entered the League of Nations we might have so strengthened the League that the Second World War could have been warded off, and I am fearful that today we shall threaten the stability and effectiveness of the United Nations, organized for the same purpose: To bring peace to a troubled world and to create the conditions under which all people can live in harmony in the democratic way of life.

FORMER ISOLATIONISTS EAGER FOR THIS LEGISLATION

Is it not strange, Mr. Speaker, that many former isolationists are now so eager for war?

It is possible that had our isolationists not so opposed and delayed our preparations, the Second World War could have been avoided.

I feel they are making a mistake now as they did before, and I hope they will come to the realization that we owe it to the country, we owe it to ourselves, and we owe it to the world not to weaken the United Nations but to strengthen it.

Actually, it has been brilliantly argued by many international lawyers that under the United Nations Charter this legislation is illegal.

Whether or not it is illegal, it certainly contains grave dangers that we may weaken the cause of international government and international law by acting alone in this way.

CANNOT EXTERMINATE ALL WHO DISAGREE WITH US

I know the President is honest, sincere, and patriotic, a great Democratic President, with the welfare of the people always close to his heart, and I know that he does not intend and did not intend by recommending this measure to involve us in any global war such as this might conceivably bring about.

I fear only, as perhaps I have said before, that he is being advised by gentlemen whose views differ from those of most of us, and to whom, somehow, matters which might be to British interest seem paramount, or to whom true democracy is not very real or meaningful, and who put their own interpretation on events.

Our ruling monopolists perhaps think that we can exterminate by force of arms all who disagree with us.

They are wrong.

The strong hopes of the people for peace and freedom are stronger than all the armaments of reaction.

(Mr. SABATH asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks

and include several editorials and articles.)

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. RIZLEY].

Mr. RIZLEY. Mr. Speaker, of course, it is impossible in the short period of 3 minutes to express intelligently our views on an important matter of this kind.

I shall vote for this rule, but I am opposed to the legislation which the rule makes in order.

I think it extremely unfortunate that the information has gone out from the press that there was an attempt to kill the bill outright in the Rules Committee.

The informant for the press who gave the information in respect to the proceedings of the Rules Committee in executive session last Friday, when it was considering the pending resolution having to do with the Greek-Turkish loan was quite accurate in most respects. However, in order that the press may now be fully informed, we think the informant who made the report should, as the lawyers would say, have told "the whole truth." Of course, I do not know who furnished the press with the information concerning the proceedings of committee in executive session. Ordinarily, and there was a time, when executive sessions of committees were presumably off-record for the public generally; but I am sure that most Members of Congress have long since learned that nothing is off the record so far as congressional procedures are concerned.

Quite often conferences of either of the parties which deal with strictly party matters, also cloaked in utmost secrecy, are made available to the press as soon as the conferences are adjourned. There is nothing secret any more except the facts that are withheld from the American taxpayers, which they would no doubt like to have before agreeing to pay for a third world war. As far as I am personally concerned, it was perfectly agreeable with me to inform the press, not only of the results, but as to the entire discussion that was carried on in the Rules Committee in executive session; but certainly the informant should have been fair enough to tell the gentlemen of the press that the postponement of the bill at that time, on the part of some of us, was not for the purpose of permanently killing the bill, which seems to have been the impression that was given the press either intentionally or unintentionally; but that the real reason for the temporary postponement was to make available to the committee further information which they believed it was possible to get from General Marshall.

Some of us wanted to ascertain from the Secretary of State, General Marshall, the position of the State Department in respect to continuing shipments of equipment, heavy materials, and other commodities to Russia. To some of us it seems that the two policies, namely, the policy to stop communism by making a military alliance with Turkey and Greece against Russian expansion, and at the same time continue to pour Amer-

ican goods into Russia, are somewhat inconsistent. Some of us believe that the American people should be told the truth about this Greek-Turkish loan. Apparently the State Department assumes for itself that it can label such legislation as a relief bill, pretend that the bill is for the purpose of giving relief to hungry and naked people, and that the House and the American people will be fooled by such hypocrisy and take the bill as labeled.

All of us know relief is desperately needed by the Greek people and we just last week voted \$200,000,000 for relief, a part of which is to go to the people in Greece. I supported that bill. Certainly I am willing to vote for funds necessary to assist the brave and heroic Greek people in food, clothing, and shelter, but the policy of a military alliance with Greece and Turkey is a matter which should be considered very carefully and prayerfully before the final step is taken.

Yes, Mr. Speaker; this country wants peace, the whole world wants peace, and we were hopeful that when we joined in the creation of the United Nations organization that we had created the machinery where questions of the character involved in this bill could be settled and would be settled by the United Nations and that thereafter no single one country would attempt to form a military alliance or a military compact with one country or two countries or a group of countries without first consulting the United Nations, and thereby attempt to bring about settlements through that organization.

It is said that the United Nations is impotent. That may be true; but at least it could have been consulted, and if the United Nations, with the exception of Russia, had concluded that the intention of Russia was to encircle Europe, the Balkans, including Turkey and Greece, or were attempting encirclement of any other section of the world, contrary to the rules and regulations and understanding contemplated in the United Nations organization, then would have been the time for this country to have spoken. In other words, if we are to disregard entirely the United Nations organization at any time and under any circumstances that we desire, then we should make that policy known, we should withdraw from that organization so that the whole world, and especially our own people, will know that we intend to make such deals at such times and under such circumstances as we deem advisable with reference to the other part of the world.

I do not surrender to the gentleman from Georgia or anyone else in my devotion to America and to American principles, but military agreements and compacts of this character usually mean war. I do not believe the American people want war. I think they are crying and praying for peace.

And another thing, Mr. Speaker, this country is not strong enough economically to police the world alone. If we follow this course we are now charting, we must have a military establishment strong enough to go into every section of the world on a moment's notice prepared

to wage war against those who attempt to foster some other form of government which we construe to be imperialistic. Maybe we will spend untold billions fencing Russia in so that they cannot infiltrate into Greece and Turkey. When we have spent those billions, then it may be that the next infiltration will be into France or into some other part of Europe, and we will be called on for more billions and more soldiers. After Europe it may be India; after India it may be China; and after China, perhaps Korea. These billions that we will be required to expend, when added to our present debt of more than \$250,000,000,-000 will bankrupt this Nation just as sure as you and I are here today. Then, with a bankrupt United States, what will happen? The men on horseback will come along here. Nothing breeds communism as much as poverty; and if we are not very careful in this world-wide attempt to fight communism, we will ourselves become insecure and communism will enthroned itself in a bankrupt America, brought about by our own stupidity.

THE SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. RIZLEY] has expired.

MR. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman one additional minute.

MR. RIZLEY. May I inquire, in passing, what governments are we going to support and just what governments are we not going to support? Does anyone claim that Turkey is a democracy? Has Turkey done anything to demonstrate its love for this country or its love for democratic principles? How long has it been since they were murdering the Armenians and Christians? Just how strong do we want to make Turkey from a military standpoint? The answer is, according to our friends who are sponsoring this legislation, Yes; we admit it is fraught with danger, it is bad, but the alternative is much worse. Where are the facts that warrant such a conclusion as the alternative? What has this administration, which is sponsoring this legislation under the theory that it is being done to thwart the Red menace, done in America to stop communism? In every branch of our Government now we have Communists. Yesterday, if we are to believe the press, Communists in Army uniform were marching in May Day parades in America. Has anything been done to weed out the Army of Communists? Had we not better stop Communists at home and make America strong before we attempt this policy abroad? Before we pass this legislation we better have a breathing, praying spell, so to speak. We better get our own house in order; we better be sure that this is not an OPA or a WPA to further the ideologies of the genuine New Dealers. Only a strong America can survive, and bankruptcy and strength do not go together.

MR. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. HERTER].

MR. HERTER. Mr. Speaker, I am taking this brief time under the rule to explain my views with respect to the pending legislation.

This legislation has now been debated in the country at large for over 2 months. It was recommended by the President, and it was passed by the Senate in substantially the same form in which it now comes to us. A bill of the far-reaching importance of this one requires just such free and full discussion, and I am glad that the rule now before us provides for 9 hours of general debate.

I am going to vote for the bill. I shall do so, and I believe that many others on the floor of this House will do so, without great enthusiasm. Our lack of enthusiasm stems from the fact that no one can tell us where ultimately the policy on which we are about to embark will lead. On the other hand, we do know this—we know that the Soviet Union has adopted a course, the outlines of which are quite clear. That course has for its objective bringing within the orbit of communistic totalitarianism as many nations as can be weaned away from their present social and political concepts. Where this cannot be done by infiltration and revolution it has been done by occupation and force. It is a policy which is very similar to the policy adopted by Hitler of picking off one nation at a time, hoping thereby to avert an open clash but hoping likewise thereby eventually to become so strong that no single power nor remaining combination of powers could challenge his worldwide ambitions. A halt had to be called to that policy of Hitler's. So today a halt must be called to the aggressive ambitions of the Soviet Union. The legislation now before us attempts to do this.

I am convinced that we have but two alternatives to choose from. The first is to reject this legislation and in effect say to the Soviet Union that in spite of the recommendation of the President and the action of the Senate we do not propose to interfere with her expansionist policy. The second alternative is to accept this legislation and say to the Soviet Union that we are giving this help to allow two nations to continue their existence without Soviet domination. In choosing between these alternatives I feel that the latter course is the wiser and in the long run is much less likely to lead to open conflict.

MR. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH].

MR. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the rule and the measure which it makes in order. No one can question the terrible import and importance of this legislation. We all, I think, realize that this policy perhaps will affect generations yet unborn, but it seems to me that we have here a proposition that should appeal to our common horse sense. In a matter of this great importance I would ordinarily hesitate to raise my feeble voice and express my views on so transcendent a proposition, but what have we here today? We have the considered recommendation of the President of the United States. It has the support of the responsible leadership of the Democratic Party and of the Republican Party. It comes to us with the endorsement of the United States Senate.

The plain, common, horse-sense question that is presented to the membership today is whether or not they are going to repudiate the foreign policy laid down by the President, by the responsible leadership of both parties and by the Secretary of State who we have designated as our representative to formulate our negotiations with foreign nations.

What has happened in this matter? For years this Nation has attempted to appease Russia. We have reached the conclusion that that cannot be done, and that is what this measure means, that this Government intends to stiffen its policy. That is the plain truth of the whole situation.

When I came on the floor this morning I happened to pick up a newspaper and this was the first thing that struck my eye. I am going to read it to you. It is dated Paris, France, yesterday:

PARIS, May 5.—Faced with the threat of a general strike, spearheaded by striking workers of the nationalized Renault automobile plants, uneasy France was wondering tonight just which direction it was headed.

Yesterday's vote of confidence for Premier Ramadier and the expulsion of five Communist Cabinet Ministers was conceded in authoritative quarters to be motivated by President Truman's program for assisting democracies endangered by Communist domination.

Someone during the course of the debate this morning asked where this would lead us, which way it would lead us. Do you not think this article from the morning's paper is significant? It shows that this policy has already begun to pay dividends throughout the world. It shows that this stiffened policy of the American people is indicating to certain foreign countries that this country will no longer yield at every point.

We had to face a similar decision in the last World War. We repudiated the League of Nations and then decided through a policy of appeasement and doing nothing that we would let the dictatorships go to the point where they could challenge the civilization of the world. Are we going to do that again?

It seems to me when I hear certain Members of this body, certain Members I say, get up here and espouse the same cause as is espoused by the followers of Henry Wallace, it seems to me that when certain Members of this body join forces with the Wallace forces, then I have seen everything that there is to be seen.

Are we going to return to the old policy of isolationism that destroyed the League of Nations and brought on the last World War?

Does history teach us nothing?

In these days are we ever going to learn that we cannot stick our heads in the sand and hope that these tides are not going to flow over us? Let us look at the realities of life. Let us realize that we cannot repudiate our Secretary of State and our President, as well as the leadership of the Democratic Party and the leadership of the Republican Party. Whatever else might be done about this matter, let us resolve ourselves in favor of following a leadership that so far has been successful.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Virginia has expired.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. SMITH].

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I am opposed to the rule and the bill. I shall vote against both. President Truman, on the skinny pretext of stopping communism, has asked this Congress to authorize the intervention of this country in the internal affairs of Greece and Turkey. He has been honest enough to admit that this calls for a basic change in our foreign policy, contrary to all precedent. Certainly it contradicts historic American policy, and if approved, will lead us into World War III—the first atomic war, if you please.

So long as we remain free and strong we shall never permit the entry of European or Asiatic nations in the Western Hemisphere. We would resist such an effort with all our resources. That is the essence of the Monroe Doctrine. As late as July 6, 1940, Secretary Hull said:

The Government of the United States pursues a policy of nonparticipation and non-involvement in the purely political affairs of Europe.

If this request is not political intervention in Greece and Turkey, what is it? President Truman reverses the Roosevelt-Hull policy and now asks us to approve a policy that justly might be called "intervention unlimited."

Admiral W. H. Standley, retired, and United States Ambassador to Russia in 1942-43, recently said:

We should not assume responsibility of maintaining economic and political order in the Mediterranean area, or in any other area, without giving full consideration to its implications.

Never again should we assume political commitments which we are either unable to support financially or unwilling to support with our full military power.

We are asked to support this legislation on the ground that our national security is involved because of communistic expansion. If that is true, then we share a great measure of responsibility. The cause of Russian expansion was accelerated in historic secret conferences at Teheran and Yalta, where Roosevelt, Stalin, and Churchill partitioned the postwar world. At those conferences—mark you well—those gentlemen turned over control of all of eastern Europe to Russia. Only Greece was exempt from those operations because of the strategic importance of that country. Churchill did not want Russia flanking Britain's life line to the Far East, and he fondly hoped that Soviet expansion would stop at the Greek borders. Stalin had other ideas. He insists that Greece is as properly within the Soviet sphere of influence as Cuba is within that of the United States. If we are honest and realistic, we will admit there is some merit to this position. So today we are in our present position by our own choice. We are reaping what we have sown.

Before embarking upon uncharted seas prudence demands that we count the costs. There is nothing in this bill which justifies taking a leap into oblivion, for that is what it is.

I am opposed to this measure for the following reasons:

First. It is purely a military venture. Second. It will ultimately lead to economic disaster.

Third. It is properly a matter to be considered by the United Nations.

I urge that the rule be voted down.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield three minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RICH].

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman 1 minute.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, we are today embarking upon a proposal such as has never been presented to the American people up to the present time. This is a military bill and should have been referred to the Committee on Military Affairs rather than to the Committee on Foreign Affairs. There is also appropriated in it \$400,000,000 which should have been referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

May I ask, where are you going to get this money?

Mr. Speaker, the administration has been spending money in the last 10 years like drunken sailors so that the country at the present time is about wrecked, financially it is \$259,000,000,000 in debt, and if we do not build up the United States and make it strong in every way instead of tearing it down and down, making it weak by such bills as this, we will not be of service either to ourselves or any other country in the world. Bankrupt the Nation and anything can happen to America.

Mr. Speaker, this bill will result in a hardship on the taxpayers of America. It will go to build up a military machine in Turkey and Greece and we do not know how long these countries will be under control of men in whom we have faith. This build-up of a military machine is just as liable to be turned against us as to be used for us when we want it. This will not stop communism in Greece or Turkey.

Great Britain withdrew from Greece and asked us to go in there and pull her chestnuts out of the fire and to perpetuate in Greece a monarch who does not have a drop of Greek blood in his veins. That is the kind of dynasty we are now trying to build up for the Greek people. Do you think for one minute that is going to be a country which will be loyal to Greeks? I question it very much.

We are taking as an ally the Turks. Never before have we condoned the things that the Turkish Government did and, in my judgment, they too will turn against America after we have built up a military machine that they can turn against America. O! how foolish a proposal this military bill is for us here in America.

The Rules Committee was told by members of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, very little what the bill was intended to do with the exception of the gentleman from South Carolina, that this is to build up a war machine for Greece and Turkey. The gentleman from South Carolina told us that we are going over there to build up a military machine in order to keep the Dardanelles from falling into the hands of Russia,

that we are going to build up a military machine over there to protect certain oil interests in the Near East.

Mr. Speaker, this bill smells too much of oil to suit me and the quicker the American people realize we are going over there to protect oil interests the better it will be for the American people. Be honest about it.

A few years ago I remember in a political campaign a great radio voice said and I quote: "I promise you mothers again, again and again I will not send your sons to fight on foreign soil." Mr. Speaker, if we pass this legislation we will be sending the sons of America over there to fight on foreign soil again and that in the very near future. Do not bypass the United Nations or you kill it. Keep America strong—build up our own country, our own resources, our own flood control, our own reclamation, our own Army and Navy, our own Air Force, our own Marine Corps, our own atom-bomb.

If we become bankrupt we are no good to ourselves or anybody. Be wise and economize.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. WADSWORTH].

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the rule and also do not hesitate to say that I shall support the bill itself. Obviously, in the time assigned to me it is utterly impossible to discuss the bill. I can merely express my opinion in two or three sentences. I believe the passage of this measure will serve as a deterrent of war rather than encourage it. And I believe further—that this is more important, in my view—that the passage of this measure will inure to the safety of the United States.

My plea now is, however, that the House of Representatives adopt this rule so that we may go into this thing in an open debate, in which the Members interested in the matter may take part; a public debate, which may contain utterances heard around the world. I am for that kind of debate, and whether you are opposed to the legislation itself or in favor of it. I hope on this occasion, when the House of Representatives is facing the world and world opinion, that we shall go forward, debate this matter, and make the great decision.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BENDER].

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman one additional minute.

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, what does the Truman doctrine cost? Where does it end? Does it destroy the United Nations? Is it an undeclared declaration of war?

Mr. Speaker, in my opinion, the President has proposed a policy which stabs the United Nations in the back. Mr. Truman advocates that we and we alone decide what should be done about aggression. In the Greek-Turkey bill he has asked the Congress to adopt as a policy intervention in every civil war in the world. In so doing the President

has violated our Nation's commitment to the United Nations to bring before that body any condition—economic, political, or military—which threatens the peace of the world. His policy destroys the United Nations, and in so doing the President makes inevitable a third world war. The sons and daughters of America will die on the battlefields of Asia and Europe to carry out this policy.

Financially, we cannot afford to divide the world into two armed camps. We already owe \$260,000,000,000. Now Mr. Truman asks us to give away anywhere from ten to twenty billions of dollars every year. This fancy doctrine should be called the bankruptcy policy for America.

Our taxes are already too high. How can taxes be reduced if we continue to send \$20,000,000,000 of goods and services abroad every year? The simple answer is that it cannot be done.

Mr. Speaker, there are other excellent reasons for opposition to this violation of our commitment to the United Nations. In Greece, Mr. Truman would use our money to sustain a corrupt and venal monarchy. One Greek king was assassinated; three Greek kings were driven into exile. The Greek people hate monarchy; yet Mr. Truman wants to spend three hundred millions of good American money to keep him in power.

The story on Turkey is even worse. That country for a thousand years has persecuted Christians and Jews. Turkey has been a military dictatorship for the past 20 years. They have no freedom of speech—no free press—and in the last war they sold out the Allies to the Nazis. They violated their sworn agreements; yet, it is proposed that we should form what in effect is a military alliance with Turkey, despite the demonstrated unreliability of their military dictatorship.

He is asking us to cut the American standard of living in order to form a military alliance with Turkey. Every old, worn-out, moth-eaten shiek in the Middle East will be filling his pockets with our tax money.

Mr. Speaker, our money will be poured down every international rat hole from Singapore to Constantinople.

Fortunately, there is another way—an honorable way—and an effective one. We should keep our commitment with the United Nations. We should join with the other nations of the world in preventing aggression. Fortunately, we do have enough money to contribute relief and clothes to the Greek people, but Mr. Truman, under the guise of feeding the hungry, is asking us to form a military alliance with a Turkish dictatorship. This policy destroys the United Nations—it leads to war.

FAVORS ADOPTION OF RULE

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Speaker, I want to make my position clear. As the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. RIZLEY], a member of the Committee on Rules, has explained, we wanted to postpone the action on the rule until we could obtain additional information. My position for years, and I still adhere to it, has been that I shall not deprive the House by my vote or

action of the opportunity to pass judgment on any important legislation. I feel, however, since I voted to postpone action, that I owe it to myself and the House to say that I feel that the rule should be passed, because that has been my belief and my practice.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SABATH. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. May I point out that on March 12 when the President addressed the joint session of Congress he stated:

We have considered how the United Nations might assist in this crisis. But the situation is an urgent one requiring immediate action, and the United Nations and its related organizations are not in position to extend help of the kind that is required.

This statement of immediacy and urgency was made on March 12. It was made to justify the bypassing of the United Nations. Almost 2 months have gone by. I think the time element and events have negated the urgency of the request, in view of the fact that nothing has happened to substantiate the alleged urgency, urged as an excuse to bypass the United Nations.

May I add further that no one up to now, including the President, particularly, with the Assembly of the United Nations and the Council in session, has been able to explain the reason why the United Nations should be bypassed.

GREAT BRITAIN GAVE UNITED STATES RUSH ACT

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I fully believe that Great Britain has, by her usual conniving methods, given us the rush act, feeling that if our country had time to consider this matter carefully there would be no chance to maneuver us into pulling her hot chestnuts out of the fire and permit her to unload many of her responsibilities upon us. May I ask: What has Great Britain ever done for America that we should assume her burdens and commitments?

Few have taken the trouble to examine the patent absurdity with which Britain announced 6 weeks ago her financial inability to further maintain an illegal occupation army of perhaps 12,000 officers and men in Greece, and her subsidies to the rotten Turkish autocracy, while continuing to maintain and finance an illegal occupation army of more than 100,000 officers and men in Palestine.

Through a tremendous propaganda campaign Great Britain is skillfully placing herself in a position of arbiter between the United States and Russia, when there is only imperial jealousy and economic conflicts between England and Russia.

This is an absurd situation.

As the richest and most powerful Nation in the world, with no national aspirations toward imperialistic exploitation, but desiring only peace and freedom of commerce and travel and of establishing a democratic way of life, we should be the arbiter, the world umpire.

Our only aggressive and dangerous enemies—and I want to repeat this again and again—were the Nazis and the Japanese war lords. We fought those countries and defeated them, in alliance with Russia and the other United Nations.

It is the English bankers and investment brokers who have been bleeding Greece and Turkey and much of the rest of the world with high-interest loans and absentee ownership of utilities and resources, and it is the British Empire's life line that stretches through the Mediterranean and Aegean Seas—not ours.

DANGERS EXAGGERATED

As I have stated frequently on this floor, I believe that the great hue and cry about imminent danger from communism is a blown-up fraud perpetrated by those spokesmen of reaction who oppose the slightest progress.

I sincerely believe that there is greater danger to our country, and to international peace, from stubborn reactionaries, from brutal cartels playing for monopolistic power, and from the adherents of the Nazi-Fascist ideology than from our handful of Communists whose potential power has been so fantastically exaggerated.

There is little doubt that England played a double game throughout the rise and reign of Hitler.

Without the tacit consent of England the Hitler legions would never have marched into the Saar and the Ruhr over the protests of France and Russia. The sacrifice and betrayal of Austria and Czechoslovakia could not have been accomplished without British complicity.

It is a matter of history that the British delegation deserted Russia at the crucial time that Hitler might have been checked.

HISTORY REPEATS ITSELF

Surely Hitler must have believed that Chamberlain intended to betray Poland, as he had betrayed Czechoslovakia, and to renounce the defensive treaty with Poland, or he would never have risked the Polish invasion.

True, England did meet her treaty obligations by declaring war on Germany to protect Poland; but only after Germany had amassed the most powerful army, up to that time, the world had seen, and when it was too late to aid and protect Poland from devastation and misery.

Even when England was fully in the war, she never lost sight of her own economic and political stake in Poland.

More than that of any other government in exile the Polish Government in London was a government in captivity which was directed and supported by the British with a view to recapturing her own economic domination of that brave unhappy country when peace came.

She broke her promises and pledges to that Polish Army when she could no longer use it, and there seemed no profit to be extracted from it. It is to be regretted that she has once more failed to keep her promises, and after using the Polish soldiers attempted to force them to take the most degrading employment.

One of the most ancient democratic documents in history is the Constitution of Poland.

The pride and courage and the democratic strength of the Polish people runs strong and true, and have for centuries.

There are, therefore, many strong bonds of sympathy between the brave

Polish people and the common people of Greece and Turkey.

It is perhaps not well known in this country that Turkey was the only state which refused to recognize the partition of Poland.

Similarly, the Polish people have sympathized in the struggles of the Greek people for freedom from foreign and domestic tyranny.

During the war Poland and Greece suffered equally from the brutal destruction and slaughter of the Nazis, and thousands of Greeks died in Nazi concentration camps on Polish soil.

I have tried to show not only the bonds of friendship and of common experience between the people of these countries but also to suggest some parallels.

Germany found her excuse for invading Poland with Hitler's overwhelming war machine in manufactured "border incidents."

We have heard, and always from British sources, reckless charges of "border incidents" in northern Greece, and of allegations that Greek guerrillas tagged with the term "Communist," were helped from across the border, always intended to create prejudice in America against the Greek patriots who resent British rule.

For many weeks now a United Nations investigating committee has been looking into those reports.

We have had a lot of gossip about burglars and straying delegates, all of which have been officially denied, but no authentic information that the Commission found any truth in the rumors of trouble on the border.

Many similar unfounded stories, rumors, and suspicions have been published with great headlines, but the truth of the facts denying the original stories receives scant press publicity.

The report of the investigators is being drawn up now in Geneva. I feel that the House should have that report before acting on this legislation.

THIS IS USING RELIEF FOR POLITICS

It has been stated, even before the bill is passed, that other financial assistance will be extended to France if the new Cabinet is free of Communists, and there is talk of similar aid to Italy and other countries on the same conditions. This, I submit, is using relief and rehabilitation for politics very openly, although we condemn that practice when it is even suspected of other countries.

Some Members have said frankly that they intend to vote for this bill, not for the sake of aiding Greece in establishing a sound economy and a sound government, but because it is clearly a war measure directed against Russia.

Mr. Speaker, my urgent plea to this Congress, and to my country, is to take a positive and constructive approach to the whole question of aid to the war-torn countries of Europe.

Our task is not to restore and strengthen the brutal exploitation of Greece, Turkey, Poland, Rumania, and the other countries there by the British, no less than the Germans, but to aid them in rebuilding their countries.

Soup lines and doles are not the answer; but machinery, agricultural implements,

irrigation and drainage projects, fertilizer and seeds, insecticides, tools, medical care, for all the people, without regard to race, creed, or political inclinations.

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SABATH. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. COX. Is the gentleman in agreement with the observation made by the gentleman from New York [Mr. MARCANTONIO]?

Mr. SABATH. He read what the President stated. Those were not his views, they were the expressions of the President.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further since my name was mentioned?

Mr. SABATH. I yield.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Will the gentleman from Georgia, who has admitted that this is virtually a step that will lead toward war, explain in his time what reasons he can give for the bypassing of the United Nations?

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield again?

Mr. SABATH. I yield.

Mr. COX. If I have one virtue it is frankness. I am seeking no alibi. I regard this argument that this matter should be referred to the United Nations as an alibi, because every informed Member of the House knows that under existing conditions the United Nations can do nothing because of the veto power held by Russia.

Mr. SABATH. I disagree with the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. Cox] because a year ago the United Nations did act in the case of Iran and forced Russia to withdraw its troops. It was capable of acting there and I believe it can act now, if the right cooperation is given.

REACTIONARIES WILL SUPPORT BILL AS WAR MEASURE

Unfortunately, Mr. Speaker, I am fearful that the coalition of Democratic reactionaries and Republicans will support this measure for its warlike sound and meaning, and not for the sake of helping to rebuild the Greek economy and to establish a sound, democratic government in Greece, and not to help the Turkish people to progress further in their slow way toward democracy.

It is a sad commentary that those wealthy and powerful forces who seem to control our industry and business and finance and to maintain their own invisible government favor this high-handed military intervention in Greece because they believe that through it they can bring about the elimination of the threat of communism and perhaps the defeat of Soviet Russia.

They appear more interested in the welfare and the economic rehabilitation of the Germans and the Japs than in the nations who fought side by side with us against the enemy, and who suffered the cruel ravages of barbarous warfare, with the wanton murder of their nationals and destruction of all their industrial and agricultural wealth.

WHAT WILL IT COST?

God alone knows how much it will cost in years to come in American dollars and American resources and Ameri-

can lives to stop communism as the proponents of this wild plan claim.

You cannot stop communism by war and murder and military rule.

On the other hand, war and murder and military rule create the conditions which bring anarchy and socialism and communism.

Furthermore, you cannot bribe a whole people into submission with any amount of money against their own powerful aims and hopes for freedom and self-government and decent living conditions.

That is the outstanding reason I cannot support and vote for this bill; though a war crusade might, which I doubt, destroy communism, it might also and probably would destroy civilization. Such a war would, beyond any doubt, be not only a most unfortunate thing for our country but for the world; if that sad eventuality comes about it will be the most destructive of all wars in lives and property.

Therefore, I feel we should consider long and carefully before we take this fateful step.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I wish to insert at this point an editorial from the Chicago Sun of Sunday, May 6, commenting on the published interview between Commander Stassen and Generalsissimo Stalin:

STALIN ON THE RED DOGMA

Harold Stassen may have risked his standing with some Republican leaders by talking with Stalin, but he has brought back one of the most illuminating interviews yet to come out of the Kremlin.

We all knew beforehand that Stalin wants peace. What is new and important is the great emphasis which Stalin, under Mr. Stassen's prompting, laid upon the compatibility of the Communist and capitalist economic systems.

Mr. Stassen was on perfectly sound ground in pointing out that some of Stalin's own past statements suggested the contrary view. The Leninist orthodoxy has often assumed an irrepressible conflict with capitalism. But Leninism, like other orthodoxies, has many facets, many tenets. Stalin was able to argue that the true religion does not exclude the possibility of peaceful coexistence with capitalism. And he could point to "the book" to prove his case.

The significant thing is that Stalin should find it desirable to make this point so emphatically. There have been many indications that western suspicion and fear of communism were based in part on an outmoded interpretation of its principles. Many of us have gazed with rapt fixation on that part of the doctrine which spoke of inevitable struggle for world rule. If Stalin now chooses to underline that part which points in the opposite direction, Communist hierarchs everywhere are reminded that the line has changed, and the world is reminded that the line does leave a basis for the composition of power conflicts.

One may say that this shift in the line is no more significant or trustworthy than others of the past; that, when circumstances change, the old idea of world domination may come forward again. But this is not important. The cardinal error would be to base our own policy on the assumption that communism has fixed and rigid purposes, when in fact it is opportunistic, flexible, and capable of infinite adaptation to practical situations.

The very fact that the Red orthodoxy is elastic enough to include theoretical compatibility of its system with ours is significant of itself. For this means that, with wit and wisdom, we have a chance to attain a

peace settlement and an organization of the world which, once established, will be proof against a revival of the world-revolution idea.

If we begin with the premise that the world must divide, then on both sides we shall do things which widen the breach and accelerate the descent toward ultimate war. But if we start from the opposite assumption, as Stalin suggests can be done in harmony with Communist dogma, and as we know can be done in harmony with our own, then there is hope that a reconstructed world will gradually build up on both sides a vested interest in peace.

In that case it will not matter that the Red orthodoxy is capable of returning to the idea of world domination. A peaceful and prosperous world will create little incentive for revolution. A peaceful and prosperous world will open to it no opportunities.

Stalin's confidence in the ultimate attainment of international control of atomic energy is encouraging. But he obviously still believes the tenet of Communist orthodoxy which holds capitalism to be naturally aggressive and imperialistic. He thinks we are in for an economic crisis, and that when that happens we may go to war for foreign markets. Mr. Stassen earnestly tried to convince him that capitalism will accept regulation to the extent necessary to avoid a major depression and restrain any expansionist tendencies. Stalin didn't sound convinced. It is up to all of us to prove Mr. Stassen right—to disprove this item of the dogma as we have disproved others.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN].

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed out of order.

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

There was no objection.

TRUMAN ADMINISTRATION RESPONSIBLE FOR INFLATIONARY SPIRAL IN FOOD PRICES

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker, the Truman administration is responsible for the inflationary spiral in food prices. That fact should be remembered when we hear almost daily appeals by administration spokesmen for reductions in prices. It is not generally realized that purchases by the Government for relief to the needy abroad is having a noticeable impact upon our own cost of living.

These purchases for foreign relief have the double effect of reducing supplies in the United States and in adding to the money or credit in circulation. Countless items daily are being taken out of our stocks to cover Government commitments made to peoples abroad.

It will be noticed that in all of the pleas by administration officials for business firms to slash their prices, nothing is said about the way the Government is entering the markets and taking out huge quantities of food and other materials.

The Truman administration cannot escape the responsibility for higher prices of certain vital food products which account for the increase in the cost of living during the months of February, March, and April of this year.

President Truman properly has made appeals for a reduction in the cost of living. We all want that. I feel, however, that the President would be more helpful in pointing to the causes for

higher prices if he would tell the people the part his administration has played in causing the inflationary spiral of grains and certain foods, instead of attempting to place the blame on farmers and the food industry.

Without criticizing the need for an export food program of grains and other food by the Government, a careful study of daily purchases of grains and other food by the Government discloses that prices were driven up by reckless and ill-timed buying for shipment abroad.

This is an example of bungling by bureaucracy—some officials hammering for reduction in the cost of living; others adding to prices by barging into the markets with huge orders for food products without proper planning of purchases so as not to blow the lid off prices. I suggest to President Truman that he cause coordination of these policies.

There is evidence that speculators have been reaping a golden harvest on Government-made bull markets. America has become the happy hunting grounds for easy money for wealthy refugees from abroad. They are flocking to this country and putting their money to work in the food and other markets—of course, with the intention of making money from rising prices. The net result is higher prices for food and other things the American people must buy.

The prices for corn, oats, feeds, meat, bread, and other food products generally follow the price of wheat. The speculative fever in commodity markets was created last fall by Government buying to fill commitments that had not been counted upon earlier in the year.

But the speculative boom in grain prices did not actually acquire its upward momentum until Monday, January 20, 1947, when the Commodity Credit Corporation, the Government buying agency, stepped into the market and purchased 19,728,647 bushels of wheat in 1 day.

This single day's purchase of wheat by the Government, which involved more than \$40,000,000, was the spark that touched off feverish speculation in all grains. In the weeks following January 20, wheat advanced around \$1 per bushel, with corn, other grains, and meat following the upward price of wheat. With large increases taking place in the price of wheat and other grains, prices of feed, flour, bread, meats, and other foods except dairy and poultry products, were advanced to cover higher raw material costs.

I want to again stress the importance of the ill-timed planning of the Commodity Credit Corporation in its buying of wheat during the month of January, at which time it was also announced by the Department of Agriculture that the 400,000,000 bushels of grains scheduled for shipment during the crop year 1946-47 would be stepped up and completed by May 1, 1947—2 months ahead of schedule. During the month of January the Government purchased 38,593,541 bushels of wheat. Of this total, 19,728,647 bushels were purchased on January 20. This operation was the go-ahead sign for the bull market and the green light for the wild speculation which took place during January, February, and March.

While I am satisfied that policy-making officials in the Department of Agriculture did not knowingly or intentionally disclose any information as to the magnitude of the Government's grain-buying program in advance of actual purchases, it is commonly heard on the street that certain well-known speculators in Washington, Chicago, and New York acquired large speculative grain holdings in the futures market during the months of November and December and prior to January 20 of this year.

An analysis of speculative operations for the months of January, February, and March will disclose that hundreds of millions of dollars in profits were made by speculators in grains and cotton.

American citizens were not the only speculators in the futures market for cotton, grains, and other commodities. My investigation discloses that certain wealthy refugees, who are enjoying the bounty and hospitality of the United States, and who are not required to pay income taxes on speculative gains, were amongst the leading speculators in the recent bull market in grains.

The nationality of some of the foreign speculators are listed as follows: Greek, Chinese, German, Dutch, Iranian, Polish, French, British, Egyptian, Czechoslovakian, Latvian, Swiss, Argentinian, Australian, Colombian, Cuban, Japanese, Mexican, Norwegian, Russian, Swedish, Turkish, and Venezuelan.

I am satisfied that all American citizens and foreign nationals did not make a profit out of the recent speculative grain market. Some of them lost money because they took the "short side" of the market too early, but most of them made substantial profits.

Foreign nationals are not required to pay any income taxes on speculative gains made in this country. This policy is wrong, and I will ask the Ways and Means Committee to report a bill to amend our income-tax laws so that all foreigners will pay the same taxes as are assessed against American citizens.

The information which I have gathered covering Government grain-buying operations and speculation by individuals in the futures market during recent months will be presented to the Committee on Agriculture for investigation.

GOVERNMENT GRAIN BUYING AFTER JANUARY 20, 1947

While Commodity Credit did not buy any substantial amount of wheat after its \$40,000,000 purchase on January 20, speculation in grains was given added impetus by statements of responsible Government officials and other prominent citizens as to the need for large additional supplies of grain and food from this country to take care of the expanding needs of hungry people in the world. Obviously, we must ship food supplies abroad to prevent starvation.

Just as obviously, these shipments and Government purchases of food should be planned in a manner which will least upset our domestic economy. In the current instance, wise planning has not been done and the Government itself has become the greatest gambler in grain and the most bullish influence in a highly speculative market.

Thus, I repeat, the Truman administration cannot escape responsibility for high food prices by placing the blame on farmers and food distributors.

I will also request the Committee on Agriculture to investigate the "squeeze" that is being put on dairy farmers and poultry producers, who are forced to pay prices for feed which are far out of line for what they receive for their products.

I will have more to say on this subject at a later date, but in conclusion, I want to add the following thought for the benefit of the administration. President Truman is properly asking for a reduction in the cost of living.

It seems to me that he could set a good example for all producers and distributors in this country, by making drastic cuts in the price of Government. Congress is engaged in this task, and it would be very timely for the President and his Cabinet to join in slashing the budget by at least \$6,000,000,000.

President Truman's frequent statements that it would be false economy to reduce his budget estimated have not been helpful. He has taken the attitude that his budget is sacred writ and that Congress, the policy-making branch of the Government, must take it as it is. Department heads and officials of other Government agencies have taken the attitude of the President as a signal to oppose reduction in the swollen budget.

The country is demanding elimination of unnecessary Federal expenditures. I believe that cooperation by the President in reducing the price of government would be helpful not only to relieve the taxpayers' burden but as a weapon against inflation.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. HOFFMAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. MORRISON (at the request of Mr. McCormack) was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a copy of a bill.

ASSISTANCE TO GREECE AND TURKEY

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. CHENOWETH].

Mr. CHENOWETH. Mr. Speaker, this is a solemn moment in the deliberations of this body. It is the hour of destiny for you and for me. We cannot avoid the issue like this bill bypasses the United Nations. We must make a fateful decision which may determine the future of this country. No one can decide for us and each of us must face the cold and brutal facts involved in this situation.

The title of the bill would indicate this is a measure to provide assistance for Greece and Turkey. This is a misnomer, as this is not a relief bill. We passed the relief bill last week and authorized \$200,000,000 for Greece and other foreign countries. Of course we want to help Greece rebuild. The Greeks are our friends. The Greeks need food, medicine, and clothing. We are called upon in this bill to furnish military assistance and equipment so that Greece can fight communism. In other words, we are using American dollars and American

soldiers to settle the political and domestic quarrels of a foreign nation. Such a policy is contrary to American tradition.

It is urged that we must prevent the spread of communism abroad. I am one of those who have been calling attention to the dangers of communism in this country. Surely we have all we can do to combat Communists right here at home. The danger from communism lies within, and not without our shores. We do not have to send military supplies and soldiers to Greece and Turkey to prove we are through appeasing Russia; we can do that by exposing the activities of Communists in this country.

I would also like to inquire what will be gained by stopping communism in Greece, and permitting it to spread through Europe. I am greatly concerned over the precedent we are establishing if this bill is passed. How can we deny similar aid to Poland, Austria, Italy, and France if we carry out the spirit of this new, and, in my opinion, most dangerous doctrine?

If we pass this bill it sets this country on a new course without compass or chart, and no one can predict what our destination will be. No one knows where the policy contained in this legislation will take this Nation. Today it is Greece and Turkey. Tomorrow it will be Korea, then perhaps India. By this bill we announce to the world that the United States is embarking on a world crusade, and that we will use American money, and American soldiers, to compel every country to adopt the type of government we dictate. All admit it is a step in the dark, but they say it is a calculated risk, and one we must assume. The proponents of this measure tell us the alternative will be worse. I dispute that. I wholly repudiate the doctrine announced in this bill. I do not believe the American people want to assume any such responsibility or obligation. I think one member of the Foreign Affairs Committee very aptly described the situation when he appeared before the Rules Committee. He said that no Member of this House can vote for this bill without violating his oath of office, unless he really believes that the first line of defense of the United States of America lies in Greece and Turkey. I agree with him, and I am not ready to admit that the security of the United States will be affected by the political philosophies of Greece, or any other foreign nation. I am reminded of another bill that was in this House since I have been a Member, the lend-lease bill, which was also labeled a peace measure. This was back in February 1941. The setting was very much the same and we were told that the bill was necessary to keep this country out of war. The question came up about delivering materials and supplies and whether or not we would use American ships as convoys. The House was assured that we would not convoy, but later it was discovered that we were so engaged even at the time the bill was being debated. We were deceived, and the American people were denied the truth. All of us know the tragic consequences that followed.

Now, we are told that we are not going to send combat troops. We intend to send only 40 American officers to Greece and Turkey, who will act in an advisory capacity, and train the armies of Greece and Turkey. Can you imagine 40 officers stopping communism in Greece and Turkey? You might as well try to bail out the Atlantic Ocean with a thimble. It cannot be done. It appears that history will repeat itself. Such a course may not result in war today or tomorrow, but in the end the outcome is inevitable. The bill calls for military commitments that start us on the road to war. For me, Mr. Speaker, I refuse to take this step.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. CHENOWETH] has expired.

All time has expired.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered. The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution. The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. MARCANTONIO) there were—ayes 168, noes 22.

So the resolution was agreed to.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. SADLAK asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an address by the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. Lodge].

Mr. HOFFMAN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks in two instances and in each to include excerpts from papers and letters.

Mr. SABATH asked and was given permission to revise and extend the remarks he made earlier today and include therein certain articles and editorials.

Mr. PRICE of Illinois asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include newspaper articles.

Mr. JOHNSON of California asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include editorials.

Mr. SCHWABE of Missouri asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include a poem.

ASSISTANCE TO GREECE AND TURKEY

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. 2616) to provide for assistance to Greece and Turkey.

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. 2616) to provide for assistance to Greece and Turkey, with Mr. CASE of South Dakota 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 is recognized for 4½ hours, and the ranking minority Member, the gentleman from New York [Mr. Bloom], is recognized for 4½ hours.

Mr. EATON. Mr. Chairman, I propose to yield myself at this point 15

minutes, but before doing so I wish to announce an arrangement we have made with reference to the time.

In consultation with my distinguished colleague, the ranking minority member of the committee, the gentleman from New York [Mr. Bloom], we have decided on each side to allot or yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. Smith] an hour and a half, making 3 hours in all; and each of his colleagues who desire to oppose this measure will kindly report to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. Smith], and he will report to me or to the gentleman from New York [Mr. Bloom], and we will allot time in accordance with his wishes.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EATON. I yield.

Mr. RICH. The gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. Eaton] will have 3 hours and the gentleman from New York will have 3 hours. That makes 6 hours in support of the bill as against only 3 against the bill. It is not a fair distribution of the time.

Mr. EATON. The gentleman seems to object to recognizing that the gentleman from New York [Mr. Bloom] represents a great political party and that the chairman of the committee also represents a great political party. If the gentleman from Pennsylvania assigns to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. Smith] a third political party, we are going to question whether it is equal to the other two.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EATON. I yield.

Mr. BLOOM. Do I understand that in the matter of time for the opposition the gentleman from New Jersey has given control to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. Smith]? Suppose a Member on my side asks me for time in opposition, or suppose a Member on the gentleman's side should go to the chairman of the committee and ask for time in opposition? Are we not privileged to allot any time to the opposition?

Mr. EATON. Under the understanding each side was to allot an hour and a half to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. Smith].

Mr. BLOOM. But suppose a Member comes to the gentleman from New Jersey or to me for time in opposition. Have we got to tell him to clear it through the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. Smith]?

Mr. EATON. If a Member came to me for time in opposition I would turn him over to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. Smith].

Mr. BLOOM. Then I will do the same thing.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from New Jersey yield for a parliamentary inquiry?

Mr. EATON. I yield.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Under the rules of the House it is my understanding that time in general debate is equally divided between the chairman of the committee and the ranking minority Mem-

ber, irrespective of what opposition applicants for time may take on the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the provisions of the rule it has been provided that the time is to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and the ranking minority member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs. The announcement which the gentleman from New Jersey has made is a private arrangement that might be said to come under the rule which has been adopted.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. In other words, the announcement that has been made is not in conformity with the rule of the House?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair does not consider that a parliamentary inquiry. The gentleman from New Jersey has merely made an announcement of what he proposes to do with some of the time under the rule.

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EATON. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. RAYBURN. I was in the gallery when this colloquy started. I may say that I was alongside of the two gentlemen here, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. Smith], and the Speaker when the arrangement, whatever it was, was made. There was not any agreement as to yielding any 3 hours to the gentleman from Wisconsin to be yielded by himself.

Mr. EATON. That is right.

Mr. RAYBURN. It was that the gentleman from New Jersey would yield to Members suggested by the gentleman from Wisconsin an hour and a half.

Mr. EATON. That is correct.

The CHAIRMAN. That is the statement made by the Chair. The time is equally divided between the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs and the ranking minority member of that committee. The gentleman from New Jersey has made an announcement merely of what he proposes to do with an hour and a half of the time for which he is recognized.

Mr. RAYBURN. And he will yield the time himself?

The CHAIRMAN. The time is under the control of the gentleman from New Jersey and the ranking minority member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EATON. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. DONDERO. I am sure the gentleman from New Jersey did not mean what his statement implied a few minutes ago that those of us on this floor who might hold some firm convictions on this bill belong to a third party on this floor?

Mr. EATON. Mr. Chairman, I will be glad to have the gentleman from Minnesota explain my position on that subject.

Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 15 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, I am strongly in favor of the immediate and practical purpose of House Resolution 2616 which is to furnish aid to Greece and Turkey to survive as free and independent nations.

In addition to this immediate and practical purpose, the bill implements the foreign policy of our Nation as set forth by President Truman in his his-

toric address to the Congress on March 12, 1947. In implementing this foreign policy, the bill becomes one of the most fundamental and far-reaching enactments ever proposed in the history of our Congress.

Mr. Truman did not create the national foreign policy which he enunciated on March 12. It was forced upon him and upon the Congress and the Nation by the inescapable facts of history. It is a product of those mysterious and mighty spiritual energies of mankind upon which the world has been, is now and will continue to be carried irresistibly forward to its unpredictable destiny. We can no more escape the impact of these mighty forces flowing beneath the surface of human existence than we can escape the law of gravitation.

President Truman condensed the essence of our new and far-reaching foreign policy into a few simple and pregnant sentences. He said:

One of the primary objectives of the foreign policy of the United States is the creation of conditions in which we and other nations will be able to work out a way of life free from coercion.

At the present moment in world history nearly every nation must choose between alternative ways of life. The choice is too often not a free one.

One way of life is based upon the will of the majority and is distinguished by free institutions, representative government, free elections, guarantees of individual liberty, freedom of speech and religion, and freedom from political oppression.

The second way of life is based upon the will of a minority forcibly imposed upon the majority. It relies upon terror and oppression, a controlled press and radio, fixed elections, and the suppression of personal freedom.

I believe that it must be the policy of the United States to support free peoples who are resisting attempted subjugation by armed minorities or by outside pressures.

I believe that we must assist free peoples to work out their own destinies in their own way.

The adoption by our Government and people of the principles upon which this proposed foreign policy is based involves great risks. The rejection of these principles involves greater risks. I am profoundly convinced that the safety and security of our Nation and of the world, as well as the very existence of the United Nations, depends upon the acceptance by our Government and people of the principles underlying this foreign policy and our resolute defense and enforcement of those principles.

I hold in my hand a letter I have just received from the Secretary of State, a gentleman for whom we all have the profoundest respect and in whom we have the greatest confidence. I will read this letter to you.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,
Washington.

MY DEAR MR. EATON: I regret that I was not in Washington during the consideration by your committee of the Greek-Turkish aid bill. As the bill comes before the House of Representatives for consideration, I would like you to have an expression of my views on it.

Prior to my departure for Moscow, I participated in the formulation of the program which the President later laid before Con-

gress. The President telegraphed to me in Paris the proposed text of his message of March 12, and I informed the Department that I fully concurred. The bill which was later introduced in both Houses of the Congress, together with the amendments agreed on in the Senate, has my full approval.

My strong conviction that the immediate passage of this bill is a matter of the greatest urgency was made even more positive by the recent meeting in Moscow.

I am in complete accord with the actions taken by Mr. Acheson on this subject in my absence. We were in constant touch with each other and all moves were fully coordinated.

Your committee is deserving of the highest praise for its thorough exploration of the question and for its able and comprehensive report. I fully endorse the committee's conclusion that the bill pending before the House would enable the United States, in this crisis, to support the United Nations by pursuing a positive policy in behalf of Greece and Turkey. I am convinced that it will be in our own interest and in the interest of world peace.

I hope that the bill will be enacted as expeditiously as possible.

Sincerely yours,

G. C. MARSHALL.

The currents of life which have carried mankind forward to this most fateful hour of its entire history are not difficult to define. Man is the only member of the animal kingdom endowed by the Creator with the power of rational choice. In the exercise of this divine power, freedom of choice becomes an absolute necessity and it is the exercise of this power of choice and the struggle to be free in its exercise that constitutes the essence of human progress from the dawn of time to the present complex and baffling world civilization in which we find ourselves today.

Certain races seem to have been endowed with a genius for freedom. Other races less endowed with this genius have lagged behind in individual and social development. Today with the world in complete and continuous contact the minds of all races, including the most backward, are disturbed and inspired by an awakened sense of the value of freedom and a determination in one way or another to achieve freedom for themselves.

This inherent passion for freedom is, without doubt, the fountainhead out of which has grown all fundamental individual and social emancipation.

Within the last hundred years there has developed, principally in Europe, a devastating counter movement against the principle of freedom. Its prophet in the beginning was Karl Marx. His announced objective was in accord with the ideals and principles of freedom. His motive however was hate, which is the most reactionary and destructive force in human nature. His method for achieving economic freedom for the masses of men, he called, the class conflict, which was simply hate expressed in terms of destruction rather than construction.

Out of this Marxian glorification of hate and violence grew a three-pronged ideology, each based upon some particular form of class hatred, each destructive of every freedom for which man had fought for thousands of years, and each inspired by a mad dream of world con-

quest, either by force of arms or by traitorous penetration of self-governing societies, or by both.

Fascism destroyed itself when it came in contact with organized freedom. Nazism was destroyed at a frightful cost, leaving a large section of the civilized world in social, political, and economic ruin. Communism, in its essence close kin to fascism and nazism, now bestrides the shattered world like a colossus. It seems to have forgotten nothing and learned nothing from the frightful tragedies that have darkened the first half of this alleged century of progress.

No amount of wishful thinking or mockish sentimentality can disguise the grim facts of the communistic march toward world domination.

During and since the war Russia has taken over the northern strip of Finland for the purpose of dominating the arctic, and the southern tip of Finland which gives her domination over the Baltic.

She has absorbed the three independent Baltic states—Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania.

She has taken a substantial slice of eastern Poland.

She has acquired domination, more or less complete, over the internal government and economy of Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Rumania, Bulgaria, Yugoslavia, and Albania.

Her armed forces are devouring the substance of Austria.

In the Orient, with or without the consent of her allies, she has acquired immeasurable influence in the communistic areas of China and neighboring regions.

She has stripped Manchuria bare of its immensely valuable productive machinery.

She has acquired control of one of the great railroad arteries of that region.

She has assumed dominance of Port Arthur and Darien.

She has taken over the most productive half of Korea and held it incommunicado behind an iron curtain against the United States.

She has been granted undisputed possession of the Kurile Islands and the Japanese half of Sakhalin.

And today the Communists, either directly or through their satellites—Hungary, Yugoslavia, and Bulgaria—hover upon the borders of Greece and Turkey ready to take over and absorb these two essential gateways to the Orient.

Much of this expansion of Russian power has taken place in complete disregard of the obligations which she has assumed in the organization of the United Nations.

If Russia were permitted to take Greece and Turkey, her next steps of course would be Iran and Afghanistan, India, and China, all of which countries border upon Russian territory.

These are the deep spiritual forces and the external facts which make the foreign policy, enunciated by President Truman on March 12, absolutely inevitable if free self-governing nations and institutions are to survive here and elsewhere throughout the world. And these are the reasons why, in full knowledge of the risk involved, the United States must for our own protection and for the peace

of the world go to the help of Greece and Turkey at this time.

I would recognize the validity of many of the secondary arguments advanced against this legislation by conscientious and patriotic Members of the House if the world situation, with which we are confronted, were other than that which I have described. But these secondary considerations are of absolutely no avail in solving the supreme issue which confronts today not only our Government and people, but the entire world. That issue is simply this: Is the world civilization now in process of creation to be a civilization of freedom or of slavery? Does Americanism or communism hold the key to the future of mankind?

There stands the challenge which we must meet. And we must meet it here and now.

The moving finger writes; and, having writ,
Moves on; nor all your piety nor wit
Shall lure it back to cancel half a line;
Nor all your tears wash out a word of it.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Chairman, I yield 33 minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. COURTNEY].

Mr. COURTNEY. Mr. Chairman, I do not know why I am designated to open debate upon our side of the House. Conscious as I am of my own limitations, I had expected that the ranking minority Member and my distinguished colleagues who are my seniors on the committee would precede me. Unexpected, however, as my position in the debate is, I shall do the best I can. I shall endeavor to yield to the Members to answer any question that I can with respect to this bill, but I do request that you withhold requests for me to yield until I have completed the remarks I have prepared.

Mr. Chairman, today America stands at the crossroads. This is the day, this is the hour for a momentous and far-reaching decision. The issue to be determined is this: Are we to continue our old foreign policy of just muddling through, of shifting this way and that from day to day as in the past, with no long-range plan, until some crisis of unprecedented proportions descends upon us and finds us unprepared? I criticize our former peacetime foreign policy with no partisan feeling whatever. It was no more criminal to scuttle our Navy and reduce our armed forces to skeleton proportions under the Harding administration than it was under the Roosevelt administration to beat our breasts and wail to high heaven in sympathy with the Chinese and at the same time furnish Japan with oil and scrap with which to blast their cities and riddle their helpless bodies.

To adhere to our former uncertain policy is one alternative. The other is: Are we to adopt a new, firm, permanent, and far-sighted policy that will command respect throughout the world, give assurance to our friends, and give to every potential enemy reason to stop and think before seriously contemplating an act of aggression against us? The importance of this decision may be measured by the fact that had we had such a policy in the past, in my considered opinion, World War II would not have come upon us. The bones of our sons

that now lie buried on every continent and within the soil of every country, almost around the circling globe, would be walking upright with us in the flesh today, and their blood that stained the seven seas would never have been spilled. And upon this thought I shall amplify a little later.

It has been loosely said, Mr. Chairman, that we are eternally pulling England's chestnuts from the fire. This bill that we consider today is proposed for no such purpose. The objective it seeks to attain is protection for ourselves, and others who believe as we do, that we may continue our way of living. President Truman wisely said:

At the present moment in world history, nearly every nation must choose the alternate ways of life, between representative government and government by minority, based upon terror and oppression.

Yes; the forces of disintegration are on the march in all the countries which share our belief in the kind of world state we seek to establish. Greece and Turkey stand as bulwarks against communism in its spread from east to west, and their fall would hasten its further spread from the east around the world in the other direction. Should they succumb to communistic influence, we will see that doctrine spread like consuming fire from the Dardanelles to the China Sea, and then in the other direction throughout Europe. Soon America, aided with such feeble efforts as England may be able to command will stand alone against this despicable, evil, and degrading theory and form of government. So we are not pulling England's chestnuts out of the fire.

Incidentally it might be said, though such a consideration is relatively unimportant as respects this proposed legislation, the first fruits that would fall to Russia as her influence engulfed Greece and Turkey would be the control of 27,000,000,000 barrels of oil underground in the Middle East. When we realize that the United States has an estimated 21,000,000,000 barrels only underground, and that oil, or the lack of it, wins or loses a war, we have some food for thought on that score.

The unwarranted statement that we are always pulling England's chestnuts out of the fire came into common use because we have fought by England's side in two wars. We did not do this to help England primarily, but for the reason that, in both instances, we had no other alternative but to fight. In the first war the enemy engaged in a series of provocative acts against us that no self-respecting nation could endure; and the second time the common enemy thrust war upon us overnight. Such incidental help that England received, in both instances, was well deserved and well earned, for she has been our shield and our protection in the past. We have known throughout the years that she stood between us and any danger that might threaten from Europe; that the might of her navies underwrote the Monroe Doctrine and that our first line of defense was the far-flung battlements of the British Empire. But that sustaining protection is fading fast away. "I

have not," said Mr. Churchill several years ago, "become the King's first minister to preside over the liquidation of the British Empire." But Mr. Churchill is out of power and that disintegration proceeds apace.

Rudyard Kipling never dreamed that he spoke with true prophetic ken when he penned the lines:

Far called our navies melt away;
On dune and headland sinks the fire;
Lo! All the pomp of yesterday
Is one with Nineveh and Tyre.

And so England told us recently, with apologies and in sorrow, that her internal affairs and her economic position were such that she could no longer continue her commitments to Greece and Turkey, that had enabled these countries, so far, to exist as free and independent states.

Prior to our entrance into the last war, President Roosevelt said, or was quoted as saying, that our frontier was the Rhine. And I recall what a storm of criticism descended upon him. Now, however, after the experience of World War II and with the ushering in of this atomic age, we know verily that our frontier is anywhere in the world where there exists a potential enemy, and the frontier is right at his front door.

Mr. Chairman, since England's announcement that I referred to above, the Committee on Foreign Affairs has been in session for some 25 days. We have examined and have had the counsel and advice of high officials of the State, War and Navy Departments. Their significant testimony will be found in the record of the hearings. We had the benefit, too, of the advice of our respective ambassadors to Greece and Turkey; that was heard in executive session, not for the purpose of hiding anything from the members, but because from the nature of things, it would be improper for our representative, accredited to a foreign government, to frankly discuss the situation of that country and have his views passed back to its citizens to confront him on his return. Such a course would greatly embarrass him in his future relations with that government. We examined in all some 35 witnesses. We were much impressed by the testimony of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CRAWFORD], whom, by the way, I consider to be one of the ablest men in the House. His testimony will be found in the record from pages 178 to 195. He spoke with respect to several matters and set out in detail an amendment that he is to propose. He, however, was so impressed with the gravity of the situation prevailing, that he advocated, if I understood correctly certain portions of his testimony, that this bill to strengthen the resistance to communism falls far short of the mark; that what we should do is to send our representatives—Secretary Marshall and General Eisenhower, I presume—to Moscow, have them seek out Mr. Stalin and, standing up to him brow to brow and belly to belly, tell him bluntly that he must forthwith cease and desist from his devilment, call his troops back within their proper boundaries and proceed to disarm them, and that if he refused then to advise him to issue an alarm to his people so that non-

combatants might flee the cities and towns and take to the caves and the hills, as we expected immediately to fly over and blow the whole outfit to kingdom come.

Well, that is one way to handle the situation, and a rather expeditious one though, on the whole, somewhat Draconian. I doubt if the majority of you would want to go that far. But I do believe that all of you who read the record of the hearings carefully and the committee report will agree that this is must legislation.

And now to the bill itself, and I must apologize for taking up so much time with preliminaries before getting directly to the point at issue, but I thought some background might be helpful.

The bill authorizes an appropriation of \$400,000,000 in loans, grants, and credits, to Greece and Turkey, to enable them to survive as free and independent nations. It is assumed tentatively that some \$275,000,000 of this will go to Greece and some \$125,000,000 to Turkey. These funds would be used to give military aid to the two countries, especially Greece, and to give such help to both countries as may be necessary to build up their resources and their industries to a point where they would be on a going basis so that further help from us would not be necessary.

These countries are and have been subject to unusual pressures, as the committee report records, which threaten the peaceful existence of these nations and their right to maintain their freedom and national integrity. This pressure, to speak bluntly, is Russian and communistic, being applied to these countries, as it has to others in the past, steadily and with increasing force.

I know of no better way to describe the conditions in these countries than by quoting the words of the Honorable Dean Acheson, the Under Secretary of State, who has, I think, the most alert, active, and brilliant mind that it has ever been my privilege to contact. With respect to Greece, he says this:

Greece's difficulties are not new, but they have become acute as a result of special circumstances. Long before the war Greece had a hard time making ends meet. Her poverty of natural resources is so great that she has always needed more imports than she could pay for with exports. Only by hand-to-mouth contriving has she been able to maintain a precarious balance in her international economic position. In the past, much of her export trade went to central European markets, particularly to Germany. During the thirties she was forced into closer dependence on Germany through clearing agreements and other instruments of Nazi economic warfare. Then came the Italian invasion, the German invasion, 4 years of cruel enemy occupation and the scorching of her earth by the retreating enemy. Perhaps no other country in the world has suffered greater destruction of its physical resources than Greece. Furthermore, the authority of the Greek state is threatened by thousands of armed men who defy it.

It is certain that these insurgent groups are assisted from outside Greece by supplies and training in neighboring countries, including Bulgaria, Yugoslavia, and Albania, the three of them being backed up and supported by the Soviet Union.

The situation in Turkey differs substantially, and I again quote Mr. Acheson:

The Turkish Army has been mobilized since the beginning of World War II and this has put a severe strain upon the national economy. During the war, Turkey received substantial assistance from Great Britain and the United States, which helped her to carry this load.

Today the Turkish economy is no longer able to carry the full load required for its national defense and at the same time proceed with that economic development which is necessary to keep the country in sound condition. With some help from the United States, and further assistance which Turkey may be able to negotiate with United Nations financial organs, Turkey should be in a position to continue the development of her own resources and increase her productivity, while at the same time maintaining her national defenses at a level necessary to protect her freedom and independence.

Turkey is being subjected to severe external pressure, which has forced her to maintain large armed forces for defense purposes. This pressure includes repeated demands for the separation of certain portions of eastern Turkey from the rest of the country, and demands for bases which would virtually give Russia military control of the Dardanelles. The collapse and subjugation of Turkey would, in the opinion of our highest military experts, almost inevitably follow, and would involve the speedy collapse and subjugation of the entire Middle East.

This would greatly compromise the strategic position of the United States and aggravate the danger to world peace.

So, we see the necessity for this aid.

I shall now direct my attention to the questions frequently heard with respect to this legislation. First, how are we to know that these funds will go for the purposes intended and not be dissipated on unnecessary items. I quote now from the committee report:

It is understood that the American mission in Greece would be in a position to carry a large part of the responsibility for this activity. The expenditure in Greece of any funds that may be made available to the Greek Government for the program would be subject to control by the American mission there. Purchases in the United States with the funds made available would be made through the procurement agencies of the United States Government, or, if made otherwise, would be subject to careful supervision and strict control.

Members of the committee expressed the strongest concern that competent persons be sent to Greece to insure the development of controls at key points and to supervise their application.

The committee has been given assurance that our Government will insist that sound policies will be adopted and effectively administered in such matters as fiscal methods, a modern tax structure, strict husbanding and control of the foreign exchange earnings of the Greek people, conservation of remaining gold resources, a restriction on unessential imports, and the expansion of Greece's exports. These are all essential to the establishment of stability in Greece.

The military programs in Greece and Turkey will be administered through small groups of United States military and naval personnel sent to those countries for that purpose. They would screen requirements and advise in the best application and use of the materials and equipment made available to Greece and Turkey.

It was suggested by someone recently that funds advanced under this bill

might be dissipated through payments on loans to foreign governments. This is covered by a amendment to the bill, requiring that as a condition precedent to the receipt of assistance, the recipient government must agree "not to use any part of the proceeds of any loan, credit, or grant or other financial aid rendered pursuant to this act for the making of any payment on account of principal or interest on any loan made to such government."

In the next place, the question has been raised in many quarters as to why this whole matter should not be turned over to the United Nations. Well, primarily we are proposing this loan at the suggestion of the United Nations or a component agency thereof. The Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations was asked by the Greek Government to send a mission to Greece to look into the prevailing situation. The mission of the organization of the United Nations made a preliminary report in September 1946. The report is dated November 9, 1946. Recommendation No. 3 made by this associate organization of the United Nations is as follows:

It is recommended that the Greek Government request the Economic and Social Council of the United Nations and the Governments of the United States of America and the United Kingdom to aid it in securing funds for the continuation of essential food and other imports to cover the period after UNRRA's withdrawal until expanding exports, international-development loans, and expanding production enable Greece to balance its international accounts without special aid.

And that is essentially what Greece has done. It has in the past asked Great Britain for this assistance. Great Britain has now told her that she can no longer continue it. There is no point in appealing to the Economic and Social Council of the United Nations in this emergency because that organization has no funds with which to operate, nor has the United Nations itself, or any agency or organization thereof. The Economic and Social Council acts merely in an advisory capacity and has no particular executive powers. Greece is now asking the United States of America, which is the only source to which she can turn, as indicated by this organization's report as an emergency matter.

Furthermore the authority of the United Nations is recognized and preserved in the premises by an amendment that has been made to the bill now under consideration, which is as follows:

The President is directed to withdraw any or all aid authorized herein under any of the following circumstances:

* * *

2. If the President is officially notified by the United Nations that the Security Council finds (with respect to which finding the United States waives the use of any veto) or that the General Assembly finds that action taken or assistance furnished by the United Nations makes the continuation of such assistance unnecessary or undesirable.

The United Nations was not created to supersede the ordinary relations between states. If the United Nations can help in any situation, it certainly should do so, but no nation in the United Nations is precluded from asking the assistance of

any other friendly state when an economic or other internal matter arises which causes difficulty in the state.

And I quote from the testimony of Mr. Acheson again, at page 34 of the hearing:

For instance, some time ago the Export-Import Bank set aside \$500,000,000 to be loaned to China when conditions in China would make such expenditure of that money useful in the reconstruction of China. It did not, so far as I know, occur to anybody that that was showing any disrespect for or disinclination to support in every way the United Nations.

This Congress has appropriated very large sums of money to assist the new Philippine Republic. That was not considered in derogation of the United Nations.

The United States Government has done a great deal to assist the new Italian Republic. First and last, almost \$1,000,000,000 worth of goods have been made available to that new struggling republic.

All of these acts, I had supposed, were in support of the principles of the United Nations. Now, it is against that background, I think, that we ought to consider this request of the Greek Government and the various requests which the Turkish Government has made for economic assistance from the United States.

If there is anything in the charter which precludes us from doing what we have been doing with other countries since the charter was created without criticism from anybody, then we should stop and ponder those considerations very carefully.

But if there are not; we should not lose critical and valuable time in going forward in order to go through what would eventually be procedures which would lead right back to the requests which we are now making of the Congress.

Mr. BENDER. 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 five Members are present, a quorum.

The gentleman from Tennessee may proceed.

Mr. COURTNEY. Mr. Chairman, furthermore, were we to refer this matter to the United Nations, we would run smack into a Russian veto. Russia has already used the veto 10 times and has refused to join various United Nations subordinate organizations—the Food and Agriculture Organization, the International Trade Organization, the World Bank and Monetary Fund, UNESCO, and others. And so we could certainly expect Russian resistance to this proposal were it taken up within the framework of the United Nations. That the United Nations is not yet able to handle so urgent a situation as is presented does not mean that the United Nations has failed or is going to fail. Two hundred years elapsed between the first attempt to federalize the American Colonies and the triumph of the Union in 1865. With the progress made so far, I predict that within 12 months the United Nations will be perfected and will be functioning as intended if Russia will come around and begin at least a semblance of cooperation. The passage of this bill will serve perhaps to bring Russia to her senses and to point her in the right direction. General Marshall said that the mere proposal to make this loan to Greece and Turkey had a profound

and favorable effect upon the stolid Russian attitude. It was this proposal, in my opinion, that brought Stalin around when, after blocking all efforts for solutions of problems at the recent peace conference at Moscow, he said after the adjournment of the session that having proceeded so far with the discussions already, we will probably be able to get together at the next meeting, or words to that effect.

And this brings me down to the third and last objection frequently made to the bill: It may bring us into war. The Under Secretary of State was asked this direct question by the gentleman from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD]—see page 19 of the hearings:

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. Secretary, you have given this a good deal of thought and consideration. In your opinion, what are the possibilities of this policy leading to war?

Secretary ACHESON. I should say that—I was going to say there was no possibility of it leading to war.

I do not see how it possibly can lead to war. It seems to me that by strengthening the forces of democracy and individual freedom and strengthening the economies of those two countries, you do a great deal to eliminate the sort of situation which would produce friction between the great powers.

Russia does not want war now, but she will want it eventually if necessary for her ends and purposes when she thinks she has set the stage properly for it. Russia may be stupid, but not stupid enough to bring on war now. When we compare the British-American sphere with the Russian sphere, we find that at the present time the former controls 67 percent of the world's crop land, 84 percent of its coal, 85 percent of its industrial production, 85 percent of its steel, 85 percent of its railroad mileage, 89 percent of its electric power, 90 percent of its petroleum, and 97 percent of its shipping.

Russia's plan is not for war at the present time.

The Russian plan is one of infiltration, of troublemaking, of encouragement of civil war in outside areas. Her plan is to lay the groundwork for local Communist groups to take over, whittling away at the areas outside the Russian sphere, getting things set so that if and when a war does come her fifth column can make trouble for the other side. (See United States News, issue of May 2, 1947.)

And Russia has an active fifth column in every country in the world—stronger than any that Hitler had that enabled him to conquer country after country with such ease—and developments indicate that Russia has in this country today a fifth column far stronger and more effective than Franco, who coined the expression, had in Madrid as his other four columns marched upon it. Russia continues her dilatory tactics upon the amazing theory that the Government of the United States is about to go to pieces. Pravda, the official newspaper of the Communist Party, has recently been pursuing the line which likens our "bourgeois system" to a pyramid "the foundations of which are riddled with poverty and deprivation, while its summit is decorated with diamonds and gold." "Such a system must necessarily collapse," the Communist organ reasons,

and "involve the United States in a colossal economic crisis." And so Russia continues to delay the peace settlement, waiting for this chaos that she foresees to descend upon us so that we will be helpless to resist her demands. The quickest and easiest way to dissipate this illusion on the part of Russia and show her how false and ridiculous it is will be to pass this bill by an overwhelming majority, the object of which is to enable Greece and Turkey to strengthen their resistance to communism and to bring to an end the Machiavellian machinations of the Kremlin with regard to these two countries.

In closing, Mr. Chairman, to amplify a statement I made in the beginning of my remarks: We stand today where we stood in the early thirties when Japan first turned on helpless China with all the power of her first blitz attack. Had we followed the advice of the then Secretary of State Stimson, taken a firm attitude and said, "Thou shalt not, if an embargo on our exports to you, and financial aid and material help to China, short, of course, of intervention, can prevent you," then the course of tyranny and oppression that from that beginning spread over the world as a seething, hissing fire, would have been quenched in its incipiency.

Had we said the same thing to Italy when Mussolini sent his mechanized forces against helpless Ethiopia, even then we could have stopped it.

Had we said as much to Hitler as he poised his troops toward Poland, he would have blanched and quit, and death would never have stalked through the homes of every city, town, and village in America.

Shakespeare had his Brutus say in Julius Caesar:

There is a tide in the affairs of men,
Which, taken at the flood, leads on to fortune;
Omitted, all the voyage of their life
Is bound in shallows and in miseries.
On such a full sea are we now afloat
And we must take the current when it serves
Or lose our ventures.

And so, Mr. Chairman, it is with nations. God led this Nation to its present place of power, the strongest nation on the face of the earth. He did it, I think, with the divine belief and the divine expectation that we would accept and discharge the responsibilities that go with that power. We cannot escape, we must not escape our rendezvous with destiny.

Mr. EATON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to my esteemed friend and fellow member on the committee, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. SMITH].

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, it is not easy for me to come into the well of this House as a member of this great Committee on Foreign Affairs and to oppose the majority members of it. I have discussed this matter with my own chairman and I am sure he feels that I have a sincere conviction of my position, and I know that he would defend my right to assert that position this afternoon.

Mr. Chairman, I yield to no man in my desire to stamp out communism. As a member of the American Legion in the State of Wisconsin for more than 20

years, I traveled about the State calling attention to the menace of that foreign ideology. As department commander of that organization, I spent many hours trying to bring to the attention of my people just what communism would do to this country. Mrs. Smith, as president of the American Legion Auxiliary, did the same thing on a national level. So, I am unalterably opposed to communism and want to stamp it out.

Hardly without exception Members have come into the well of this House today and called attention to the seriousness of the present situation as reflected in this legislation. Indeed it is serious. I believe a terrible mistake has been made by the Rules Committee in limiting this debate to 9 hours. Here we are considering the greatest problem that has faced this country since it was organized and we are to debate it in 9 hours, and those who oppose it have 3 hours in which to state their position.

I want to serve notice on those Members who have come to me this afternoon asking for time. I want to tell them that the time has been oversubscribed by 100 percent, that there is not going to be time for you. I have asked for 10 minutes myself and at that reduced my time by two-thirds, if you please, to give those who want to speak an opportunity to do so. And yet we are asked to come into this House and debate this matter fully! How fully? How fully? You answer that question.

I am somewhat interested in the philosophy apparently of some who come into the well of the House and say: "Well, we do not have much of a stomach for this thing but I guess we have got to go along." What kind of reasoning is that? Have we got to go along with a man who is wrong just because we like him personally? I say that Harry Truman is wrong, and history will so record it. One of the primary issues in this debate, it seems to me, is the one wherein we are asked to follow this leadership, a leadership which led us into a war but which after we have fought it with dollars beyond comprehension and with the lives and blood of our children, now asks us to approach the threshold of the next one, which will be an atomic war, mark you well.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. I am sorry, I cannot yield to my distinguished friend from Michigan. My time is almost gone now.

Someone has said that we have got to save face, that in the Orient face saving means everything. I say to you we can well lose face instead of our necks. That is exactly what it is going to be. I do not propose to go along with any face-saving policy. This is no time to save face; it is time to save the Nation.

Let us proceed now to consider this "stop communism" proposition. Stop communism with \$400,000,000 and 40 to 50 men from the Army or Navy? Are we serious about that kind of proposal? Obviously it is so fallacious I am amazed that the argument is even made at all. I suggest if we are going to stop communism, let us stop it right here in this country. All of you gentlemen received

yesterday or the day before a report of J. Edgar Hoover made before the Un-American Activities Committee. Read that report. He tells you the extent of communism in this country. We will under this bill send \$400,000,000 to Greece and Turkey to stop communism there. What is the President asking for to stop communism in this country? He said, "Give me \$50,000,000 and we will clean them out of all the Government departments." Fifty million dollars in this country and \$400,000,000 over there. Does that make sense? Of course it does not.

I wonder if the President is sincere about stopping communism. A few weeks after he had appeared before this body former Governor Earle, of Pennsylvania, wrote to him and called attention to the danger of communism from within. And what was the President's amazing response? He said, "Mr. Earle, do not worry about that. Communism in this country is a bugaboo." Well, if it is a bugaboo in this country and if our national security is not involved, why should we worry about it in Turkey and Greece?

Oh, it is not communism. This is a military proposal; as so many have said on the floor of the House. The distinguished gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. COURNEY] put his finger on it. It is oil; it is the Dardanelles, and all we are doing is shoring up, if you please, a broken-down British economy which cannot afford to have the sword of Damocles hanging over the British in the eastern Mediterranean. I admire the British; I have no quarrel with them; and I do not blame them for getting all the assistance they can from us. But we ought to be prudent in this matter. We ought to consider this bill very thoroughly. Certainly we should not approach it by saying that it is a fight against communism. It is not a fight against communism, as I have indicated. It is a military proposal.

When Mr. Patterson appeared, I asked him this question: "Mr. Secretary, assuming that you got what you asked for in this bill, then you found out in 6 months or a year that it did not work to our advantage, that we did not stop communism?" What was his answer? He said, "Frankly, I do not know." He said, "I know that is not the kind of answer you want but," he says, "I cannot tell you."

Mr. Chairman, there is the crux of the whole situation. We are asked to support a proposition and we do not know where we are going or where it is leading us. There is no indicator on the highway. I challenge anybody in the course of this debate to show me in writing or in print the State Department's policy on this matter.

What is the plan? The plan is a military one. I believe we ought to tell the American people that is what it is. We ought to go before the American people and say, "We have a national interest in those oil fields in the Middle East and we will have to take military action if necessary."

Why not be forthright in this matter? But no, it is the old, old technique; little by little, inch by inch, and then finally

we find ourselves in the position that we are in today and we cannot back out.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin has expired.

Mr. EATON. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman two additional minutes.

Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. EATON. The gentleman was pleading for more hours of general debate. I am sure the empty seats in this House do not lend color to that statement, since only a handful here represent 435 Members.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. I might say to my distinguished colleague that he knows how these debates are handled. It is just a matter of routine, is it not? But, those who are here are ready and willing to talk.

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will count. Ninety-five Members are present, not a quorum. The Clerk will call the roll.

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

	[Roll No. 50]
Abernethy	Fogarty
Allen, Ill.	Fuller
Anderson,	Gallagher
Calif.	Gifford
Andrews, N. Y.	Gillie
Barden	Granger
Battle	Gregory
Bland	Gwynne, Iowa
Bonner	Haleck
Boykin	Harris
Bradley, Mich.	Hartley
Buckley	Heffernan
Bulwinkle	Hinshaw
Burleson	Hope
Byrne, N. Y.	Howell
Celler	Judd
Chapman	Kearns
Chef'	Kee
Clark	Keefe
Clements	Kefauver
Cole, Kans.	Kelley
Cooley	Kennedy
Cotton	Kilburn
Coudert	King
Curtis	Lane
D'Alessandro	Latham
Davis, Tenn.	Lea
Dawson, Ill.	Lesinski
Doughton	Lucas
Ellsworth	Lusk
Elsesser	McDowell
Elston	McGregor
Fellows	Madden
Fisher	Mansfield, Tex.
Flanagan	Meade, Ky.
	Wilson, Tex.
	Worley
	Meade, Md.
	Miller, Nebr.
	Mitchell
	Morrison
	Nixon
	Nodar
	O'Toole
	Pace
	Pfeifer
	Philbin
	Poage
	Powell
	Rabin
	Rivers
	Sarbacher
	Scoblick
	Scott, Hardie
	Shafer
	Short
	Sikes
	Smith, Maine
	Smith, Va.
	Stockman
	Sundstrom
	Taylor
	Thomas, N. J.
	Thomason
	Towe
	Trimble
	Van Zandt
	Vinson
	Welch
	West

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. CASE of South Dakota, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill H. R. 2616, and finding itself without a quorum, he had directed the roll to be called when 327 Members responded to their names, a quorum, and he submitted herewith the names of the absentees to be spread upon the Journal.

The SPEAKER. The Committee will resume its sitting.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. SMITH] is recognized.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. DONDERO. Just before the gentleman was rudely interrupted by a quorum call, he stated there were Members on this floor who were going to vote for this bill just to go along. That reminded me immediately of my experience in Germany a year ago last summer. When I asked the German people, from Hamburg to the Rhine, in their language why they followed Hitler so blindly, their answer was "Because they had to go along," and they did to their destruction.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. I thank the gentleman for that very excellent contribution. That is exactly what is going to happen here.

I want to say to my Republican brethren, you pass this bill and next year, 1948, you will have the indispensable man on your hands and the swapping of horses in the middle of the stream just as sure as you are a foot high. That is where we are headed and we ought to realize it.

Mr. Chairman, in conclusion, remember, this is just another blank check; no program—just give us the money.

I hope that when an amendment to cut this amount is offered the committee will very seriously consider it. Also other amendments that will be presented when the bill is read.

Mr. Chairman, I am opposed to this legislation because I believe it is, first of all, a military venture, secondly, that it is not designed to stop communism, and, thirdly, that it is in effect a declaration of war against Russia. When, as, and if we go to war again, we will emerge from it, if we are victors, the greatest imperialist Nation in the world. That will be a burden to the American people and will ultimately lead to the extinction of the North American Republic. What a heritage to anticipate for those who follow us. Members of this House have a great and lasting responsibility. We should vote our firm convictions and not be swayed by pressure to go along with the present administration.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin has expired.

Mr. EATON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. VORYS].

DOES NOT BYPASS UNITED NATIONS

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, this bill presents momentous questions for us to decide, but there are certain questions that, in my judgment, are not involved. Mr. Chairman, there has been considerable discussion as to whether this proposal bypasses the United Nations. I want to point out that the little country of Greece months and months ago appealed to the United Nations for help in their perilous condition, caused by guerrillas coming across their northern border, and has gotten no action yet from the United Nations investigating committee, which is tied up by Soviet obstruction and delay. It looks to me as if the United Nations is bypassing Greece rather than the United States bypassing the United Nations. Senator Austin has reported our proposed action to the United Nations. The Vandenberg amendment in this bill gives the Security Council of the United Nations the right to stop our assistance by majority vote, and we waive our veto. The United Nations FAO Committee has rec-

ommended to the United Nations, in its report on Greece, that Greece apply to the United States for assistance. The United Nations has no funds and no machinery for rendering such assistance. In view of all this, I feel that the claim that this bill bypasses the United Nations is simply an attempt to bypass our responsibility on this bill.

NOT A RELIEF BILL

There has been a lot of talk that this bill is a relief bill. I want to point out that the word "relief" is not used in this bill. It is an assistance or aid bill; to authorize the President to furnish assistance up to \$400,000,000 to Greece and Turkey upon their request when it is in our interest. The assistance is to consist of economic and military loans, grants, supplies, and advice. This is not merely a loan bill. This is an assistance bill.

PURPOSE OF THIS BILL

The purpose is to start stopping Soviet aggression, and it is about time that we started to do this. One nation after another has been taken over by the Soviet, and by the administration policy of appeasement we have ignored or condoned and thus encouraged this expansion and aggression. The time has come when we can no longer condone or appease or look the other way, as Members today have suggested, as this aggression goes on.

Now, this is the way the bill will work. Greece and Turkey are on the spot. This bill may help them enough to relieve the pressure on them. Our help should then be sufficient to make those countries good economic risks for the World Bank for further aid, if they are considered good military risks. Now, no life insurance company would grant a policy on the life of a man who had been threatened by gangsters, even though the threats were utterly lawless and the man utterly innocent. On the other hand, if the gangsters agreed to lay off, or if the man were assured police protection, he then would become a good risk for a life-insurance policy. No world bank is going to loan Greece and Turkey money at present. If Greece and Turkey were assured police protection by the United Nations or by the United States and other member nations, acting under article 51 of the Charter of the United Nations, in case of armed attack, until the United Nations was ready to aid, Greece and Turkey might then become bankable risks, and this is a first step in that direction.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VORYS. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. The gentleman stated a moment ago that Greece had months and months ago applied for relief to the United Nations.

Mr. VORYS. Not for relief.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Or for assistance and aid. What was the position of the United States delegates to the United Nations on that request?

Mr. VORYS. The United States participates and has membership on the Commission, which is still investigating. We are investigating what everybody

knows is going on across the northern Greek border.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. What was the position of the United States delegates?

Mr. VORYS. The United States delegates supported it.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. I mean the United States delegates to the United Nations, what was their position on this particular request?

Mr. VORYS. They supported the request and are participating in the action which is now going on.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VORYS. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. When I was home recently a minister of the gospel accosted me and asked me some pertinent questions, and I would like to ask the gentleman one or two at this time. He asked me how strong is the present Greek Government, and in the event that this loan goes through, will the Greek people be represented in the disposition and administration of this loan?

Mr. VORYS. The answer is, It would strengthen the Greek Government. It is a very weak government. It is using police measures to attempt to preserve order, in a country that has been devastated and torn asunder by war, and that is threatened by guerrillas supported from outside. The only reason we are offering aid and assistance is that the government is weak. If we provide this assistance, we are going to bolster up that government and we are going to insure that it is a democratic government. I do not think we should dictate the type of government they should have in Greece any more than we should do so in any other country, or than we would permit any dictation here.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VORYS. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. Can the gentleman enlighten the Members of the Committee as to what success the Allied Commission of the United Nations is having in investigating the Communist activities in the Balkan and central European area? Have they made any report up to this moment?

Mr. VORYS. No; they have not made a report. The report is stymied by the Polish and Soviet members of the Commission appointed by the United Nations. The interpreter joined the guerrillas. That was another action embarrassing to the Commission. We know from this about how effective United Nations action can be at this time.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VORYS. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. BLOOM. May I add that the Commission was supposed to report on the 1st of April, and it has not done so yet on account of the opposition by the two governments the gentleman named.

Mr. VORYS. Yes; the United Nations Commission was supposed to act by the 1st of April but it is still tied up and stymied by the same forces that would tie up and stymie and delay any attempt to refer this matter again to the United Nations.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. If the gentleman will yield further, the gentleman seemed concerned about the question of free elections in Greece. May I ask his opinion of that?

Mr. VORYS. The last election was a free election according to about 600 observers, among them many Americans. When Greece gets ready to have another election, I hope she will again have a free election. One of the purposes of this aid is to maintain Greece's integrity so that she can have free elections and choose the kind of government she wants.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. JACKSON of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VORYS. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. JACKSON of California. Is it not true that the Commission investigating the border disturbances on the northern frontiers of Greece was turned back at the border of Yugoslavia and not permitted to enter?

Mr. VORYS. Not only Yugoslavia but Bulgaria.

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VORYS. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. OWENS. What testimony did you have before the committee to that effect?

Mr. VORYS. We had the testimony of both ambassadors and we had the testimony of the Under Secretary of State, Mr. Clayton. If the gentleman will familiarize himself with the hearings, I will point out further testimony. We also have the long questionnaire prepared in the other body, answered by the Under Secretary of State, Mr. Acheson.

NOT THE MONROE DOCTRINE NOR LEND-LEASE

This is not an extension or a violation of the Monroe Doctrine. Remember, we are invited to do this by both Greece and Turkey. We have furnished similar assistance in South America, in China, in the Philippines. European nations have furnished military equipment and advice in South America, on request, and we have not claimed this violated the Monroe Doctrine.

This is not like lend-lease, in that neither of these nations are now at war.

THE OPEN-DOOR POLICY

This is an extension of our open-door policy. When China was about to be divided by the great powers, we stepped in and said that we wanted, not a slice for ourselves, but an open door for all, and demanded territorial and administrative integrity for China. That policy was announced under a Republican administration, by Secretary of State John Hay. It was written into a nine-power treaty here in Washington in 1922 under a Republican administration when Charles Evans Hughes was Secretary of State.

Our Government offered at Potsdam to help guarantee to Russia an open door through the Dardanelles in peace and war. Russia, however, wants the key to the door herself. We want no special position. All we are asking is an open

door through the Middle East for Russia, Greece, Turkey, and all of us.

We are not pulling any British chestnuts out of the fire there because the British chestnuts in the Middle East are in the fire and gone whether we do anything or not. The question is, whether we help those Middle East nations maintain an open door, or whether Russia closes the door.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Ohio has expired.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Chairman, I yield five additional minutes to the gentleman from Ohio.

THE NEW POLICY

Mr. VORYS. What makes this bill unique, a new policy for us, is that Russia seems to be offended at our friendly response to a request for help from her neighbors. Stalin knows Greece and Turkey are not going to attack Russia. He knows Russia is pledged not to attack them. The new part of the policy is that we may respond to requests for economic assistance and legitimate military advice on defense, whether Russia likes it or not.

INCREASES CHANCES FOR PEACE

Will Russia fight over this? I think not. The experts say Russia will not fight now because she is not ready. These same experts said Russia would not last 90 days against the Germans. If Russia fights, the assistance possible under this bill would not enable Greece or Turkey to stand for long unassisted against an all-out Soviet attack. That simple fact plainly shows the fundamentally unmilitary character of this particular bill. On the other hand, if any nation, anywhere, launched an aggressive, unprovoked attack on a neighbor now, I think this Congress would back a United Nations request for police action, and would join with other nations for collective defense under article 51 of the Charter, if the Security Council were paralyzed by a veto, and I think our counterblow as a part of such collective self-defense would not necessarily be made at the place where the attack was taking place but might be by air elsewhere. This bill does not commit us on that question. The passage of this bill shows, however, that we will not refuse justified and necessary unilateral action, even though expensive and unpleasant, merely because of the threat of unjustified and unnecessary unilateral action, however unpleasant and expensive, by the Soviets. This bill shows we are not pulling out of Europe, but intend to stay and help work things out.

If we fail to do anything to assist Greece and Turkey now, there is no reasonable chance of their resisting the pressures now being exerted against them. If they go down and become satellites and the satellite frontier moves forward, we may expect political disorder and economic disruption in the Near and Middle East from the same causes, and with similar results. After the domination of the Dardanelles and the Suez Canal by the Soviets, there is no effective strategic, economic, or ideological line of resistance short of the Atlantic, and we know that this ocean is now no barrier to subversive infiltration activities which are now going on in the capi-

tals of the Western Hemisphere. Such activities are going on right here in Washington. If we do nothing now, when our right has been challenged even to help and advise these two nations, our decision will announce to the world that we are withdrawing to the Western Hemisphere, and no amount of talking, or making proposals in the Security Council will convince the aggressors or their would-be victims otherwise. I know, from personal talks with statesmen and common people in Greece, Turkey, and from the other nations in Europe and the Near East who had representatives at the Interparliamentary Union meeting in Cairo, what a lift this Greek-Turkish proposal has given them. If we do nothing now, we might as well withdraw to our own borders, double our military budget, adopt universal military training, and get ready for the bitter end of World War II in a few years.

If fighting should break out now, at least Russia will not be as ready as she will be in a few years with a continent to use as a base. After seeing the war-devastated countries, I believe in fighting our wars away from home. I think this bill is a step toward peace, by stopping Russia from achieving the fruits of war by unprovoked, unjustified, yet unresisted aggression. On the issue of whether this brings us nearer to war or not, I prefer to rely on the judgment of General Marshall rather than that of General Bender. I think the bill will bring Russia to her senses. If it does not, and war with Russia is inevitable, and she starts now, we will be better able to defend ourselves now than later.

CONDITION IN GREECE AND TURKEY

I was in Greece and Turkey a little over 3 weeks ago. I realize that I did not become an expert in the few days that I was there. I learned enough, however, from what I saw, and from my talks with Greek and Turkish officials, with our American representatives, with newspaper correspondents, and others to confirm the information given by our Ambassadors and others in the hearings and to refute certain reckless generalities that have been made in this debate.

Turkey is not a corrupt and venal dictatorship. Its government is not perfect by any means. They are struggling to become a western democracy. They have adopted our clothes, our alphabet, our Sunday, and an enlightened code of laws. They have an opposition party which attacks the party in power for its extravagance, corruption, and inefficiency. This proves, at least, the degree of free speech permitted in Turkey. One of our delegates said that these criticisms sound just like home. I never could secure a reliable figure on the number of men they had under arms. The figure in the hearings is 600,000, but I believe it is much larger. The reason for secrecy is obvious, considering the threat that hangs over them. This threat is very real. They know of the Soviet troops massed above their border. Soviet diplomatic pressure continues. Five times a day the Soviet radio beams Turkish-language broadcasts across the northern border, filled with threats and abuse. You see soldiers everywhere. The Government is secretive as to the total

amount their present state of preparedness is costing, although it adds up to at least 50 percent of their budget. Again, the reason for secrecy is obvious. It is simply untrue to say that the Turks will sell out to either side in a struggle where Soviet Russia is involved. I have been assured, by Turks and by Americans in Turkey, that the Turks will fight to the last man against any Russian invasion, whether we help or not. The lend-lease equipment we have already given them is of value in their defense. The assistance planned in this bill, only a part of which is for arms and ammunition, will enable them to defend themselves more effectively and will relieve the dreadful strain of their present burden. The encouragement to them and the deterrent to their enemies which is implied in this assistance is of even greater importance.

Greece is not a royalist dictatorship. Greece has a very weak Government, with a new King, uncertain of his position, with a coalition of anti-Communist parties attempting to carry on and preserve order in a poor country that suffered more than any other in the war. I have had Greek republicans, who opposed the monarchy, tell me that they would prefer to see any new election postponed until the country can get on its feet and feel safe from outside aggression, for only then, they say, can a free choice be made between a monarchy and a republic in Greece. At present, the only choice is between the constitutional monarchy, which was voted in by a fair election last fall, and communism. The connection between the Communists in Greece and Moscow is so clear that it is taken for granted in Athens. I saw leftist papers on the streets, with pictures of Stalin and cartoons against the United States. Their contents shows that they are part of the world-wide Communist movement headed from Moscow. A day in Athens confirms what our Ambassadors and high officials have told us.

ENDING WORLD WAR II—PAST MISTAKES

I am one of those who opposed every step our Government took in 1939-41 toward war in the name of keeping out of war. I urged, not isolation but friendly neutrality, an American peace offensive, with the hope that we might stop the war before we got into it. We did not follow that course. It is useless now to debate what might have happened if we had done so. After Pearl Harbor I voted for the laws that spent three hundred and forty-one billions and brought wounds and death to a million Americans in order to win the war. Now, over 5 years after the struggle began, I am forced to this grim realization: If we fought the war for the ideals and purposes we said we were fighting for, either the war is not over or we lost it. I prefer to believe it is not over. We have no peace treaties with our main enemies. We have no feeling of security; the totalitarian threat against our way of life is still critical. Soviet expansion, by infiltration and aggression, has taken more territory and subjugated more people in the last 2 years, we are told, than either Germany or Japan conquered in the 4 years before that.

It will not do much good to debate now the New Deal policy of appeasement that is partly responsible for this. It was not a bipartisan policy. Republicans generally opposed it. We were for a policy of firmness with Russia. Now that our policy of firmness is at last being followed, we Republicans should back it up.

By this new policy we seek a happy ending of World War II without further fighting.

The administration made a lot of mistakes in launching this program. Republicans should have been consulted earlier. Paul Porter, the most thoroughly repudiated public official in America, should not have headed the mission to Greece. The United Nations should have been informed earlier. We should never have been told that March 31 was the deadline.

So what? All of this is spilled milk—very sour spilled milk—but there is no use crying over it. If this bill is voted down it will be taken the world over, not as a vote of protest against the administration's past mistakes, but as a vote against the new policy of firmness backed with action instead of words. It will look like a vote of confidence in Stalin, a vote of lack of confidence in ourselves and our way of life. This bill does not give the Governments of Greece or Turkey a vote of confidence. It is their own lack of confidence that prompts their requests.

CONFIDENCE IN DEMOCRACY

We are not going to take over those Governments. We are going to furnish a lot of advice, pressing advice, but they will run themselves. In the end, suppose after we have furnished all this help, they vote into power, by fair elections, a Communist regime controlled from Moscow. Why, then we are through. Democracy, as we know it, is through. We are told that just will not happen, that no country in the world outside Russia ever adopted communism by majority vote. Remember, the Communist system involves a single minority party taking over the government by revolutionary means. But if, with the provisions for publicity in this bill, with the urge for freedom we know is afire in those nations, the Communists can win in a fair election, we, of course, are through.

It is our faith that people who have a chance to be free will stay free. We need a little more faith and confidence in ourselves, our system. We need to believe in it. We need a little more of the missionary zeal the Communists have. This is our chance. I have such faith in the dynamic power of democracy that I believe we will save money on our military budget eventually by a judicious and well-ordered plan of assisting in the rebuilding of the economy and the defense of the world. I believe this will bring peace nearer; at worst, it will make our defense cheaper.

I am concerned at the strain on our resources, but if we act wisely we will not go bankrupt. We need more faith in the terrific productive power of our free land. I believe that our production plant, with the marvelous possibilities of atomic energy just ahead, is going to make us and the world richer. I believe

that our American way of doing things is going to sweep over the world, including Russia, not by force, but by friendliness; not by military power, but by spiritual power; not because of its might, but because it is right.

I have faith in America. We have the kind of strength, moral and material, to assist Greece and Turkey and a war-torn world, right in our stride, as we grow stronger here at home.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Vorys] has expired.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman one additional minute.

Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VORYS. I yield.

Mr. MUNDT. I think it is important that we emphasize the point made by the gentleman from Ohio that the appeasement policy which preceded the March 12 address by the President to the joint session of Congress was not a bipartisan policy.

Mr. VORYS. Amen.

Mr. MUNDT. Either wise or wrong, it was an administration policy. I want to emphasize to my Republican colleagues that this is the first thing we have approximating a bipartisan foreign policy, jointly arrived at by Republicans and Democrats, originally given emphasis by the elections in November, but evolving from that to the point today where the Republicans and Democrats stand committed to a discontinuation of the appeasement program with Russia.

Mr. VORYS. I agree, and I hope the Republicans will not desert this new bipartisan policy of firmness through action, instead of appeasement.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Ohio has again expired.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. JARMAN].

Mr. JARMAN. Mr. Chairman, in view of the statements just made by my distinguished colleagues that until now we have had no bipartisan foreign policy, I can but wonder what a gentleman named VANDENBERG has been doing during the past 2 years.

My good friend, the distinguished gentleman from Wisconsin, spoke of the fact that the President asked for \$50,000,000 to clear Communists out of the Federal Government and \$400,000,000 to withstand their advance into Greece and Turkey, and said, "Where are we going?" or something to that effect. My comment on that is, first, Greece and Turkey are much nearer to the great majority of the Communists of the world than is Washington. Secondly, I hope and believe there are a great many more Communists in Russia than in Washington.

The gentleman also correctly quoted Secretary of War Patterson to the effect that we are not sure where this course will lead. How can anyone ever be sure of the final result of such a tremendous, momentous problem? I will say, however, that the burden of the testimony before the committee was to the effect that if we do not do something we will most probably be in a bad way, whereas there is great hope in this effort.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JARMAN. I will yield to the gentleman from Ohio. Then please may I not be permitted to continue with my statement? I gladly yield to my good friend the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. VORYS. On this matter it is only costing \$50,000,000 to eliminate Communists from this country. The gentleman was in the last war. Does not the gentleman believe that the place to stop communism is before it gets to the borders of our country as a possible military force?

Mr. JARMAN. I thoroughly agree with the gentleman and wish to thank him for his contribution.

Just as I said this morning, it was much preferable to fight Hitler in Hitler's territory than here.

Mr. Chairman, I quote from President Truman's message to the Congress:

The gravity of the situation which confronts the world today necessitates my appearance before a joint session of the Congress.

The foreign policy and the national security of this country are involved. * * *

This is no more than a frank recognition that totalitarian regimes imposed on free peoples, by direct or indirect aggression, undermine the foundation of international peace and hence the security of the United States. * * *

This is a serious course upon which we embark. I would not recommend it except that the alternative is much more serious. * * *

If we falter in our leadership we may endanger the peace of the world—and we shall surely endanger the welfare of our own Nation.

Great responsibilities have been placed upon us by the swift movement of events. * * *

On this subject the executive and legislative branches of the Government must work together.

Those, Mr. Chairman, are strong, momentous words, words in which I do not believe any President of the United States, past, present, or future, be he Democrat or Republican, would indulge casually, frivolously, or without mature consideration of good reasons. If my confidence in the people of the United States is justified, or even if it is merely half justified, certainly those words pose a challenge to statesmanship to us that we cannot lightly wave aside. Certainly those words place a responsibility for statesmanship upon the shoulders of each one of us which must be answered by each individually.

I thoroughly agree with the gentleman who made the statement this morning that on this subject it is a matter between us and our God. Certainly, Mr. Chairman, that being true, none of us can devote a moment's consideration to answering that challenge to statesmanship by falling victim to any of the faults of human nature such as pride of authorship, jealousy, publicity, or politics; nor will we do so. On the other hand, each Member of this House must and will decide this question for himself with one idea, and one alone in mind, that is, a patriotic consideration of what is for the best interests of the country we all love. Yes; standing out over any petty considerations such as those to which I

have referred must be that patriotic love of country. It must stand out just as Mount Suribachi on which those magnificent marines, incredibly it seemed to me as I stood on the spot and looked down that steep, rocky grade, raised Old Glory, stands out over the little island of Iwo Jima and looks down on every acre of it, including the graves of more than 4,000 American soldiers in the cemeteries on the right and on the left. Out of that strong language there naturally grew this bill which could well be termed "a bill to aid Greece and Turkey maintain their independence, prevent domination of those countries by communism, and contribute to permanent peace."

This merely faces up to what I believe is probably the great responsibility of our age—the prevention of communistic domination of the world. We are quite willing to have Russia maintain the form of government she wishes in her own country. We not only do not wish her to try to inflict that form of government on us but we do not wish her to succeed in inflicting it on the rest of the world, leaving us standing out isolated and alone as Suribachi stands out on Iwo Jima.

A most unfortunate situation confronts Greece as was so ably explained in detail by the distinguished gentleman from Tennessee [MR. COURTEEN] and I shall not repeat but try to briefly supplement it. Before doing so, my mind reverts to the thrilling headlines we read each morning during the dark days of 1940. How greedily we read each word which told of the magnificent feat of those brave little Greek soldiers as they stood their ground against Mussolini's legions, Mussolini having decided, against the advice of his senior partner, to conquer them without assistance. Not only did they stand their ground but I think there is no doubt either in the United States, in Greece, in Italy, or in Germany that could the issue have been resolved entirely between these countries, valiant little Greece would have defeated a much larger neighbor. Consequently, it became necessary for Hitler's hordes to flow down and literally engulf the Greek Army. In the meantime, however, it had sufficiently retarded his advance to save hundreds of thousands of lives, at least thousands of which were those of Americans. Do not we, does not the world, owe this noble little country a debt of gratitude?

It is common knowledge that Greece would have long since collapsed but for the hope engendered in the breasts of her brave people by this legislation. There is not the shadow of a doubt in the mind of any informed man that should this legislation by any chance fail of passage she would collapse—certainly within 2 weeks. It is not civil war either but an attempted Communist revolution. It is simply a part of the same Balkan pattern which has been in progress since VE-day, a pattern which I think a great Englishman foresaw when he insisted on an attack, when he repeatedly insisted on an attack, on the soft under belly of Europe at a time when you will remember Marshal Stalin was insisting with even more determina-

tion on the creation of a second front by an attack from across the channel. Everyone must realize now that what Churchill mainly had in mind was the desire that Allied armies be in the Balkans when the war ended, instead of what happened. It was a mistake, but both individuals and countries frequently make them, particularly during war, and it was one of the head and not of the heart.

As to the situation in Turkey, that was well illustrated by an article that appeared in Sunday's Washington Post, referring to the capture of a Bulgarian soldier down near the corner where Greece, Turkey, and Bulgaria join. He was carried to a commissioner for questioning who happened to be of Bulgarian descent and who happened to recognize that his pronunciation was not Bulgarian. Soon the prisoner confessed that he was a Russian lieutenant of the intelligence department and that Marshal Zhukov had instructed his organization to get plans of all the roads in Turkey and how many divisions each could handle. He had a map in his pocket of all the installations in that whole area. Two days later he was exchanged for one of the Turkish spies the Bulgars had captured. The high command of Turkey was not disturbed about that because they were thoroughly convinced that the whole thing was planned, the capture, his confession, the map, and everything, just a part of the war of nerves with which Turkey has been afflicted and will continue to be afflicted indefinitely.

Turkey cannot continue to maintain the tremendous army it feels is necessary to combat this war of nerves and the threat against her, and also maintain its economy. If her people do not receive assistance, they will naturally become discouraged and the danger will soon be as great in Turkey as it is now in Greece.

It is rather amusing to me to hear this program referred to as intervention, when, as the gentleman from Tennessee well said, every single thing proposed to be done in this bill has been definitely requested by the governments themselves.

Furthermore, the report makes it quite plain that we have no desire to intervene in the local governments of the countries concerned. We want them, as long as they believe in democracy, to have whatever particular form of government they wish, just as we do not wish Russia telling us or the world what kind we or it should have.

Now, I think it is generally understood that civilization very probably cannot withstand the shock and the destruction of another war. Our main hope against another war is, of course, the United Nations organization which can, must, and I believe will, succeed. It is equally ridiculous to me to refer to bypassing the United Nations with this legislation. The United Nations as such has no funds. As was said, the Social and Economic Council merely recommends. It is an advisory council which recommends social and economic action to the countries of the United Nations. The Export-Import Bank, which has just completed its organization and has made no loan, makes

long-term self-liquidating loans. The Advisory Commission for Europe is only in its early stages of organization. Hence, had Greece requested this assistance from the United Nations instead of from us, the only result would have been, even in the absence of a veto, great delay, because it would have been necessary for the United Nations to refer the request to us, since we are the only nation in the world in position to grant the relief at this particular time.

Furthermore, as has also been said, the Food and Agricultural Organization of the United Nations made a careful analysis of the situation in Greece and suggested that Greece request aid of us. However, to make the assurance doubly sure, an amendment stipulates that either the General Assembly or the Security Council of the United Nations may order the discontinuation of our efforts under this legislation at any time, and by it we waive the veto in advance.

* The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Alabama has expired.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman five additional minutes.

Mr. JARMAN. Mr. Chairman, another angle of that United Nations proposition is, if we are correct in the belief that this is the only hope for peace, how foolish would it be to load it down with matters which it cannot take care of; matters which are not its functions. It is performing its function right now in the mountains of northern Greece. When that trouble occurred, that threat, Greece requested the United Nations to send a commission over there, and they have done so, but as far as authorizing or contributing \$400,000,000, the United Nations simply has no funds at this time for that purpose, and the easiest way we could kill it would be for this Congress to unilaterally pass legislation to try to have it take over a burden which is absolutely impossible for it to accomplish.

Certainly, my friends, if we believe in peace—and I know we all do—and if we agree that either the United Nations or something like it must succeed if civilization is to survive—and I think most of us do—certainly I beg of you let us not take the chance of crippling, if not killing, the only hope for the salvation of the world.

In conclusion, Mr. Chairman, not only is it hoped that this communistic penetration will immediately stop, thereby removing the threat to the Middle and the Far East and the indirect threat to the peace of the world, but it is equally sincerely hoped that passage of this legislation will have a most salutary general effect on Stalin and Russia as well as on the peoples in the other countries of Europe who believe in democracy, and that it will encourage those people to continue or commence their fight for freedom. Not only that, Mr. Chairman, but I am impelled to hope that it will also have a most salutary effect on the people of our own country who are performing the tremendous disservice to our country and the world of so greatly encouraging the spread of communism. To my mind, they are more dangerous to the future of this country, on which the peace of the world depends, than paid agents and proponents of this foreign ideology. I hope,

incredible though it be to believe, that many of them are unaware of the result of their activity, and that this legislation will cause them to stop, look, and listen, just as, I repeat, it is the duty of every Member of this House in meeting the challenge to statesmanship to which I referred in the beginning to stop, look, and listen.

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JARMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. OWENS. Was the gentleman present when Mr. Inman, guest professor of international relations, Ohio Wesleyan University, testified?

Mr. JARMAN. Unfortunately I was in Alabama during 1 day of the hearings, and Mr. Inman appeared at that time.

Mr. OWENS. Will the gentleman tell me what he thinks of this statement of Mr. Inman:

Every man who travels outside the United States today knows that people everywhere—even in Canada, the Scandinavian countries, Holland and England—talk of fear of American dominance. The other great fear is of communism. The way to throw the weight of the public opinion of the world on the side of Russia is to follow the President's plan to start arranging the affairs of other nations for them.

What is the gentleman's thought about that?

Mr. JARMAN. I answer that by saying that the President positively has no such plan.

Mr. FULTON. If the gentleman will yield, I wish to compliment him on the statement that this is America's job.

Mr. EATON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. VURSELL].

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Chairman, the President's proposal in this bill to extend our foreign policy to the point where we are committed to defend by force, if necessary, any nation in the world with our men, money, and munitions whose governments are threatened or about to be overthrown by aggressor nations, is a commitment our American people do not approve if they understood it. It is a commitment we should not make, we cannot keep, and in attempting to keep it, may destroy the economic and financial solvency of this Nation.

The President's proposal to expend \$400,000,000 to send money and men into Greece and Turkey, is the most momentous step the people of this Nation have been asked to take since we became a nation following the Revolutionary War. It may far exceed in importance our entry into the two world wars. In each of these wars we had allies. Now we are branching out on our own on to the unchartered fields of the world. Let no one be deceived. This is a world program and a world commitment on the part of the United States to use the military forces and might of the Nation around the world at the expense of the United States Government and through the sacrifice of her people on the home front, and our young manhood on the battle fronts of the world in the future.

Mr. Chairman, we are asked by this legislation to wrap up a \$400,000,000 diplomatic atomic bomb, so to speak, and

place it, with the detonating mechanism all set for explosion, on the very doorstep of the satellite nations of Soviet Russia. If ever there was a time for the Members of this Congress to quit dreaming and idealizing, and seriously face what we are doing here today, and its effect on the people of America and the world, the moment is upon us. We should consider legislation as realists and not as theorists or idealists. We all endorse the idea of stopping communism. But as realists, can we endorse this proposal as the proper approach?

Let us strip away the wishful thinking and look at this legislation in the light of what it may mean, rather than what we hope it means. More than half of the \$400,000,000 is admittedly for military aid to Greece and Turkey. We are told that the purpose of this loan is to "stop communism," which is the political ideology of Soviet Russia. All of us detest the reprehensible record of the Russian Government and all of us are opposed to its ideology of communism. If by voting for this appropriation of \$400,000,000 we could stop communism even in the Middle East we would support it, but tied in with this initial step is a world commitment 1,000 times more dangerous than the millions involved.

Certainly no one can seriously believe or contend that what military aid we propose to render to Greece and Turkey will put those countries in a condition that would prevent Russia from overrunning the Middle East within a matter of a few days if she desires to move in. What we are beginning, in fact, is the establishment of a military beachhead in Greece and Turkey which commits us to pour all of the men, munitions of war, and military might into that sector of Europe and, if necessary, to defend over 3,000 miles away this military beachhead if Russia now or later decides to move into the Middle East. These are the things the American people do not know are wrapped up in this legislation. If we are challenged we shall certainly have to do this or be humiliated before the world.

If this legislation passes this House, it having already been given the senatorial green light, the die is cast, our diplomatic challenge will have been sent to the Middle East. Stalin and Soviet Russia can react in one or two ways. They can cry out against our actions through the press—try to inflame the minds of the Russian people that we are an imperialist nation and that the Russian people are in danger of being attacked.

This move gives them the benefit of the opportunity of using such propaganda which doubtless will tend to solidify the Russian people in believing that we are, in fact, their enemies, which, of course, is false.

The second way they can react is to act physically through their Balkan satellite nations, and authorize Balkan Communist forces to agitate and start a Balkan war. In other words, Russia can have Bulgaria, Rumania, and Yugoslavia start the fight and set back and wait to see how things proceed. If we enact this legislation, we would have to rush our men and military forces into the

third world war, which would start as a side show with the Balkan countries. When we move in backing Greece and Turkey, then Russia can, and doubtless will, back the Balkan countries. Then we are on our way with the third world war.

Certainly the Members of this House must deal and think in realities. Certainly the American people ought to know what may likely happen if this legislation is passed. They will have to furnish the billions that this program will cost, even if it does not provoke war. They will have to furnish the millions of young men to fight and die throughout the world if it hastens the third world war.

They will have to submit to regimentation and controls far greater than we experienced in World War II. In considering this legislation the Members of Congress should realize that all of these things may happen and many more. We must visualize our economy geared to all-out production for war. We must visualize the serious possibility of the reorganization of the draft boards with millions of young men filtering through these boards on their way again into the maelstrom of destruction of life and property throughout the world.

Now is the time to think about these things that may happen. Let us count the cost before we take such a fatal step.

Mr. Chairman, if this move starts World War III now or later in the Balkans; in order to support Greece and Turkey we must protect the British life line of World War II. We must protect our flanks through the Gibraltar Straits—the Straits of Sicily—and the escape route through the Suez Canal, the Red Sea and Indian Ocean. In South America there are strong communistic party organizations in most of the Republics which may need our attention.

If the World War III comes we must expend money, men, and munitions to aid the noncommunistic forces of South America to make sure we are not attacked from that quarter.

Then we must defend and supply the vast Pacific from the Aleutians to the Philippines and Korea, around Guam and back to the outposts of the Panama Canal.

Mr. Chairman, we know that our military forces are now at a rather low ebb; yes, we know the millions of men and the billions of dollars that will be required to meet this task if it comes. These are some of the realities that we are facing in considering this legislation. We had better face them now than to indulge in theoretical dreams and wishful thinking.

Mr. Chairman, by comparison the Russian dictatorial government instead of demobilizing their forces in the interest of the peacetime economy of their country have continued the biggest army in the world today. They have appropriated \$12,600,000,000 for their over-all military budget. With their slave labor by the millions, with the low wages they pay their workers and the long hours they drive them to their task, you can begin to realize how much war production and how much force these dictators can muster if they so desire. They have all of the 17 strategic raw materials for war

contained in their land which is also serious to contemplate when we think that the United States is sufficient in less than half of these 17 strategic raw materials of war.

Mr. Chairman, in addition Russia is the largest gold-producing nation in the world. While the administration proposes to try to stop communism in the Balkans and in Europe, the Secretary of the Treasury representing the Government for the past number of years has been purchasing gold from Russia and from all nations at \$35 a fine ounce. About the time in 1933 when President Roosevelt recognized Communist Russia the Congress passed the Gold Reserve Act raising the price of gold from \$20 to \$35 a fine ounce. In other words we are still paying Russia in American dollars \$35 a fine ounce for gold that it costs Russia \$9 a fine ounce to produce.

We are now in a position where the President said recently that we must curb the power of the Communists in America, while at the same time their activities here are being financed by the \$26-a-fine-ounce profit we pay Russia for its gold which we hoard in the ground down at Fort Knox, Ky.

Russia with \$9 gold can buy strategic raw materials in the world markets which gives her a greater advantage by reason of the fact that this administration which proposes to make war on her ideology of government is, in fact, helping to finance the Russian Government to extend its power throughout the world. Our Government helped to finance Japan in the same way and in other ways with our scrap iron, oil, and machinery prior to Pearl Harbor. She shot this metal back at our troops in the war.

I do not say that we should not go to war with Russia if that is the one means for the salvation of America, and the freedom of men throughout the world.

I do not say that Americans who fought World War I and World War II in the name of freedom would not fight World War III as well for the same cause.

But I say, before we take a step inviting World War III let our people from Maine to California and Washington to Florida know all the facts. Let them know that war can come from this move instead of being told that this move is the one way to prevent war.

Let the people of America know with emphasis that five-eighths of this \$400,000,000 is earmarked for military aid, rather than for relief of starving women and children.

Let them realize that this is a parallel step in 1947 to the "all aid to the Allies short of war" that led to lend-lease and the full-scale war of 1941-45.

Look at this Greek-Turkish loan from still another angle.

Senator HARRY F. BYRD, of Virginia, presented a tabulation recently showing commitments of \$15,800,000,000 for foreign loans and other aid, present or set for the immediate future.

We have 50,000,000 men and women in jobs in the United States outside of Government and the armed forces. This cumulative and aggregate commitment of 15.8 billions of American tax dollars to help the rest of the world means \$316

for each and every one of these 50,000,000 job holders.

Yet the national debt share of each of these job holders is already something like \$6,000, on a basis of one job for every three adults of our population.

Have you who want to vote this Greek-Turkish loan told your constituents of this?

Have you analyzed for your constituents the figures which will show that the whole cost of military, air and naval preparedness to guarantee American security and American defense against the actions of aggressors for a generation is less than what we have poured out and propose to pour out in foreign largess?

If we want to fight communism, first clear out the Communist fifth column within our own borders. Clear them out of Government jobs, out of the State Department, labor unions, and out of our schools and colleges.

If we want to protect the peace of the world, let us start with hemisphere unity, help the governments of the Central and South American Republics clear out the Communists which would give Russian totalitarianism a permanent foothold in the Americas.

We need to invoke the Monroe Doctrine to apply to communism in the Western Hemisphere, if we would keep the republics of that hemisphere as the habitat of free men and women.

Mr. Chairman, after studying this proposition for weeks I have come to a firm conviction that the proposed foreign policy of the State Department is dangerous and wrong. I am so sure that there is another and a better way that should be tried first, before we take this momentous step that my conscience will not permit me to commit the American people so far as I am concerned to take this step.

The proponents of this bill, both in the Senate and the House now know that their first move should have been to take this matter to the United Nations Organization with all the force and power of the American and British forces and other peace-loving nations belonging to that organization.

They try to excuse themselves by saying that the United Nations does not have the power; they do not know this to be a fact. They have not given the United Nations a chance. The feeble Government of Iran called upon the United Nations to demand that Russia take her military forces out of that country many months ago. She promptly took them out upon the demand of the United Nations organization.

I have advocated for over a year that our Government with Britain and other peace-loving governments should amend the United Nations Charter taking away the veto power of Russia or any other nation; establish armament quotas and provide for inspection of all war materials including minerals for the production of atomic bombs from the mines through the laboratories to the industrial plants. It is not too late to make such a move in conjunction with the move I have suggested of taking the Greek-Turkish matter to the United Na-

tions. I know of no other way where we can so effectively call the bluff of Russia and put her on notice before the world as an aggressor than to follow such a course. If we should follow such a course then the people of Poland, Czechoslovakia and most of the satellite nations of Russia, including the liberty-loving people of France, Germany, Italy, and all nations could look with hope to the United Nations for deliverance from their present bondage and in the hope of perpetual world peace. I think such a course would be a thousand times more effective against the spread of communism in Europe and the world than the dangerous proposal to establish a military beachhead in Greece and Turkey.

Mr. Chairman, the proponents of the bill will say that the United Nations does not have the finances. This Government can authorize through the Congress that \$100,000,000, or more, be paid over to the United Nations organization to be used at once under the direction of the United Nations in Greece and Turkey to bolster up their economy. In fact, everything and more that the President's proposal contends for, can be effected as promptly and with greater force and power if directed through the United Nations organization. This bill should be amended providing for an approach to the problem along this line. I believe that the House of Representatives has the greatest opportunity to serve this Nation and to serve world peace that will ever come to this Congress. I believe that such a move can be approved in this House which will prevent the financial destruction of this country. If we cannot so amend this proposed legislation we should vote to re-commit the bill to the committee for further study.

Mr. Chairman, we have just financed a war that cost us over \$300,000,000,000 plus the lives of 300,000 men, with a million more wounded. It will require three hundred billion or more for compensation for the soldiers of this war before we have discharged the commitments now written into law for their relief. Our Government is committed to \$15,000,000,000 more in loans and immediate relief. Our debt now stands at \$260,000,000,000. Can any one believe that the United States Government, in justice to its own people can afford to embark on this expanded world policy that will call for billions upon billions more? Stalin is waiting for time and is predicting that a depression will come in America that will wreck our Government financially. Doubtless he is planning that when this time comes, his fellow travelers and Communists in this country with the power of Russia can destroy this Government. If we pass the administration's proposal he can begin to bleed us white financially by encouraging his satellite nations to start a war with Greece and Turkey which we will have to defend. He can threaten other nations and under the President's policy we would have to move in to protect them.

This proposed expansion of world policy may well be a trap which will work swiftly and directly to the benefit of the Russian Government by bringing about the destruction of our own form of government through financial bankruptcy.

It is too great a gamble to take until we try out the handling of this matter through the United Nations organization.

Mr. Chairman, the mistakes of our leadership and State Department at Teheran in violation of the principles of the Atlantic Charter by our own leaders in the partition of Poland, our ally, without her knowledge and consent, by secret agreements add to our difficulties in Europe today.

The mistakes and secret agreements of the State Department and our own leaders giving great concessions to Russia in Manchuria, giving equal power with us in Korea, giving her the Kurile Islands, makes Russia a threat to the Philippines and to our attempt to establish democracy in Korea and Japan. It will cost us over \$1,000,000,000 by compelling us to stay in Japan and Korea for years. It was a colossal blunder which gave Russia the power to threaten us from a military standpoint in the future never dreamed of.

Mr. Chairman, the past mistakes of the State Department and our leaders at Yalta in agreements affecting further mistakes made at the Potsdam Conference which have prevented the cooperation of the four powers to bring order out of chaos in Germany, will cost billions of dollars and may defeat the whole purpose of European peace under the United Nations Charter.

Now they ask us to go on our own and make this world-wide move, which, in my judgment, will compound the mistakes of the past and may well wreck the United States Government financially.

I refuse to be a party to helping save the face of the State Department or of the bipartisan leaders of both parties who apparently have entered into a combination to drive through the Greek-Turkish loan, and expanding our foreign policy.

How can we have faith in view of the State Department's constant mistakes on foreign policy that they are right now?

Mr. Chairman, the all-important aim of this Congress is to prevent World War III. To do this we must cast aside the old war-breeding policy of having each nation arrogate to itself the right to decide what it will do to or in other nations, and instead begin to use the machinery of the United Nations.

Have we forgotten the Biblical admonition, "They that take the sword shall perish by the sword"? America should not take unilateral action. Whatever action needed to be taken should be taken through the United Nations Organization. It is not too late to correct our course and start putting the pressure on Russia through the United forces of the liberty-loving people who formed the United Nations organization to meet just such emergencies as we are facing in the Greek-Turkish matter.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Chairman, I yield 14 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. KLEIN].

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Chairman, so far as I am concerned, I am opposed to this bill in its present form. I hope that when amendments are being offered that certain of those amendments will be adopted by this committee, which will make it a better bill and one more acceptable to the American people.

Mr. Chairman, the bill for military aid to Greece and Turkey involves one of the most significant policy questions ever to face the American Congress. It is urgent that the American people understand the issues involved in this bill; the policy to which it commits us; the people it commits us to support; the interests which are behind this bill and the methods they are using to put it across; and the consequences for this country and the world of such a policy.

Let me quote from Walter Lippmann in his column of April 22:

This is not a bill to establish democracy in Greece and Turkey. It is only incidentally a bill to bring relief to the victims of war. It is a bill which establishes the United States as a power in the Middle East.

This Government is now considering a policy of unlimited intervention in the affairs of Europe, intervention which repudiates our solemn pledge in the Atlantic Charter to "respect the right of all peoples to choose the form of government under which they will live."

Under this policy we commit ourselves to support reactionary forces throughout the world, to support the residue of the very forces against which we expended billions of dollars and 300,000 American lives in World War II.

We are told Greece is a democracy because they held an election attended by United States observers. However, the left was not allowed to campaign and had no ticket. Neither the left nor the center is represented in the present Greek Parliament. The present Greek Government includes collaborators with the Nazis and the Greek Army has been recruited from prewar royalists and quisling forces formed by the Germans. The Government is using the same police force which served the Metaxas dictatorship and the Germans.

We say we are supporting the forces of democracy in Greece against "leftist bands." But who are these leftist bands against whom we propose to throw the full economic and perhaps military might of the United States? Let me quote to you from the report of the New York Times' distinguished foreign correspondent, Raymond Daniell, in the New York Times magazine of April 20, 1947:

A year ago leftist bands had dwindled to an insignificant size, but they have been growing steadily until they have almost doubled. This is not entirely due to the power of Communist persuasion, nor is it the result, as Government spokesmen often argue, of terrorist tactics on the part of leftists alone. The truth is that large number of villagers have been forced to seek sanctuary with these bands because Government troops and gendarmes, including members of the security police created by the Germans to fight the resistance, themselves have created such a reign of terror in the provinces that for a good many it seemed the best chance of survival was union with the bands.

If there were a truly democratic form of government in Greece, I would be one of the first to come to its support. But as I have indicated, I am opposed to using our money, our military equipment, and eventually our young American manhood, to maintain in power a reactionary government such as now exists there.

But of course the support of Greek reaction against these humble Greek villagers is merely a starting point. As Lippmann pointed out on April 8:

Greece is only a pinpoint in the Truman global policy.

A policy of this kind is bound to fail—

Lippmann continues—

because it commits us to an alliance with the most reactionary forces in the world. * * * If we conduct the Truman policy on the principle that whoever is most vehemently against the Soviets is our friend and ally, we shall separate ourselves from the masses of the people everywhere.

You have undoubtedly heard that in a recent poll 63 percent of the American people felt that the problem of Greece and Turkey should be turned over to the UN, while only 23 percent were opposed, 14 percent had no opinion. I am sure that you will hear it again. I mention it here now, because I think it is a good idea to take our discussion out of the realm of politics and bring it down to earth. We can do that best by quoting facts.

It is a fact that we were given to understand that the British would withdraw their troops and Communism would take over in Greece and Turkey if we did not vote this program before March 31. It is now May 6 and the British still tramp the streets of Athens and no pitched battles rage on the Turkish frontiers.

It is a fact that we were assured that this measure would strengthen democracy. Yet, the day after it was announced, the monarchist government of the King of Greece swooped down on hundreds of moderate democrats in Athens and trundled them off. As if by signal—instead of the emergence of a democratic regime—the King of Greece watched benignly while monarchist bands murdered 21 men in cold blood held under his protection, in the royal jail—and then complimented the murderers.

No sooner were our great Turkish allies assured of the strengthening of democracy in their country through our aid to their army, than they banned 11 newspapers.

Elsewhere in the world, where they exist, the collaborators, the right wing terrorists, the reactionaries, danced with glee and felt that their day had dawned again.

These are the facts as to how we have strengthened democracy throughout the world.

As I said, Greece is only a pin point in the Truman global policy, only a beginning in a world-embracing undertaking. But Greece, Turkey, and the Near East offer an important clue to the kind of interests which are pushing us into this delirium.

Look at the United States News of March 14, 1947, pages 14-15, and you will see a map of the Mediterranean area. It is captioned: "Greece: the key to the Mediterranean." And at the far right of the map there is a pointer marked in large letters: "Middle East—world's greatest oil reserve in which United States is deeply interested."

Mr. O. John Rogge, former special assistant to the Attorney General, has explained this key. Addressing the Inde-

pendent Oil Men's Association of New England on April 16, Mr. Rogge pointed out that American oil companies now owned or controlled 40 percent of the Middle East oil production and the percentage is growing steadily. That is a substantial "chestnut."

The Washington correspondent of Barron's Financial Weekly wrote on March 17 that the Truman doctrine "in effect creates an American-trained Turko-Greek army between Russia and the world's largest oil reserves."

I think we must appreciate the frankness of some business interests. They at least do not say "democracy" when they mean "oil empire." If this issue could be put to the American people on this frank and honest basis, undisguised by arguments about relief and communism, I know a workable solution could be found within the framework of the United Nations, to which the majority of the American people have indicated that the problem of Greece and Turkey should be referred. As Mr. Rogge said:

There is no reason why the oil reservoirs of the Middle East should not be pooled for international purposes, supervised by an international commission and run by independent oil companies under a license system.

But such a sensible policy would not guarantee to Standard Oil, Gulf Oil, and other American oil interests the monopoly control they desire. So we are to run the risk of a catastrophic war in order to secure control for these monopolists.

In his testimony before the Senate Judiciary Committee on April 2 Senator O'MAHONEY warned of possible "cartel arrangements eventually controlling the supply of oil for the United States." Have we so soon forgotten the situation in which cartel control of essential items like rubber, aluminum, and tungsten left us at the beginning of World War II?

Let me give you a description of the oil properties in the Middle East, to which Greece and Turkey are considered the keys:

In Iraq, a subsidiary of Iraq Petroleum Co., controlled by Standard Oil Co. of New Jersey and Socony-Vacuum, along with dominant British and minor French and Dutch interests, has a 75-year concession, with the United States companies entitled to get nearly a fourth of the output.

Kuwait Oil Co. has a 75-year concession on the borders of Iraq in the Kingdom of Kuwait, a British protectorate at the head of the Persian Gulf. This company is owned jointly by the Gulf Oil Corp.—Mellon—and the Anglo-Iranian Oil Co., a British company. Its production is about 40,000 barrels daily.

The rest of Iraq not covered by other concessions is exploited by the Basrah Petroleum Co., a subsidiary of Iraq Petroleum, which as noted above, is owned jointly by United States, British, Dutch, and French interests.

In Iran, Standard Oil of New Jersey and Socony-Vacuum Oil Co. are involved through a purchase agreement in the 60-year concession in southern Iran given to the Anglo-Iranian Oil Co. This British concern has an output of over 400,000 barrels a day. It is now plan-

ning an \$80,000,000 pipe line from the Iranian fields to the Mediterranean to be completed by 1949.

In Saudi Arabia, American interests have a concession covering 281,000,000 acres and control virtually all the oil reserves through the Arabian American Oil Co.—Aramco—which is already getting out about 200,000 barrels a day. It has contracted for a 1,200-mile pipe line to the Mediterranean coast to be completed by 1949.

Aramco is owned jointly by Standard Oil Co. of California and the Texas Co. and is now transferring about 40 percent of its stock interest to Standard Oil Co. of New Jersey, the biggest of the oil trusts, and to Socony-Vacuum Oil Co., another company in the Rockefeller group.

A loan to Aramco of over \$100,000,000 is reportedly being made by a group of United States banks headed by the Chase National Bank—a Rockefeller bank—while another loan of \$125,000,000 is being extended by a group of insurance companies.

In the Bahrein Islands, a protectorate of Great Britain off the east coast of Arabia, the Bahrein Petroleum Co. is exploring, producing and refining oil. Bahrein Petroleum is owned half by Standard Oil Co. of California and half by the Texas Co.

In Qatar on the Persian Gulf, also under British protection, the government is actually run by the Petroleum Development, Ltd., subsidiary of the Iraq Petroleum Co. which I mentioned earlier. The oil reserves here are estimated at 1,000,000,000 barrels.

In Syria, Lebanon, Palestine, Cyprus, Trans-Jordan, and coastal Arab states, the Iraq Petroleum Co., controlled by United States, British, Dutch, and French interests, has oil rights to lands with estimated reserves of around 5,000,000,000 barrels.

These being the facts, it is a crime against the American people to withhold them from their full and free consideration, so that they can judge the policy on its real merits. It is they who must do the fighting and dying in war. It is upon them that the immediate economic consequences of this policy will fall.

For—let us make no mistake about it—this policy is alien to the American tradition. It is alien to the purposes for which we fought World War II. It is especially alien to the whole course of foreign policy pursued by the late Franklin D. Roosevelt and so overwhelmingly endorsed by the American people during the 12 years in which they elected and reelected him to office. It is those "economic royalists" who abused and slandered our late great President throughout the whole of his term in office who look upon the "Truman doctrine" with equanimity and ill-disguised gloating. In a remark which is outstanding for its bad taste and open contempt for the American people's feelings for President Roosevelt, Barron's declared on March 17:

Mr. Truman cannot be thanked too gratefully for his honest and straightforward presentation of the reasons for embarking on a course so alien to that of his widely worshiped predecessor.

One of the most serious objections to the so-called Truman doctrine is that by extending unilateral aid to Greece and Turkey the United States is bypassing the United Nations and other international bodies which we are pledged to support. The United Nations, the world's great hope for peace and security, will be undermined by this defection of the greatest power in the world. That the United Nations is capable of extended help to Greece was shown by the recent recommendations regarding Greek economy made by the United Nations Food and Agriculture Organization. The International Bank for Reconstruction and Development was specifically established for loans to nations needing funds to rebuild their economy.

If action is required to restore the economy of Greece, it should be carried out through the agencies of the United Nations in accordance with the proposals of the Food and Agriculture Organization.

Such funds as are required for this purpose should be granted to the UN by an appropriation of Congress. But no funds should be released until there has been established in Greece a coalition government replacing the present reactionary government. The function of this coalition government should be to hold office during a transition period in which honest attempts would be made to end the civil war by conciliation and by the promise of fundamental reforms.

With regard to Turkey, I am opposed to giving them any sort of help whatsoever.

In the first place, Turkey is not a democracy, and never was. In the second place, if she was not actually an ally of Germany, she enjoyed a benevolent neutrality during World War II. She played one side against the other, until, finally, yielding to United Nations pressure, on February 23, 1945, she declared war on Germany and Japan.

In direct violation of the Montreux Convention, she permitted Nazi warships to enter the Black Sea, from which they assisted in the siege and capture of Odessa and Sevastopol, and contributed substantially to the Nazi advance on Stalingrad. Her capital, Ankara, was a haven of refuge and a vantage point for Von Papen and many high Nazi diplomats, and a headquarters for the Gestapo.

In the third place, Turkey does not require financial aid. Her budget deficit is small and she has a gold reserve. A British retreat from commitments in Turkey would not have great economic effect. Consequently, the problem of Turkey is not quite the same as the problem of Greece. If Turkey's security is threatened, her case should be placed before the Security Council of the United Nations.

In summary, a British opinion on the present condition of Turkey may be of interest:

Turkey today is a happy land not only in the richness of her soil, but in her freedom from that fatal fissile which is the curse of so many countries in Europe today. Well provided, united, * * * Turkey is today probably the most comfortable country in

Europe in which to live. With more prosperous days in view, her outlook for the near future is far brighter than that of the greater part of the world. (The Statist (London), January 11, 1947, p. 36.)

An amendment will be offered to strike all reference to Turkey from the bill. This should be adopted by the committee.

Also, an amendment will be offered to limit any Greek aid exclusively to the granting of funds for relief purposes, on condition that the spending of the funds be properly supervised by representatives of the United States Government. This amendment also should be adopted. Otherwise, should we appropriate funds to the present regime without conditions, as Lippmann puts it:

Greece will be a rathole into which we will pour not only money—that is the least of it—but our prestige and our good name.

The world is watching to see if we meant what we said, when we talked about joining with all peace-loving nations to "afford assurance that all the men in all lands may live out their lives in freedom from fear and want."

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KLEIN. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Does not the gentleman feel this legislation will not stop the onrush of communism in Europe and elsewhere?

Mr. KLEIN. I agree with the gentleman. I made my position clear in connection with the foreign relief bill which we debated last week. Communism feeds on peoples who are living in misery and despair, and unless you feed those peoples, unless the people can be happy and content, you will have the desire for communism, or at least something, some ideology, which offers those people some hope. If we establish truly democratic governments over there we will not have to worry about communism because the people will shun it, they will reject it and will not have anything to do with it.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. I agree with the gentleman.

Mr. KLEIN. Examine this so-called Truman doctrine very carefully. I hope that some of these amendments which will be offered will be adopted, but if not, if the bill remains in its present form, it should be voted down, because it is not deserving of our support.

Mr. EATON. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. AUCHINCLOSS].

Mr. AUCHINCLOSS. Mr. Chairman, this legislation as presented in H. R. 2616 is perhaps the most important piece of legislation that this Congress has considered for a long time. It sets forth a pattern of the foreign policy of the United States for the days ahead, and whenever a definite policy on such an important matter is determined it carries with it grave responsibilities. It is only after the most careful consideration and thought that I have decided to support this bill, and although I do not know much about the detail of its import, nevertheless, I am convinced that it is for the best interests of our country that it be adopted.

In the first place, the President of the United States, whose duty it is to inaugurate the international policies of our country, has requested it on the grounds that it is necessary for the security of the United States; and in the second place, Secretary of State Marshall has stated that this legislation should be enacted in order to strengthen his hands in our dealings with our former allies. The Secretary of State has been reported as saying that the President's proposal was taken most seriously and had a definite effect on Generalissimo Stalin, the dictator of Russia.

Furthermore, I am convinced that the people of the Third Congressional District of New Jersey, whom I have the honor to represent, are in favor of this legislation and I know whereof I speak. Immediately after the President read his message to Congress on this subject, I recognized the importance and the far-reaching possibilities of such action on the part of our country and I felt that I should ask for the views of the people that I represent. I drafted a quarter-page advertisement for insertion in the newspapers in my district, which consisted of three paragraphs, stating as follows:

The implications in the President's message regarding Greece and Turkey are far more serious than the advancement of \$400,000 to these countries.

This matter affects the entire future of our country and demands the attention of all the people.

Therefore, I earnestly request that the people I represent write me their views and opinions on this problem.

The response to this advertisement was immediate and generous and I received approximately 1,000 letters from individuals, each giving me his or her personal views on this momentous question. The replies were divided, about 56 percent in favor and 44 percent against the President's proposal, but it should be noted that a large number of those in favor qualified their approval by stating that the proposal should have been channeled through the United Nations and that no military aid should be extended to either Greece or Turkey.

Of course, I feel that unless we are prepared to support anything we may do, our efforts to aid would be in vain. There is no sense in going into this thing unless we are prepared to stand up in support of our convictions and not run away. Whether we like it or not we have become a great international power and we must assume our responsibilities to maintain peace in the world.

It is for these fundamental reasons that I believe it is desirable that this legislation should pass and I hope it will pass by an overwhelming vote. At the same time, however, I do not wish to let this opportunity go by without making some observations about these responsibilities of ours as a great international power, and the part that the House of Representatives must play in implementing them. For the first time perhaps in history the House of Representatives is called upon to have some part in determining a definite foreign policy for our Government, and the question naturally arises—what do we Members of the

House really know about the political and economic ideologies of other nations? Do we know when we vote these huge sums of money that they will be used wisely for the benefit of those who really need aid? Are we sure that mere money and advice will bring to an end the spread and growth of communism? Do we know whether \$400,000,000 is enough to accomplish our purpose, or is it too much? Have we first-hand knowledge of the economic conditions of these countries and whether the Governments that rule them are honest and capable and are able and willing to administer whatever relief we may offer? Will these countries, and any other countries we may see fit to aid, cooperate with us to the end that the people of the world will grow to respect us and that our prestige will be enhanced? Is it economically sound for us to make such a loan and can we do likewise for other countries who may seek our aid? These and many other questions arise and the answers, if there are any, are vague and tend to add to the confusion of thought which already exists.

During the debate of the relief bill, recently passed by the House and now being considered in the Senate, confused thinking was very evident. The members of the Committee on Foreign Affairs gave the impression that they were not able to agree among themselves about many of the important features of that legislation. This great committee is made up of hard-working, conscientious Members of the House, and my statement is not meant to reflect on them in any way. The members of this committee were reaching for the truth and for what was best for America, but unanimity of thought was absent and their unanimity of thinking is necessary for the guidance of the judgment of the other Members of the House of Representatives. This is not a good state of affairs because in the days to come the House of Representatives will be called upon to decide other matters of great international import and confused thinking must be eliminated if we are to prepare and pass constructive legislation.

As I have already pointed out, the House of Representatives up to the present has not had to consider matters of this kind, and its membership was not called upon for any great knowledge about the economies or philosophies of foreign governments. This was the responsibility of the other body where, under the Constitution, treaties with other nations are considered and passed upon and our general policy of foreign relations decided. However, those days of no responsibility on the part of the House are passed; the world is on our doorstep and is looking to our Government for courage, for leadership and for financial aid, and in accordance with our constitutional system the House of Representatives must share the responsibilities of determining our foreign policy and our country's attitude toward other countries in the world. We cannot shirk that responsibility if our Nation is to live.

This present situation calls for the education of Congressmen in the ways and byways of international relations. We Members of the House of Representa-

tives, if we are to be faithful to our trust, can no longer remain content with what information is revealed to us by the Executive Department of our Government and we must develop our own facts concerning the economic and political conditions at home and abroad. It is true that many Members of the House of Representatives, in the past year or so, have traveled overseas and visited foreign lands, but I venture a guess that for many of them it was their first trip outside of the United States. These Members, of course, have seen much in a short time and have gathered a great deal of useful information, but such trips cannot possibly make anyone an expert, or the son of an expert, on foreign relationships. The world has a great history and events are changing rapidly the course of human destiny; therefore, in the light of that history these changes must be interpreted and their meaning weighed. That is a job for men of the highest technical training; it is a job for experts.

The need for this education and study has been recognized by our able and experienced colleague the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. HERTER]. It is quite natural that he should recognize the lack of appreciation on the part of the House of the difficult and complicated questions involved in the matter of administering relief. He knows considerable about it because he has been engaged in it and has studied it under the guidance of that great statesman and American, Herbert Hoover. The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. HERTER] introduced House Resolution 173 and I commend it to my colleagues for their study. This resolution provides for the appointment by the Speaker of the House of a select committee of 15 members, at least 10 of whom shall be selected from the majority and minority membership of the Committees on Appropriations, Foreign Affairs, Banking and Currency, Armed Services, and Agriculture, and reads as follows:

The committee is authorized and directed to make a continuing study of—

(1) Actual and prospective needs of foreign nations and peoples, including those within United States military zones, both for relief in terms of food, clothing, etc., and of economic rehabilitation;

(2) Resources available to meet such needs within and without the continental United States;

(3) Existing or contemplated agencies, whether private, public, domestic, or international, qualified to deal with such needs;

(4) The administrative skills and performance of such agencies;

(5) Continuing wartime or other controls, if any, required to maintain prices of commodities in short supply at reasonable levels, whether such controls be domestic or international;

(6) Any or all measures which might assist in assessing relative needs and in correlating such assistance as the United States can properly make without weakening its domestic economy.

This would not be a legislative committee; it would be a study committee, designated to secure the facts about conditions of relief and aid to foreign countries, and it would be required to report to the House "not less often than once in each 6 months." This committee may, of course, report more frequently as oc-

casion may demand and thereby keep the Members of the House supplied with factual information developed under their own auspices.

Every Member of the House would benefit tremendously from the study of such a committee and their conclusions would be more intelligently arrived at and they would have more definite knowledge of the possible results of their action. Such study would tend to promote a positive, integrated foreign policy and would stop the practice of, on the one hand, shipping supplies to a country while on the other hand during what we can to stop its expansion. Such a thoughtless and vacillating policy makes us the laughingstock of the world, because thereby we are aiding in the promotion of the very thing we are seeking to destroy. This does not reflect any glory on us who claim to be a people of great business acumen, nor does it enhance our reputation in the eyes and hearts of other nations. Bewilderment among the Members of the House today is the result of their dependency on information received from all kinds of sources, some of which is little better than mere gossip, and they do the best they can, hoping for the best. That is no way for us Members of Congress to act for the best interest of our country.

Such a study committee as proposed in House Resolution 173 should in no way conflict with the duties and prerogatives of the Committee on Foreign Affairs; indeed it would supplement its work. This is clearly set forth in the whereas clauses in the resolution itself, which read as follows:

Whereas the importance and complexity of aid required by foreign nations and peoples from the resources of the United States is assuming increasing proportions.

This clause indicates the great intricacy of this problem and the fact that this demand for aid will come from all quarters of the globe.

Whereas such aid directly affects every segment of the domestic economy of the United States.

This clause shows the intimate part that relief extension plays in the whole economy of our country, affecting industry, agriculture, defense, and our fiscal affairs.

Whereas the problems relating to such aid are of a nature to lie within the jurisdiction of a number of the standing committees of the Congress.

This clause shows that the problems involved go far beyond the scope of any one of the committees of the House of Representatives and should have the combined attention of people who are experts in the various segments of our economy which are affected.

Whereas these problems should, in order to safeguard the resources and economy of the United States, be given the most careful consideration in relation to each other.

This clause points out the fact which has been troubling many of us, that we must be on our guard that we ourselves do not become weak while we are doing our best to make others strong.

Whereas an integrated and coordinated study should be most valuable to the standing committees of the Congress.

This clause merely states the truth, but one could go further and include every member in Government, if not every citizen in the United States as benefiting from such a study.

I hope that early and favorable consideration will be given to the passage of this resolution, but we must act presently on this proposal for aid to Greece and Turkey, using the best judgment at our disposal. Pray God that any aid that we may be able to render will be sufficient and efficient enough to aid these stricken people to get on their feet and establish themselves as free men and women. What the little nations of the world want is what we cherish—liberty. What they want is to take their place among the comity of nations and contribute what they can to peace in the world. It is right that we should do everything possible to aid them to achieve these objectives, but we must be sensible and prudent or we ourselves may be engulfed by the very thing we seek to destroy.

Mr. EATON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN].

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, Sunday will be Mother's Day. I like the description of "mother" by Kate W. Wiggin, the author of Mrs. Wiggin's of the Cabbage Patch. She said that so many fine things like jewels, roses, stars, and sunrises and sunsets come in quantities in our lifetime, but there is only one mother: She is a single jewel.

You and I have been receiving letters from mothers in recent weeks, and if your letters are like mine, they are couched in such refreshing terms. Normally, the demands that one gets are, "We demand that you be for this" or against something. How refreshing it was to hear from the mothers out home and to have them say, with that kind and tender supplication, "We hope that you will do everything possible to avert another war." That is an entreaty. That is a fervent plea. That is the proposition before us today. It is a question of method, whether to go in or whether to stay out of world responsibility as the most effective way to avoid and avert another war.

I say to you out of my own prayerful meditations on this subject that I want to support this bill. I think it is the thing to do. I believe it offers a chance to cure a condition which if continued is more likely to invite conflict rather than circumvent it.

I do not believe I can tell my story any better than to tell it from this map, because this is the Middle East, the explosive area in today's world. Over here is Greece, hanging like an appendage from the body corporate of Europe. Down at the lower end is Athens, the cradle of democracy, where democracy was born 27 centuries ago. Greece is not so far from Africa. You can start from Cairo in a C-47 and in 3½ hours you are in Athens. A short distance across the blue Mediterranean—and all those distances in the Middle East are short. If you could stand on a high mountain here at Athens, the cradle of democracy, and look north to that little area that is encircled in orange, that is Albania. The

ruling head of Albania is a former chief of police who was indoctrinated with communism long ago. That is part of our trouble. Part of the terrorism of today comes from that source.

Next to Albania along the northern border of Greece is Yugoslavia, presided over by Tito. Joseph Brosip is his name. For 5 years he was a lieutenant in the armies of the Soviet Union, and you know the doctrine and the ideology that he absorbed and which he follows today. Yugoslav communism is too well known to need description. It, too, is a source of terrorism.

Standing on this high mountain at Athens, if you look a little farther to the east you will find Bulgaria, where a border dispute is in progress at the present time. The one who gives direction to the affairs of Bulgaria is Georgi Dimitrov, who is also indoctrinated with communism. Perhaps the most powerful person in Bulgaria today is Tsola Nagoychova, who is the secretary general of the Communist Party in Bulgaria, and who has recently indicated the intention that she is going to visit the United States one of these days. I hope she never does. She was the one who gave direction to the efforts of 20,000 terrorist troops in Bulgaria after the war ended. The situation was so bad that an American major general and an American diplomat could not even go beyond the confines of Sofia to have luncheon with a Bulgarian general because a Soviet sentry said no. Those are the documented facts. The State Department has not said too much about them in the interest of good feeling, so long as the world was so turbulent and so feverish. But a truly impossible situation developed there. It is a present source of terrorism.

In the northern area of Greece is Macedonia, the same place from whence this man came in a vision to the Apostle Paul to say 1,900 years ago, "Come over into Macedonia, and help us." Today, 1,900 years later, we are receiving the same kind of an appeal to help these people. And why help them? Because the wave of Red ideology wants to come down from the north, seeks to take over Greece and make it another Soviet satellite, seeks to extend the iron curtain to the Aegean and to the blue water of the Mediterranean.

Now let us look at a little proof. Standing on this high mountain in Athens, look down to Alexandria in Egypt. If you could have been there in April of 1944 you might have witnessed a mutiny upon the vessels of the Greek Government that were then attached to the British Mediterranean Fleet. That mutiny was developed by soldiers and sailors who were Communists. The man who put it down was Admiral Vouglaris, with whom I spent a day in Athens just 2 years ago—a fine, stocky, amiable gentleman who told me about his problems. That mutiny has been described as Red fascism's first bid for Greece. It occurred a year before VE-day.

In that same year, in December there came the liberation uprising in Greece that left 8,000 dead bodies upon the pavements of Athens, and 12,000 were wounded. That was fomented with Soviet money and under Soviet direc-

tion. It is a known fact that Siantos, from up at Salonika, from up in the tobacco area, Partsalides, and Zacharides, all Communist leaders, were all there when it was taking place. They are the king pins of EALS and its Red actionist wing.

I can bring a man to this Chamber who practices law in Washington who was a colonel in the Army, and I can bring a general, and I can bring a young Greek lawyer from Chicago, all of whom were there to bear witness to this story as to whether or not the Reds were active in trying to start World War III in the ancient land of Hellas where democracy was born. They saw this brutal endeavor to take over and extend Red fascism to Greece.

They found 20,000 metal Communist badges in the headquarters of KKE, the Communist Party of Greece, when it was burned. When the victims of this alleged liberation uprising were disposed of, the bodies were buried in trenches 2 feet deep and covered with lime. That was the same Soviet technique by which they buried the Poles who were butchered in the Katien Forest of Poland. They were slaughtered by the Communists. The technique is exactly the same. That is the bestial thing that wants to come down into Greece for a purpose. And when that takes hold and it can use a fine airport in Athens, it will be only 150 miles from a body of water, 45 miles long and heavily fortified, that we call the Dardanelles. The strategic straits would then be practically behind the iron curtain. The rest would be easy.

I understand that an effort is going to be made to eliminate Turkey from this bill. I hope it fails. It is only 200 miles from the Bulgarian border through Turkey to the Dardanelles, and that is another access for communism and the communistic forces. It is not so very far over to Istanbul. It is not so very far over to the Bosphorus which is only 20 miles long. It is not so terribly far over to the border where Russia and Turkey join and where they insisted when I was there that a million Soviet troops had been massed. If communism fails in its push through Greece, it can try through Turkey. The two nations are a part of a common problem.

Now, the thing that we really have not heard about in all this show is the fact that of the many demands that Russia has made upon Turkey the most important is not the Dardanelles. It is the reformation of the Turkish Government. A former high Turkish official told me about this whole picture over there. That is the thing they really want to do. By reformation, they mean reformation with the MVD, the espionage, and the secret police, and deception and brutality. So, finally, they can take over Turkey, too. For years the Moscow radio has been needling members of the Turkish Congress.

I had a very interesting all-day visit with the members. We had a little round-up at night. I examined some of the translations of the Moscow radio scripts. Gentlemen, make no mistake as to what Russia is doing. She is trying to move in and take over in Turkey as

well as in Greece. There is a reason for it. Once you cut off here, you have set up a sort of iron curtain between western culture and eastern culture—between western democracy and the type of thing that they have over in the other end of the world. And when they have done it, they will be ready in their own sweet time to take over the greatest natural resource in all the world, which is the stuff of peace and the stuff of war. By that I mean the proven and indicated petroleum reserves in the Middle East.

In these demands that Russia has made upon Turkey there is a demand for two provinces ceded to Turkey after World War I, here at the end of the Black Sea, called Kars and Ardahan. That is high ground. That would be a great base for bombers. When they have gotten that, they are just a little bit closer to the natural oil resources. Here is the great proven oil field of the world. Notice how close it would bring Red fascism to Mosul and Kirkuk, the great oil center of Iraq. One of the greatest oil geologists that we have in the United States is Mr. de Collyer, who went over there at the instance of Secretary Knox in 1944. He came back and made a report and said that the greatest known oil reserves in all the world was there and that the center of gravity of oil production was shifting from the Caribbean-Gulf area of this hemisphere to the Middle East.

Why do you think the Soviet Union wants to move into Iran? Because down at the lower end of the Persian Gulf are the great refineries and there is the oil. Why have Russian agents been undertaking to organize the highly nationalistic Kurds in the northern part of Iraq? Because the scheme is one day to set up the Kurdish Nationalistic Republic and have them join the Soviet Union. Anybody in the Kurdish Army who can speak with authority will tell you that whole story. They are interested in Iraq because there is Mosul and Kirkuk, two great oil centers of the Middle East, next to Abadan and Khorramshahr on the Persian Gulf. As one flies across this country and notes the pipe lines from Mosul in Iraq to Tripoli on the Mediterranean coast, where vessels, including naval vessels, obtained their oil for fuel; as one observes pipe lines on top of the surface of the desert; as one observes refineries converting petroleum into liquid power for tanks and tractors and planes and motor vehicles; as one traces out the efforts of Soviet agents in northern Iran, he becomes conscious of the bid which Red fascism is making for the eastern and middle eastern world.

A pipe line runs from here out to the Mediterranean coast. There is another branch that runs down to Haifa in the northern part of Palestine. Oh, how easy it is, once communism has moved into Greece, once they have developed bases in the adjoining Mediterranean, how easy it will be to set up that curtain that will separate the Western Hemisphere from the strange kind of eastern culture that threatens to engulf the whole wide world.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. I am very much interested in the gentleman's statement. Do I understand it is his view that we must stop communism in Turkey and Greece in order to protect these oil fields?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I mean just this, that the gentleman from Illinois tries to be something of a realist. Having talked with leaders in all parts of the world, how can you deal with policy unless you divine or assume or appraise or know for a certainty what the other fellow has got in mind, who is going to push into all corners of the earth? Communism is one aspect of this thing. That is the cloak and shield they are using at the present time by means of armed assaults and terrorism up in northern Macedonia to finally bring Greece to heel and take over and reform the government like they did in Latvia, like they did in Lithuania, like they did in Estonia, like they did in Roumania, like they did in Yugoslavia, like they did in Bulgaria, like they did in Albania, and like they are trying to do with Austria.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. That is the cloak that covers this bill—oil.

Mr. DIRKSEN. That is the cloak and shield that our Soviet friends are using at the present time to mask one of their ultimate purposes. They have many purposes, including world domination, as so freely expressed by Soviet leaders. There is only one answer to it, and that is, first of all, to assert, if we are going to, our eternal hostility to this ideology, which is based upon bestiality, brutality, and destruction, and to stop it from engulfing the rest of the world. That is the whole story as I see it. It is just as plain as a mountain on the map why they are interested here. They have been working at it for a long time. By sham and deception they pursue their objective. When Colonel Popoff, of the Soviet Army, was in Greece, one of the officials insisted, "What are you doing here?" He said, "I am here looking after Russian prisoners of war." But there were no Russian prisoners of war in Greece.

Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana. I should like to commend the gentleman. The gentleman has correctly and succinctly stated the issue confronting the House.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. VORYS. I have returned within the last 3 weeks from the Middle East, and I have talked in Cairo to the representatives of the other countries mentioned. The situation which the gentleman saw with his own eyes 2 years ago still exists and he has described it accurately to the House—the threat and all the rest of it.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has again expired.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman five additional minutes.

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. OWENS. I would like to ask the gentleman to answer two direct questions and he can answer them at once.

Has the Soviet Union offended us? If so, why do we not, like a nation, sever relations instead of taking a pusillanimous action like this, like we are now contemplating?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Well, you know, gentlemen, that is so easy to utter, but at the end of the road there may be dead GI's. I think our first concern is, since we have so recently emerged from the dismal shadow of the greatest war the world has ever experienced, that we do not want to wittingly or unwittingly make a move that will get us into another conflict. The thing we must do is to avoid conflict and over a period of time to give the world an opportunity to heal, have its wounds heal. I think the greatest service we can render to these distorted and fanatical minds behind that strange Red ideology that would take over the whole wide world, is to simply say, "Now, there is no malice, no venom in our policy. We simply say that we left some hundreds of thousands of youngsters in all sections of the earth for an ideal that we call freedom. We assured the world of our devotion to freedom. We sacrificed for it. We went deeply into debt for it. We signed an Atlantic Charter to evidence our faith in freedom."

Now, shortly after the war is scarcely over, up bobs a little country, raising its hands in supplication, and it says, "Please, America, help us to maintain that freedom." Do not misunderstand me. I am not unmindful of the type of government over in Greece; you do not cure it overnight. I am not unmindful of the fact that Turkey is somewhat on the semitotal side. Is freedom and democracy more likely to be asserted and perfected by themselves with our aid or by having communism take over? We are dealing here with something that brooks no delay. You have got to move now, and then to hope by the interposition of our aid to be able in due time to cure a number of things that I have set forth in a statement I made here in March. Their exchange system is all out of kilter and that is why they are suffering such riotous inflation. I hope that it can be democratized, but it will never be democratized if Siantos, and Zacharides, and Partsalides finally bring ELAS from underground and get the master hand.

As soon as they take over they will replace democracy with the hammer and sickle and all that the hammer and sickle stand for. No. That is what Russia has in mind by re-forming Greece and by re-forming Turkey. And then remember that once the filthy imprint of Red fascism is placed indelibly upon those countries it will not be erased in your lifetime and in mine. Then they will move relentlessly over into the rest of the Middle East.

On a Saturday night the biggest meeting in Beyreuth, Lebanon, was a Communist meeting at one of the largest and most fashionable hotels there. They are working on it. They are all talking about it in the streets of ancient Damascus which was the center of the ministry of the Apostle Paul.

They play for keeps, Mr. Chairman, and it is necessary for you and I now to play for keeps and to be registered on the right side of this issue. Even though all the provisos that you and I would like to have in this bill are not inscribed there by the committee, I would still vote for it.

Mr. MATHEWS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. MATHEWS. In view of the geographical and ideological situation that the gentleman from Illinois has described, is it his idea that we can accomplish this result with \$400,000,000 and 40 officers?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Indeed, do not underestimate the moral force behind the power of America which is even greater than dollars.

Mr. MATHEWS. Against Russia?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I am not worried about the strength of Russia; I am worried about this infiltration of an ideology which has already penetrated our own country and is giving us trouble right here in the Nation's Capital. There is a great moral force about the help of America.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has again expired.

Mr. BLOOM. I have already yielded the gentleman 10 minutes, but I yield him five additional minutes.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I thank the gentleman from New York.

Mr. Chairman, there is a great moral force about aid from America that is even more important than the dollars; and when this humble people so many of whose kinfolks are among the fine businessmen in every metropolitan center in the United States, feel that we are in their corner the curtain of fear will rise, there will be a new spirit in their guard service and they will be ready with a little material help to deal with those terrorists who are presently up in the rugged hills of Macedonia along the borders trying to come in and take over that nation.

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. BENDER. Is it not a fact that when Turkey has ever played she has always played for keeps and she was always for sale to the highest bidder?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Oh, now, let me put my friend straight on that. I have heard that kind of talk before.

I think Turkey performed a real service in World War II and I will tell you why. Here was the course of the Nazi forces coming down to the world bridge, and Turkey is the bridge from Europe to Asia, and Turkey was neutral. When the German hordes with their Panzers and their Stukas were coming through the Balkans, how easy it would have been for them to proceed down the Levantine coast and put the pincers on Cairo and El Alemain and sweep across northern Africa. If that had happened the war would not have been over for a long, long time. It may be said in part that the Turks kept them out. When the German legions arrived at the Turkish border and were intent on proceeding

through Turkey, the Turkish officials said: "See here, if you violate our neutrality, of course, the British will be free to violate our neutrality. Would you want that to happen?" Day after day they had to carry on this moral battle of holding the Germans back, and preventing a violation of Turkish neutrality and they succeeded. To show you how serious all this must have been in the minds of military strategists, one can go up and down this Mediterranean coast and see the pillboxes, the barbed-wire entanglements, the fortifications, the emergency airports, and everything else that was constructed in anticipation of the day when a great horde of motorized troops would one day be moving through Turkey and down the Levantine coast putting the squeeze on Cairo and North Africa, where Rommel and his Afrika Corps were threatening that continent.

Let us, therefore, not minimize the service that the Turks rendered to the Allied Nations by their firm stand on neutrality.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield to the gentleman from South Dakota.

Mr. MUNDT. In further substantiation of what the gentleman says about the Turkish contribution to the war, which is exactly correct and which unfortunately is not broadly understood in America, let me mention this: In speaking to the President in Ankara in 1945 we were discussing this particular problem and he told us then something that has since been confirmed by the record. That is, when the Russians with their backs to the wall were holding Stalingrad, he, the President of Turkey, sent a mission to Moscow to assure them that the large armies they had massed on the Turkish border, since they did not know where Turkey was going, were unnecessary because Turkey was not going to be on the side of the Germans, it was not going to attack the Russians, and with that assurance some of the reinforcements were moved from the borders of Turkey and permitted Stalingrad to stand and to help win the war.

Mr. DIRKSEN. To my good friend from Wisconsin [Mr. SMITH], may I say that he has raised this question of oil as the real reason for the action which it is proposed that we take here, but that is but a small part of it. Suppose the iron curtain is put up across this middle eastern area. What happens to the trade between the United States and the rest of this world? Will we do business with this vast area on Mr. Stalin's terms and no other? Is that the kind of a world we want? If so, then we might as well capitulate. But are our memories so short that we have already forgotten the effects of a policy of appeasement? When all is said and done the \$64 question still remains and right now is very, very simple. If Greece and Turkey are overwhelmed by Communist penetration and the petroleum domain of the Middle East is there for seizure or domination by the forces of Red fascism, will it make them more bellicose or tractable or will it make them less so? And once they dominate and control this whole area, does it make fu-

ture war more likely or less likely? To that I have but one answer and that is that conflict would be far more likely and so what we do today in stemming this scarlet tide is an answer to the mothers who are pleading for that kind of action which is most likely to prevent conflict and death for young men.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. We have already capitulated.

Mr. DIRKSEN. No; we have not.

Mr. SADOWSKI. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. SADOWSKI. Are the Macedonians Greeks? That is where all the trouble is. Are those people Greeks?

Mr. DIRKSEN. You know my friend gets me now into an ethnological discussion where I am not too well at home and I would therefore find some difficulty answering the question. I do know that we have always considered them as a part of that same country. That is where they are located; and besides, what has such a discussion to do with the business which is before us?

Mr. SADOWSKI. The gentleman knows that the Macedonians are Slavs. They are not Greeks.

Mr. DIRKSEN. It could be, but that portion is in Greece, otherwise what are they doing in there harassing the Greeks?

Mr. SADOWSKI. The gentleman knows further that the Macedonians put up a most stubborn fight in this war, as they did in the First World War. They should be entitled to freedom.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman five additional minutes.

Mr. SADOWSKI. They should be entitled to freedom. They were promised by Roosevelt in the Atlantic Charter that that they would have their freedom. They fought stubbornly on our side. The Greeks have received a lot of credit for the fighting that the Macedonians did in those mountains. The Macedonians are rugged, mountain people and they fought against the Germans there. As a matter of fact, they were never subdued by the Germans or the Italians.

Mr. DIRKSEN. No, but I know what the boundaries of those countries indicate and that is they are a part of Greece at the present time.

I want to say one more thing because it is the most important of all. It sounds so academic to go back constantly and talk about this thing called freedom, but it is the greatest thing on the face of the earth. It is the blessed inheritance of this country. It is the purpose of this country. Now, then, if we let it languish anywhere finally and within reason, of course, if we let it languish there, right in the heart of this European and Asian Continent, it will not be too long before we take it for granted and then it becomes a rootless thing and dies. Then what about freedom? Has this thing called freedom already become so vague after the slaughter of hundreds of thousands of young Americans in our own country that it means nothing? Are we ready now so shortly after World War II, and notwithstanding the pledges which

we made in the Atlantic Charter, the United Nations Declaration and other documents, to toss small countries to the dogs of communism?

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. May I say in respect to Turkey that when the pages of history have been written of her role in the last war it will be revealed that Turkey was ready to declare war on the side of the Axis if Stalingrad had fallen. However, here is what I deem to be even more important. The gentleman's main contention is that this legislation is complementary to a policy of preserving and aiding freedom and democracy. Is that correct?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Definitely.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Well, then, I ask the gentleman this: How is it that over all these years we have not had any application to Congress either from the State Department or from the President for aid to the Republicans of Spain?

Mr. DIRKSEN. There you have a different situation in this respect: This request, gentlemen, comes to us from the Government of Greece; not from a group; not from a lot of Falangists or Loyalists or anybody else. This is an official request by a sovereign country to a sovereign country, couched in the language of 1,900 years ago, "Please come over and help us."

In my judgment the help that we render now may turn the balance as to whether or not some day in the future the horizons will again be livid with the flames of war.

Mr. DORN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield to the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. DORN. I would like to ask the distinguished gentleman from Illinois this question: In view of his eloquent appraisal of the value that Turkey gave to the Allied cause during the late war, by the same token did not General Franco, by remaining neutral when the Allied forces were landing in North Africa, also contribute, as you say Turkey did, to the ultimate victory of the Allies?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I would not know. But, gentlemen, what has that to do with the issue before us here. Let us not be diverted with red herrings. Let us consider the forces that are operative in Greece, that are operative in Turkey. Let us consider the armed minorities abroad. Let us consider the psychological aggression that Herbert Hoover alluded to in San Francisco during the United Nations Conference, when he said something should be done about it. That is the kind of aggression that is being practiced over there at the present time, the objective being the taking over the rest of the area that comes to the blue water, cutting off western culture, and finally taking over one of the greatest resources that God ever put below the surface of the earth.

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. BENDER. What about the \$146,000,000 we have sunk in Turkey since 1945? We have spent \$145,000,000 in Turkey since 1945. What have we received for that?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I would not know that up to this point we have received anything. Under lend-lease we invested billions in all parts of the world. When this defense aid was authorized we knew that much of it would never be returned either in cash or in kind.

Mr. BENDER. What did Von Pappen do in Turkey during the war? Did he help the Allied cause?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Definitely not. But notwithstanding the efforts of Von Papen and his staff, Turkey did remain neutral and in that way helped to terminate the war as early as it did come to an end.

Mr. BENDER. What are the Nazis doing now in Turkey, the fugitives from Germany? What is happening to the Nazi gold in Turkey?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Let me conclude on this note: When the shadows and the bitterness of World War II have been dissipated somewhat, we suddenly discover that we have swapped a black dictator for a red one. Are we going to run out on the job now, or is this deep and abiding thing called freedom going to have a chance in countries that are still too weak from the conquering hordes of obstruction and destruction to help themselves? Let me again present the \$64 question: Will our endeavors from now on to bring peace to a sick and bleeding world be made easier or more difficult by having Red fascism take over in Greece and Turkey and impose an extension of the iron curtain across that area of the world and ultimately dominate a natural resource of such high importance in peace and in war. To that question, gentlemen, an answer is simple and easy. Our task would become infinitely more difficult and that is the best and the simplest reason I know for approving the proposal which is before us today.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. SADOWSKI].

Mr. SADOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, a few moments ago I asked a question, Are the Macedonians Greeks? We have heard much about this Greek trouble, and it is always referred to as the trouble in Greek Macedonia, but why is it that no one comes down here and tells us the truth about this situation? The Macedonians are not Greeks. The Macedonians are a Slav race of people. They are southern Slavs. Further, history will bear out the fact that these Macedonians have lived there since the time of Christ. The city of Salonia is their city, it is not a Greek city. These Macedonian people are a rugged race of people. They live in the mountains; they are a mountaineer people, a simple, hard-fighting people, good Christian people. They have withstood the onslaught of the Romans, the Greeks, and the Turks. The Turks did their best to make Mohammedans out of them. They had them under Turkish domination for many, many years. The Turks practiced every kind of brutality against these

Christian people. They desecrated their churches. They burnt their farms and homes. But they remained Macedonians. Then after the First World War, after these Macedonians had joined with us in our big fight in that war, and had shed their blood and given us of their best men in that struggle, what did we do, or rather, what did England do? England handed those people in bondage to Greece, instead of giving the Macedonians freedom. Freedom is what they wanted and that is what they fought for, and that is what they were entitled to have.

In this last war great fighting was done in that northern part of Greece, up in that hill country. A lot of credit was given to the Greeks, but who did this fighting? Macedonians, Greek Macedonians, those mountaineer people. The Nazis and the Italians never did subdue them, they never did annihilate them. They have never been conquered.

Now the war is over. Again these people are asking for freedom. They want an independent Macedonia. Are they entitled to it? In my opinion they are. I think they are. Half of Macedonia now is a free state within the Yugoslav federation. They have their own president, they have their own legislature, they have their own state set-up within this federation of Yugoslavia. The other part of Macedonia is still under Greek domination.

Here is the problem. Those Macedonians that are still within Greece, under Greek authority, all want freedom. They are united 100 percent on the basis that they want freedom, but they are divided on this: Some of those Macedonians want to join with that part of Macedonia which is now in the Yugoslav federation. Some of them do not want to join but they want to have a separate Macedonian state, a free state so that they would not be under Tito. But all of these people want freedom. All of these people have been on our side in this war and in the First World War. They fought heroically for our cause. Now it is proposed that we give bayonets and guns to the Royalists of Greece to kill these Macedonians. I am not mad at these Macedonians. I am not mad at those who want to go into the Yugoslav federation or those who want an independent Macedonia and freedom from Greece. I do not want to see any of them killed. President Truman and the State Department have remained silent about this struggle for freedom. Why? Surely the sentiment of the American people is with the Macedonians.

Here is a piece from today's Washington Star: "Greeks condemned for aiding guerrillas in Athens"; a dispatch from northern Greece reports today from the military fort at Almania they have condemned 10 persons, including women, to death and sentenced 6 others to life imprisonment for aiding antigovernment guerrilla forces.

Now, that has taken place after we have announced this program of aid to Greece. They are still killing Greeks in Macedonia, and killing those Greeks who do not agree with the Royalist Govern-

ment in Greece and killing Macedonians because all Macedonians want freedom.

Am I going to vote to give more bayonets and more guns to kill off more of these people? No. So far as I am concerned, this is not a question of communism. This is the age-old struggle, centuries old, of a fight for freedom—the peoples' fight for freedom. The United States of America should be the first to say, "We stand back of you in this fight for freedom." We did say that in the Atlantic Charter, but now must these people who are struggling for freedom go to Uncle Joe Stalin to look for that freedom? Why should it not come from us—from the United States of America? That should be our program. That is what we should do.

Mr. EATON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT].

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Chairman, I hope we can bring the discussion back now to the matter of the Greek-Turkish loan and let the theoretical discussion as to the ethnological background of the residents of Macedonia go until some more appropriate occasion.

I would like to take up with you some of the factors which, it seems to me, must be considered by every man and woman in this body as we make this very momentous decision. It is a decision which each of us is going to make, and there is no easy answer for anybody. It is not one of those cases where we can easily say "No," and shrug our shoulders and assume that we have answered the problem. It is not one of those questions to which we can say "Yes," and be sure of the consequences or of the results.

I assume if it were not for the very definite fact that the President of the United States called us together in joint assembly on March 12 and presented us with a specific program that the area of discussion in which we are now engaged could be considerably wider. Had it not been for that pronouncement which has been heard all around the world, we could begin with a theoretical discussion as to what to do about this big problem which is confronting us, growing out of the conditions existing in Greece and Turkey. But as a result of the fact that the announcement has been made in a joint session of Congress and the President of the United States speaking as its Chief Executive has announced it as his decision that this country is going to discontinue appeasing further aggression on the part of the Russians, and that he has recommended specific steps to stop that appeasement, the decision is now in the hands of the Congress. We must decide whether or not we wish to associate ourselves with the President's proposal to discontinue appeasement of Russia or whether we wish to associate ourselves with the kind of sorry appeasement policies which existed from the days of the Cairo Conference until March 12, when President Truman stood on the rostrum in this Chamber and announced that the policy of appeasement had failed and that we were set to follow a different course.

In my opinion, the appeasement policies followed by President Roosevelt in the conferences at Yalta and Tehran,

especially, and followed by President Truman at Potsdam and down to March 12 did much to create the sorry situation in which we now find ourselves. However, be that as it may, while Republicans were not consulted in those days of appeasement, we are all now confronted by the same challenging circumstances. Republicans are now being called upon to help cure that which we did not help create. It is my conviction we now must measure up to our new responsibilities.

I was one of those who opposed repeal of the Neutrality Act prior to World War II. I was one of those who opposed the original lend-lease legislation and joined with the minority of members of the House Foreign Affairs Committee, in offering an alternative plan which I thought incurred less risk of war. When our alternative proposal was defeated, I voted for lend-lease on final passage. It seemed to me then there was no other alternative. I was one of those who voted against arming our ships prior to World War II. I voted against these proposals because I felt they were steps leading to war.

As a consequence of my votes before World War II, I have been accused frequently by the administration of being an isolationist, of being a Tory, of being an obstructionist, of being a reactionary. I have been attacked by all the abusive adjectives New Dealers use to discredit diligent Republicans. However, in spite of all that, in spite of the fact that this same administration may seek some way in which to make political capital of the fact that I now support the President in a program which it seems to me is right, I have no desire to engage in the sharp practices of partisan politics in looking at a decision that is as stupendous as this one. I now support President Truman's proposal on Greece and Turkey for the same reason I opposed President Roosevelt's early proposals to commit us to the fighting before Pearl Harbor. In each case, my desire to keep America at peace is the motivating factor.

Whether the predictions of those of us before World War II, who said that these unneutral steps were leading us into war were correct or incorrect, the men who write history later will have to determine. In any event those steps did not keep us out of war. Out of that war came new problems as great as we were told by the eager interventionists of 1940 and 1941 were the problems which would be solved by World War II.

I believe that as realists, as Americans, without regard to partisanship, or political alignment, we have to survey the world as we find it today, not as we would wish it were. We cannot discuss this problem in a vacuum. We have to pick up the march of history where it is in front of us and govern our decision on the basis of the facts which exist today, regardless of how we happened to arrive at this point, or regardless of whether or not different decisions at a different time might have brought about a happier situation than that which we now confront.

It seems to me these are the facts which we now confront. Fact No. 1 is that Russian aggression is on the march in the world today. I think nobody will

deny that. I think the most insistent opponent of this legislation cannot come down in the well of this House and say that Russian communism is not marching out with an aggressive force today. That is demonstrated all around the periphery of Russia. It is demonstrated by the complete elimination of the little independent Baltic Republics of Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia—gone from the map entirely, sucked against their will and their wish completely into the Russian system, as I am convinced Turkey and Greece will be gone from the map entirely if at this stage of the game we pull the rug out from under the President in his first practical step in opposing the program of appeasement of Russia. We must not send out the signal to Russia that as far as the people of America are concerned, through their elected representatives, we do not propose to support the President when he stands toe to toe and says Russian aggression must stop. We now have Russian aggression. We will have to concede that. If peace is to prevail this aggression must stop or be stopped.

Fact No. 2 we will also have to concede. That is that the Red tide of Communist aggression now threatens to break out of its boundaries at a new point—in Greece and in Turkey. Certainly, nobody who has kept abreast of the developments in that area through the newspapers and the radio, even, if you have not taken the trouble to read the hearings reporting the evidence before the committee on this bill, can help but concede that Russian interests and Russian influences and Communist forces are, in large part, responsible for the guerrilla warfare taking place in Greece today. They are responsible for the unstable conditions existing in Greece today, and certainly for the dreads and fears which the people of Turkey have that the Red Army is going to come rolling in and take over the Dardanelles and the eastern provinces of Turkey.

Thus we have a set of circumstances which nobody likes but with which we must deal to avoid the things which none of us would like to have happen. But here they are, these facts. What are we going to do about them? Each one of you has to make a decision on those circumstances. It is not only those of us who are going to vote in support of this legislation who have to make the decision, but also the rest of you have a decision to make. What are you going to do about the facts which exist historically today? I think there are only three decisions any of us can make:

First. We can go along as proposed here with the President's proposal, throw up some temporary dikes at the points represented by Greece and Turkey to hold back the Red river of Communist aggression at that point, at least for a time, so we can prepare a more comprehensive program for keeping the Communist forces within their own boundaries. You can do that if you will; that is one alternative. It is represented by the legislation now before us to aid Greece and Turkey.

There is a second alternative. You can say that you do not want to see communism overflow the world, that you

want to do something about it, but this is not the place and this is not the time. You can say that we should erect this dike at a later time or at some other place; and I will not quarrel with you about that decision. However, I think you owe it to your country and to your Congress to tell us where then you would put up the dike if you believe one should be erected somewhere else and at some other time. If you think Turkey and Greece are not the proper places to try to hold in this torrent of communism, you should tell us where you think we should make the stand so we can intelligently appraise the merit of your position.

There is a third alternative. You may say you do not think the dike should be built at Turkey and at Greece, that you do not think the dike should be built at any later time or any later place, that you believe the thing to do is to let communism overflow its banks, seek its own level and sweep out until it comes to our immediate shores and threatens our own particular industry at home.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from South Dakota has expired.

Mr. EATON. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman five additional minutes.

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MUNDT. In just a moment. I wish to develop this third point first.

You may say you think the thing to do is to wait until communism has overflowed all through Europe, until it has overflowed into Africa and Asia, and then if the Red torrent continues to come our way at our shores we will try to stop it.

There are no other ways than these three alternatives confronting us. None of them are very happy eventualities, none of them can be cited as being a completely secure policy for us; but to me the first alternative is the best to set up the dikes now in Greece and Turkey. I think this choice holds more of peace and less of war than either of the other two alternatives. If there be other alternatives, at least during the hearings which we held for many weeks in our committee none was presented by any person in authority.

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MUNDT. I yield.

Mr. BENDER. If the gentleman's claim is correct, that Soviet Russia is on the march, does not the gentleman feel that we were wrong in disposing of our surplus war materials at a fraction of the cost to the taxpayers of America, that we were making a mistake? Does not the gentleman feel that we are making a mistake in cutting the appropriations of the State Department, of the War Department, of the Navy Department? Does not the gentleman feel that the Republican program for economy in these items is wrong if Soviet Russia is on the march, if we are going to have another world war?

Mr. MUNDT. I will try to answer the gentleman's question if I can remember all he said. It was sort of a chain series of questions.

Certainly I would say that the program is wrong that we have followed in the disposition of war surpluses. It has been full of mistakes. I am not trying to justify the War Assets Administration. It has had nine successive administrators since it was first organized. I recognize, of course, that this is a stupendous problem, but it has been handled most stupidly.

Mr. BENDER. And much of the surplus property is going to Russia.

Mr. MUNDT. I decline to yield further but I doubt if much of the surplus property is now going to Russia. If the gentleman has any evidence to show that it is, I think he owes a duty to the House to spread it in the RECORD.

Mr. BENDER. I brought that out on the floor a month ago.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Chairman, I cannot yield further. A little later if I still have time I will yield. I want to finish up with these alternatives, one of which we must select. I think the bill before us is the alternative which we should choose. There are several reasons why I favor it to the other available choices.

In the first place it buys us some time at a moment when time is important. I think it sets up these temporary dikes. I think it is going to serve as a stop-gap measure to give us a chance, now that we have abandoned appeasement, to revise our American foreign policy on an intelligible and effective basis so that the Members of Congress can set themselves up in opposition to the forces which threaten freedom.

The second point which I think this legislation covers is that it does something of a constructive nature in that it will prevent Russian aggression into Turkey and Greece from taking place in the near future. I do not think there is a remote chance that the armies of Russia are going to go into Greece and Turkey in the face of the passage of this legislation.

Mr. Chairman, the Russians are realists. They know better than we do that they do not have the atomic bomb; they know that their navy is inferior to the American Navy; they know better than we that their army is not mechanized in terms of modern equipment in comparison with the American Army; they know they are woefully weak in the element of machine tools, so essential in the event of a modern war. If they find out that we are determined and I hope united in our opposition to further aggression on the part of the Russians this stop-gap will serve as a temporary measure while the Russians stand back and resurvey the situation, not being willing to precipitate a war by going up against us in a situation like this.

The third constructive thing I think the measure does is that it signals to the world that this is the end of the era of appeasement and remember, Mr. Chairman, when we vote on this measure we are going to send a signal to the world and that signal is going to be one thing or the other: Either we are going to signal that the Congress of the United States stands firm with the President in believing that the end of the period of appeasement should come, that this is the end of our appeasement program

whereby we bend the knee and bow the head every time the Kremlin speaks. That signal will say in a most impressive manner that from now on we are going to have a program of realism, of reciprocity, of justice, of respectability. We are going to send out that kind of signal when we vote on this measure or else we are going to send out the other kind of signal.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from South Dakota has expired.

Mr. EATON. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman five additional minutes.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Chairman, that other signal would be we are going to send the signal out to Russia and the people of the world that the Congress does not uphold a program of firmness against Communist aggression, that we are not standing shoulder to shoulder in bringing about a cessation of the program of appeasement.

How will that signal be interpreted in Moscow? How will the men of the Kremlin feel and what will they do if we announce to them and to the world that we are not going to help the Greeks and the Turks keep down this Red invasion? I would not be greatly surprised, if we sent out that kind of signal, that within 30 days the armies of Russia would be in Athens and in Ankara in control of the situation. Then, Mr. Chairman, how would those who now dissent from this measure answer that situation? What would be their answer then? What do they then propose? Do they propose that we do nothing then or do they propose taking steps leading to war? That is why I say there is less chance of war in setting up these temporary barriers to give us time to survey the situation and develop an intelligent positive program than there is by running the risk of inviting the Red armies to walk in when we show weakness at this critical period.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MUNDT. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. The gentleman speaking is a very able member of the Un-American Activities Committee. Does he believe that we have appeased Russia in this country?

Mr. MUNDT. I certainly do, but we have taken steps of late to drive the Communists out of the Government, out of high positions of responsibility, and 10 days after the President addressed a joint session of Congress he issued a proclamation, which indicates that the President himself now realizes we are going to have to curtail communism at home at the same time we are fighting it ideologically abroad.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. And he asked for \$50,000,000. Do you think we can do it with \$50,000,000?

Mr. MUNDT. Here at home?

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Yes.

Mr. MUNDT. I certainly do. If we place \$50,000,000 in the hands of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, I think we can drive the Communists out of every Government position in America; we can get them out of teachers organizations, labor unions, churches, and elsewhere. Fifty million dollars, put in the

hands of the FBI, will give us a population of sturdy Americans such as we have not had in this country since the days of Teddy Roosevelt, a long time ago.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MUNDT. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. VORYS. The gentleman has mentioned March 12, 1947, as a historic day. Would not the gentleman say that November 5, 1946, when the complexion of the Congress changed and the people spoke, and the Republicans who had been denouncing Communist appeasement at home and abroad were swept into office, is the historic date when the administration changed its course?

Mr. MUNDT. I think the gentleman is correct. I think the vote last November 5 was the original impetus. I think that was the one single thing which started this issue of events, which started the switch from a policy of one-party Russian appeasement to one of a bipartisan arrangement in which Democrats and Republicans joined and which has finally eventuated in that happy goal where the better type of Democrats, aided by the Republicans, supported the President in his tardy proposal to purge the Communists of all Government positions.

The fourth constructive thing, it seems to me, this measure achieves, is this; that it will give new hope and new confidence to freedom-loving people all over the world. Even in Poland there are a great many freedom-loving people still very unhappy under the 'whip lash' of the Communist leaders. Even in Yugoslavia there are many freedom-loving people who are restive under the whip lash of Tito, the dictator. If we answer this call of freemen today it is going to give new hope and new confidence and new courage to freedom-loving people everywhere, including those, in some considerable number, living behind the iron curtain of the U. S. S. R. today.

Now, I want to say in all candor there are some things this bill does not do, because I think we should appraise this bill dispassionately and objectively. In the first place, I think this bill does not mean that this is an end to the menace of communism and the aggressive forces of Russia. I do not think this means an end to the efforts of communism in America to take us over from within, and I do not think it means an end on the part of the Communists in the Kremlin to push out their boundaries in all directions.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from South Dakota has again expired.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman five additional minutes.

Mr. MUNDT. Thank you. I do not think that this bill will mark the end of the Communists menace, but, as I say, it does set up a dike. It stops the immediate hazard at the point where the danger exists, and since this is the first time since 1941 that the Russians will have been stopped in an effort to take away the autonomy of a little country, it is going to cause some serious thinking in the Kremlin before they make the effort anywhere again.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MUNDT. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. RANKIN. One of the gentlemen spoke a few minutes ago about the \$50,000,000 asked for to purge this Government of Communists. If the Congress will pass the bill that we now have pending before the Committee on the Judiciary to make the FBI an independent agency, we can take that \$50,000,000 and expose every Communist on the Federal pay roll and elsewhere throughout the country.

Mr. MUNDT. I think the gentleman is correct.

Now, if I may proceed and get away from a discussion of that which has transpired earlier in my remarks I would like to push forward to the conclusion of my statement.

The second thing that this bill does not do is this. I think it does not mean that we are adopting for America a permanent foreign policy called the Truman doctrine or anything else which could be interpreted as meaning that we are going to finance faltering governments all over the world simply because they claim to be operated by free men. I do not think that that is involved in this decision. We are meeting an important problem, recognizable at two specific points and answering it in a specific manner. This does not mean that we are committing ourselves—and our committee report makes that very clear—to faltering governments which may get into difficulty all over the world, and simply by coming to us and saying, "We need help; we believe in freedom," expect that we will aid them with hundreds of millions of dollars. These are two unique cases paralleled by no other country in the world, unless possibly you could present the case of Iran. In Iran we have already done the thing we now propose to do in Greece and Turkey.

Mr. JARMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MUNDT. I yield to the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. JARMAN. I wish to compliment my distinguished friend, one of the ablest members of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, on the able address he has made, and to say that I think he is very effective, indeed.

Mr. MUNDT. I thank the gentleman very much. Had I known the gentleman was going to say that of course I would have yielded to him a long time ago!

Mr. DORN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MUNDT. I yield to the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. DORN. It appears to me that Turkey and Spain are in the same category. We are lending money to support the Government of Turkey. I want some of the gentlemen on the Committee on Foreign Affairs to tell me why we do not at least accept an ambassador from Spain in this Nation's capital. I think Spain did as much to stop communism and remain neutral as Turkey or any of the other neutrals in that section of the world did.

Mr. MUNDT. I cannot permit the gentleman to divert me onto a lengthy discussion which would take more than the remaining time I have, so I shall have to decline a discussion of that point. I want to keep this discussion limited to Greece and Turkey because, as I say, they are cases which are not typical of any other areas in the world with the sole possible exception of Iran, where we have already proceeded in this direction and with this same formula. I might add, also, that up to now certainly our policy in Iran has been highly successful.

The third thing this bill does not do is that it does not suffice in itself as a doctrine for freedom or as a policy for preserving what we consider the American ideals throughout the world. For this program to be effective, it seems to me it is imperative that it must be made part of a comprehensive and consistent overall program, which I have the courage of hope is now in the process of formation in the councils of the mighty here in the United States. I think that new policy should be an affirmative, positive, American foreign policy of action, instead of a cringing American foreign policy of reaction to what happens in various parts of the world, such as we have been following since the days of the war. American foreign policy should be geared to action in support of American ideals not just a pattern of reactions to moves by Russia or any other country.

If we accompany this program in Greece and Turkey by the evolution of a truly bipartisan American foreign program, positive and active in nature, moving on its own force and with its own ideals, and abandon herewith and hereupon this whole program of making our policy one of reaction to what happens here and what happens there, then I believe these \$400,000,000 holding up this temporary dike will indeed save the situation long enough for us to articulate and enunciate a policy which can preserve the peace and establish equality throughout the world.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from South Dakota has expired.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Chairman, I yield two additional minutes to the gentleman from South Dakota.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MUNDT. I am sorry; I have only 2 minutes. If the gentleman can induce my chairman to give me some more time I shall be happy to yield.

Mr. EATON. The chairman of this committee cannot manufacture time. The gentleman has had over 20 minutes already. While he is a very brilliant and able Member of the House, there are some other gentlemen here who still have something to say, and we have to give them some time.

Mr. MUNDT. I am not asking for more time, I am explaining why I am unable to yield any more of the rapidly vanishing time I still have.

You have a right to ask me and I have the impossible task of trying to tell you in a few minutes what I think should

be included in this affirmative American foreign policy.

Let me point out, first of all, though, that I think accompanying this program should be a revitalization of an American information program abroad. To that effect, this afternoon, I introduced a bill which has just been given the number H. R. 3342, and which would give legislative authority for our Voice of America short-wave program and also set up a broad over-all program to tell the truth about America in the areas of the world where we are today being misinterpreted abroad by the voices coming from the Moscow headquarters of Red fascism.

The second thing I think we should do to supplement approval of this legislation and make it effective is to remove the last vestige of communism from every official place in American life, be it the Federal Government, the State governments, the local governments, or the schools of this country.

The third thing I think we must do if this program is to be made effective, if these temporary dikes are to hold back the flood of aggressive communism long enough for us to get real security, is to press for an early and an affirmative decision on the international control of atomic energy, because unless we do that there can be no peace in a world in which the atom bomb is loose in the hands of dictators.

The fourth thing I think we have to do with the time this legislation will buy is to establish a program of realistic relationships with Russia which, as I see it, can come only from a meeting between the leaders of America and the leaders of Russia. I find myself in that one category alone advocating a move also advocated by Henry Wallace. It is the only place in which I have agreed with Henry for so long that I am almost afraid to find him supporting my idea in that connection. But I would like to see the American and Russian leaders, alone, get together and define their areas of agreement and their areas of disagreement and find out whether or not it is possible for us to work with the Russians, because if it is not possible then we must formulate an organization in this world where we can work without the Russians to help preserve the peace. It is the suicidal course to war to simply drift along misunderstanding each other, mistrusting each other, without taking positive steps for one mighty effort to work out a basis on which these two strong nations can work together to preserve the peace. It is, indeed, possible that once Russia realizes that we are firm in our position against further aggression on her part she will come to terms with us on an enforceable agreement which stabilizes boundary lines and settles existing differences on a firm and final basis. To me, it is at least an effort which should be attempted. Should it fail, we are no worse off than we are today; should it succeed, all humanity will pay homage to its achievements.

Mr. Chairman, a fifth step which I think America should take during this interval of time which we are about to purchase through our aid to Greece and

Turkey is to turn our attention to equipping the United Nations with authorities and means so that hereafter that great international organization can meet effectively all threats to national solvency and all acts of aggression.

A sixth part of what I conceive to be an essential over-all program which must be evolved if our aid to Greece and Turkey is to become permanently effective and helpful is that we must exercise our great leadership to bring about a stabilization of international boundary lines and the settlement of prevailing international disputes. Small festering sores are likely to erupt into something serious. Let us use our great strength to heal these sores while they are yet small and easily curable.

Finally, Mr. Chairman, and most important perhaps of all with the exception of the matter of atomic energy, if our approval of the President's proposal for Turkey and for Greece is to be more than an expensive gesture, we must use this time we herewith purchase to evolve and enunciate an affirmative American foreign policy of positive action based upon American traditions and American ideals rather than apologetic reactions to the words or threats or actions of any other power on earth. This new American foreign policy should be conceived by bipartisan action and not be simply the statements of the party in power accompanied by the hope that they will be supported by the party out of power.

Let us make this American foreign policy so clear and so candid that all who run can read and understand it. Let it be stated with such clarity that both at home and abroad there will be no doubt as to its contents or its motives.

Mr. Chairman, if we take these seven additional steps during the interval of stability which we secure through this aid to Turkey and Greece our money will be wisely invested. If we simply aid Greece and Turkey and do nothing more, however, that is more effective than perhaps aiding a country or two more which might solicit our assistance I am afraid we shall have forever missed one of the greatest opportunities in our entire national history. With the end of appeasement, I dare to hope we are entering the dawn of a new era which will produce the elements out of which peace can be made permanent and justice secure.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HUBER].

Mr. HUBER. Mr. Chairman, if we were to allow political expediency to determine our vote on this bill I imagine a great many of us would vote against it. I know that the mail that I have received has been overwhelmingly in opposition, yet I am satisfied that we are going to vote as Americans and not as Democrats or Republicans. The principal newspaper in my district has editorially come out on both sides of this question, so I can see there are a great many people who are disturbed about this legislation.

Mr. Chairman, while I shall support H. R. 2616, I shall do so with some reluctance. I had hoped, as I am sure the entire membership of this House had

hoped, that with the end of the cruel and costly war from which we emerged the "four freedoms" would become a reality instead of a phrase.

Abraham Lincoln once said "This Nation cannot endure half slave and half free." Mr. Chairman, if this Nation could not endure half slave and half free in those so-called horse-and-buggy days, how can this world, in this atomic age, endure half slave and half free? The great war in which we engaged to preserve the democracy of man is not over as long as great masses of the world's population are denied the guarantees of the "four freedoms." We cannot bring back the thousands of American boys who sacrificed their lives to preserve the principles in which we believe. We cannot bring back the 6,000,000 Jews and others who were consumed in the incinerators of the despots. We can, however, make sure that those incinerators are not rekindled, else the stench again assail our nostrils and end this civilization for which we have had such high hopes.

There are over a million displaced persons in the American, British, and French occupied zones. Some haven must be found for the millions whose homes are gone, whose families are gone, before even their hope is gone.

Four hundred million dollars is an immense sum, yet it is only a pittance if it helps to continue our way of life. I urge that this money be expended to the best possible advantage, that it not be used for the purchase of automobiles and other luxuries for the politicians of Greece and Turkey. I urge that it be used for the rehabilitation of the unfortunate people of those lands. I urge that we make an all-out effort to the end that Greece may become the shining example of a product of Democracy; that those countries of faint heart, and those who are discouraged, may look upon that ancient country revitalized through our help, as a country that is an example of the workings of true democracy.

I realize that there are those who say that much remains to be done in our own country and that the proposed loan to Greece and Turkey ideally lends itself to criticism from all quarters. However, we are somewhat in the position of the family who, though denied most of the necessities of life, are willing to help their unfortunate starving neighbors to acquire and possess a few of the necessities of life.

In that spirit I know this Congress will approve the legislation now under consideration, and I only hope that time will prove the decision which we make to be the right, the honest and the Christian thing to do.

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HUBER. I gladly yield to my good friend the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. FULTON. I think the gentleman himself visited Europe and has been in Russia and has seen these things first hand. Is that not so?

Mr. HUBER. May I say to the gentleman from Pennsylvania that I recall that he and I together saw first hand the misery that exists in the occupied coun-

ties of Europe and that is why I have a very strong feeling on this matter.

Mr. FULTON. I compliment the gentleman on his fine statement.

Mr. HUBER. I thank the gentleman. Mr. OWENS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HUBER. I yield.

Mr. OWENS. In view of the fact that the gentleman spoke about rehabilitation of the people of those countries, can you say why we in this Congress would withhold \$150,000,000, a much smaller amount than \$400,000,000—last week—from the people of Poland and other central European countries, and give \$400,000,000 to this cause?

Mr. HUBER. When you say "we" you are referring to those who voted for the amendment that limited it to \$200,000,000?

Mr. OWENS. Yes. Perhaps you did not and I did not, but the Congress did. Can you justify the action of this Congress?

Mr. HUBER. I cannot justify it, and I hope we will see the light in this and not approve further restrictive amendments to this bill such as were made to the foreign relief bill recently passed by this House.

Mr. JARMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HUBER. I yield.

Mr. JARMAN. Does the gentleman not agree that two wrongs do not make a right?

Mr. HUBER. That is certainly one of the finest statements I ever heard.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HUBER] has expired.

Mr. EATON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. KNUTSON], chairman of the Ways and Means Committee.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Chairman, the gullibility of Congress is a never-failing source of wonderment to me. If there is anything in the world more gullible than a Congressman it is two Congressmen. When I saw how the membership of this House just ate up the remarks made by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] I could not help but form the conclusion that this Congress was not much different from the one we had back in the First World War.

Let me give you an example of the gullibility that existed at that time. Speaking on a resolution to take America into the war, a certain Congressman from Ohio said:

Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, I am going to vote for this resolution, but I am going to reserve the right to oppose in the future any attempts to send American boys to the European trenches. I do not believe that any American soldier should be drafted to be sent to the battlefields of England to fight Great Britain's battles that her own sons have refused to fight.

And a gullible Congress applauded. The RECORD shows they applauded. Did we send American boys to France back in 1917? Yes. We sent about a million of them and, as I recall it, we had 300,000 casualties. That war cost us \$48,000,000,000 and left us with a net national debt of \$26,000,000,000.

In the Seventy-eighth Congress we gradually took steps toward war, and the then President Roosevelt at Boston said:

I want to say to you fathers and mothers again and again and again, that your sons will never be sent to fight on foreign soil.

And again a gullible Congress applauded. They said, "We may declare war but we won't have to fight. Even if we get into war we won't have to send our boys across." That is what we also said in the First World War: "We can get into it but we won't have to fight it. All we will have to do is to say we are against you and the Germans will quit."

We fatuously believed it in 1917, just as we believed it in 1941. In the First World War we fought to make the world safe for democracy. Do you know what we got out of that war, in addition to a debt of \$48,000,000,000 and 300,000 casualties? We exchanged the Kaiser for Hitler. A good trade, what?

That is what we got out of the First World War. We traded the Kaiser for Hitler. It was just like trading an electric razor for a rusty jackknife.

Then our trigger finger got so itchy we got into the Second World War. I do not know what the Second World War was all about, neither do you, whether we went in to make the world still more safe for democracy than we did in the First World War, but something like that anyway. Before they dragged us into the Second World War Churchill said: "Give us the implements and we will do the job." So we gave him 50 destroyers and billions in lease-lend.

You remember that. And again a gullible Congress applauded. Do you see what I mean?

I do not know what bird is the most gullible of all birds, but whatever the breed, I would be in favor of placing him on our national emblem. At the moment I would vote for the penguin. He resembles so much some of our colleagues.

I fear there are Members in this House today who believe that we can stop communism by spending \$400,000,000 in Turkey and Greece.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KNUTSON. Not just now. I have only 10 minutes. If I have time later I will be glad to yield later.

It has been well said that communism is brought on by maladministration, poverty, inequality, and all the other evils that mankind has been affected with since the beginning of time. You cannot stop communism with guns and bullets, no; that has been tried.

The Communists, the Russians, will not go in and take countries over by force of arms, they will take them by infiltration.

They tell you that the points that must be held are Greece and Turkey. The gentleman from Illinois fortified himself with a map to prove that was true. If he believes that we can stop Joe Stalin in Greece and Turkey with four hundred million he is more gullible than I had thought him. You know the place to stop Joe Stalin is in Germany and in Japan. If Russia takes completely over in one or both of those countries, then

all the world will go Communist with the possible exception of the Western Hemisphere. You cannot get away from that. It is as fundamental as anything can be. You may spend \$400,000,000—and, by the way, that amount is only the first step. There is no one within the sound of my voice who will contend for a moment that \$400,000,000 is all that we will have to spend in this grand, new adventure that is here proposed. It is going to cost us billions and billions and billions. We first go into Greece and Turkey, and the next move will be Iran and Iraq. Then we will have to go into India, Arabia, Palestine, perhaps into northern Africa, India, Italy, finally into Spain, Portugal, Korea, and finally France—we do not know where our adventure will lead us, but we do know that the cost is going to threaten the solvency of our country if we carry on to the bitter end. Are we prepared for it? Can we do so with a national debt of \$258,000,000,000 and over a million casualties from the late war to take care of, not to mention our national debt, with an annual carrying charge on that debt of \$7,000,000,000, and with a budget for next year that may approximate thirty-seven and one-half billion dollars?

Mr. Chairman, one of the preceding speakers asked us to be realistic. I am asking him to be realistic because he was anything but realistic in his half-hour address to this Committee. Of course, it would be fine if this old world were studded with gems of generosity and altruism and all the other things that go to make up a perfect world; but, Mr. Chairman, we have a very practical problem here at hand, and that is to keep America solvent. You are proposing by this legislation to take her down the road that leads to insolvency and perhaps to communism as well.

Less than 2 years ago practically all the nations of the earth, save our late belligerents, met in San Francisco and set up the United Nations organization for the specific purpose of outlawing war and bringing to a ravaged world the blessings of peace and security.

The San Francisco Conference drew up a charter, which was hailed by the peace-loving peoples of the world as a beacon light that would forever outlaw the black specter of war, and at the same time remove all fears and substitute therefor lasting peace and security.

Let me read from that charter:

The purposes of the United Nations are: 1. To maintain international peace and security, and to that end to take effective collective measures.

Let me call your particular attention to the words "to take effective collective measures." In no part of the charter is it so much as hinted that any signatory may at any time adopt unilateral measures. I read on:

To take collective measures for the prevention and removal of threats to the peace, and for the suppression of acts of aggression or other breaches of the peace, and to bring about by peaceful means and in conformity with the principles of justice and international law, adjustment or settlement of international disputes or situations which might lead to a breach of the peace.

Mr. Chairman, that was a covenant openly arrived at, and unanimously adopted by the assembled representatives of the subscribing nations. We were one of the principal sponsors, yet now, less than 2 years later, we are the first nation to attempt to nullify it by proposing to act alone.

I am one of those old-fashioned Americans who believes that promises and agreements are made to be kept, but here we find the President of the United States proposing, and another body, by a majority vote, giving approval to a proposal to scrap the charter of the United Nations, and to reinstate the old order, which permitted any nation, at any time, to invade another country, and to kill, pillage and destroy at its pleasure.

If the House of Representatives takes affirmative action upon the proposal before us, as proposed by the President, we will proclaim to the world that the word of America is no longer good, and that henceforth our word is not to be relied upon.

The proposal before us today is freighted with possibilities for evil, the magnitude and importance of which no mortal can foresee. If the plea of the President receives congressional sanction, it means our embarkation upon a new policy that may lead to no one knows where.

What I am about to say, Mr. Chairman, has been better said before, both in this body and in the other body; however, it will bear reiteration, and it is barely possible that we may be able to present a new facet or two.

Let me state briefly the question we are asked to answer: Shall the United States alone, and in utter disregard of its pledge made at San Francisco, guarantee the future political and territorial integrity of nations situated in the Eastern Hemisphere? To decide the question affirmatively would be to depart from America's traditional policy, and to repudiate the solemn pledge we made at San Francisco. Indeed, it would mean our embarking upon a policy to attain world domination—something we have always spurned.

Great Britain has consistently played that role the past 300 years, and in carrying it on under all conditions and circumstances has succeeded in bleeding herself white and, today, we are told she is bankrupt. During the past 100 years she was obliged to fight 35 wars in order to maintain her position and prestige.

Let us ask ourselves, do we want to follow her example, and are we ready to pay the price that must inevitably be exacted of us—national bankruptcy?

We are told that it is absolutely necessary for the preservation of our freedom and economy that we alone now step into Greece and Turkey so that Russia may be halted in her march toward world domination.

Is there anyone in this Chamber who believes that once we go into these two countries with American dollars and men it will settle the immediate problem of curbing Russian ambitions? Is there anyone in this body who really believes that we can stop there without going further?

Intervention in Greece and Turkey would merely be but the first step. Later we would have to go into Iran and Iraq, Egypt and Palestine, and possibly India and Afghanistan. Who can, with any degree of accuracy, foretell when and how it would all end? That secret is locked up among the riddles of the unforeseeable future, which no finite mind may explore.

Communism cannot be halted by dollars, bayonets and bullets, because it is a symptom of social and political unrest. Communism spawns and thrives on poverty, lack of opportunity, mal-administration, and the many other evils that have beset the human race since the beginning of time.

Assuming that communism can be held back by dollars, bullets and bayonets, is there anyone within the sound of my voice who is so gullible as to believe that the \$400,000,000 the President asks for Greece and Turkey is all that will be required? No, no, my friends, the ultimate cost will reach astronomical proportions, and the total ultimate cost may be so great as to bankrupt and beggar the American people. Will you take that chance? Can you afford to? Have you a right to do so?

The Truman administration made little or no effort to stop communism from entering and taking over Poland, Czechoslovakia, Yugoslavia, Rumania, and Bulgaria. Why this sudden zeal for what we call democracy? The answer is simple—oil. We are asked to stake the future of American sovereignty and political integrity for the sake of the enormous oil deposits in the Near East, and to maintain the life line of the British Empire, which is equally commercial in its implications. Let no one tell you differently.

We may send American troops and dollars into the Near East, and I care not how many, they would yet be insufficient to prevent the infiltration of communism if local conditions are such as to invite its entrance.

Assuming that dollars, bullets, and bayonets can hold back communism, then I ask you what are we doing to prevent the further spread of communism in a number of American Republics where the Communists are daily becoming more strongly entrenched? Let me cite one instance, if I may. I refer to the Republic of Haiti, which lies athwart our pathway to the Panama Canal. The Government of Haiti is also in financial straits, and we are in a large measure responsible for Haiti's present plight.

Briefly, we went into Haiti 32 years ago with the Marines for the purpose of restoring law and order, and remained there for a period of 21 years, the occupation only ending in 1936.

During our occupation we administered Haiti's finances, supervised her expenditures, and completely controlled her internal affairs.

In the year 1922 the Haitian Government, through a New York bank, was granted a loan of \$23,500,000, at an interest rate of 6 percent. Up to the present time, I am informed, she has paid thirty-eight millions in amortization and

interest on that loan. I am particularly well acquainted with the details of that transaction, as I happened to be in the country at the time it was negotiated, and have visited there a number of times since, the last time early in December.

All moneys borrowed by Haiti during the occupation were expended under American supervision, and it is a significant fact that none of it was used in promoting what might be termed productive enterprises that would have improved the lot of the Haitian people, and provided them with permanent and gainful employment.

Let me come down a little later to the period when the need for rubber in the late war became so desperate. In an attempt to help relieve the rubber shortage the Haitian Government, on its own responsibility, and upon our urging, expropriated for the duration of the war the land owned and tilled by more than 300,000 small farmers, all of whom became displaced and were compelled to seek refuge in the cities because they had no other place for them to go. Haiti, not being an industrialized country, was unable to assimilate them in the new order of her economy, and today these displaced persons constitute fertile soil for the spread of communism on the island Republic, which lies less than 2 hours from Miami.

In order to get these unfortunates back onto the soil, President Estime, who is a sincere friend of his people, early in January sent to Washington his Minister of Finance, M. Gaston Margron, a most able and estimable gentleman, for the purpose of adjusting Haiti's financial problems, and securing a few million dollars of additional capital with which to reestablish in agriculture the 300,000 peasant families already referred to. Mr. Margron was turned down by every American agency to which he appealed, and as a result the work of communizing Haiti goes merrily on.

Cuba, which is situated even closer to continental America than is Haiti, has already traveled far along the road to communism, and I am informed that the Communists use the city of Havana as their political headquarters in the Western Hemisphere. Communism has also made great strides in Mexico, Chile, and other Latin American countries that could be mentioned.

Just what are we doing toward halting the spread of communism here at home and in nearby countries? Precisely, nothing.

It would seem that the administration is indifferent to what is happening in our own front yard, but when it is told that if we do not advance \$400,000,000 to Greece and Turkey, and send to these countries military missions which would be a prelude to the sending of troops, Europe will be completely communized, the administration all of a sudden becomes galvanized into action, notwithstanding the fact that those countries are more than 4,000 miles away. Again, the reason is oil.

Let us make no mistake. Once we embark upon the policy proposed to us by President Truman and his advisers it will mark the first step in our march toward

World War III, because you know, and I know, that the course we are asked to take will sooner or later bring us in direct conflict with Russia.

If Russia constitutes a danger to the future security of America, and American institutions, then in God's name let us act intelligently and promptly, but let us do it in a manner that will be direct and effective. We now have the means within our hands to safeguard the future of America for at least a hundred years. If it be necessary to act, let us act quickly, energetically, rationally, and with effect. Let us be done with the hypocritical approach that is here proposed. Let me emphasize that the real reason we are asked to go into the Near East is to be found in the almost inexhaustible supply of oil in Iran, Iraq, and Arabia. If these pools of oil are necessary for our future security let us act, but let us act like men rather than like crawling worms.

I, for one, reject the President's proposal for two reasons. It would be ineffective and will but lead to another war; it will commit the United States and the American people to a monetary outlay that will ultimately become so great as to threaten our financial solvency.

If we are determined to combat communism, and I want to do everything necessary to prevent the spread of this pernicious philosophy, then it would seem that we should direct our talents and energies toward first checking its spread in the Western Hemisphere. That would be the sensible way of going at it. Like charity, national defense should begin at home.

Mr. EATON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FULTON].

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Chairman, it tickled me a little bit to hear the revered chairman of the Ways and Means Committee speak of the gullibility of Congress. He has evidently forgotten that he is a Congressman, too, and therefore is equally gullible with the rest of us here when he makes the statement that all Congressmen are gullible. When he makes that statement he wields the same whitewash brush on himself as well.

Secondly, he says he does not know what the Second World War was all about. I will not agree with him that he does not. However, I would like to express to him what some of us felt it was about. A lot of the people in this country hated fascism—they do not cherish communism either—and we hated fascism enough that we did something about it. We hated war, but we had to go to war to stop fascism.

When he says we are going bankrupt in appropriating this \$400,000,000 and that this is only the first step, I cannot see how he makes the statement he is willing to put the program in effect in Germany and Japan, for example, saying it is necessary there, because if it will bankrupt us one place, it would in any other. The gentleman is reduced to saying that as a matter of geography, it is not necessary some place else in the world. So if it is reduced by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. KNUTSON] simply to a question of geography, I think it is just as necessary over in the

eastern end of the Mediterranean as it is in Germany and Japan.

As to the gentleman's remarks on "applause" showing in old CONGRESSIONAL RECORDS, the gentleman must be as gullible as he would have us believe of the average Congressman who is now speaking on the issue and talking about this bill. The gentleman himself knows that previously in the RECORD when they inserted the word "applause" it was filled in by the clerks after the session was over and these items were distributed like sugar, for the particular Congressman to show in his home district that he had applause.

To be absolutely faithful to my good friend and to the present fact, I think we should note for the RECORD that while he got no applause whatever on his statements during his speech, he did get a good round of applause at the end of it.

Mr. JARMAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 1 minute.

Mr. Chairman, I was a little bit amused during the remarks of the distinguished gentleman from Minnesota, chairman of the Ways and Means Committee, at his references to the gullibility of Congress then and now. He is one of the deans of the House. He has been here longer than anybody else except three or four. It is surprising to me how he could have remained here during all those years and failed to improve the Congress. I furthermore notice that he has not become sufficiently disgusted to resign. I would like to inquire also if the Congress was similarly gullible when it recently passed his tax bill?

Mr. EATON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GAVIN].

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Chairman, I have listened with a great deal of interest to the masterful address by my friend, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], and I want to say that I, too, recall just a few short months ago the day that ended World War No. 2. I recall the load of anxiety that was lifted from a world of mothers' hearts and how the old war-torn world turned back to peace with a profound gratitude to God and with the thankfulness to the men who paid for it with their lives. These are matters that we should be thinking about. So, we, I might say, do have some remembrance of the recent occurrence. And I want to call to the attention of the House what we have done in recent months and recent years to relieve this situation in the war-torn countries of the Old World. I also want to bring out the fact that we in Congress, who represent the people, should be properly informed on the policies and programs of the State Department and the War Department.

The formation of a sound American policy in the affairs of continental Europe is long overdue, and I cannot understand the secrecy of the State Department on foreign affairs and policies about which this Congress should be advised.

The question is whether or not our Government is being directly and strategically drawn into the maelstrom of continental politics.

If we go into Greece and Turkey with our planes, tanks, guns and bayonets, backed up with our military personnel, and trouble breaks out anywhere on the British life line between London and Singapore, or between any of the nations in the Mediterranean Basin, or the Indian Ocean, certainly we will be in the middle of things and we shall become sooner or later involved.

This is an unusual venture that our Government is taking and it might commit us to the maintenance of a large army and establishment of naval bases in the Mediterranean. And, if and when, the shooting starts, we will be right in the middle of it.

What is the purpose back of this strange excursion into Greece and Turkey? Into the location which historians have pointed out as the crossroads of all wars.

It appears to be a step in the direction of imperialism. Imperialism is a policy of extending the domain or control of a nation. It is the kind of a policy this Nation has always avoided and Uncle Sam has never attempted to gain sovereignty over other nations, and, I do not think you want to see him dress up in a turban now. Why is Britain so anxious to pull out and have us take over?

However, the State Department seems to be determined that we horn into the Middle East with all of its feuds and hatreds. Slowly but surely we are being sucked in under one pretext or another; into the whirlpool of continental politics. The State Department and War Department should state definitely their objectives in this proposal.

Our people have not been asked whether or not they want this proposed scheme. I presume it is a product of a few minds and they are willing to be reckless with our money and with the established policy of our Government of non-imperialism and with the future of you and your sons.

This Congress should proceed carefully and cautiously and not rush headlong into a turmoil and add more debt and higher taxes which will have to be paid by every American citizen.

Remember, once we go in we are in the center of a world of trouble and there are many grave questions to be settled in this part of the world besides the spread of communism; the oil of Iraq and Arabia, the Dardanelles, the Palestinian question, Italy, Greece, and the whole Mediterranean area; they are all explosive.

It looks as though we are just getting under way in this spending program and I understand from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD that we will be asked shortly to give \$600,000,000 to Korea and another billion dollars to China, and about \$6,000,000,000 more to France and Britain; also Italy, which is an even more strategic spot than Greece, will request a stupendous loan based on our support of the Greek-Turkish situation. And then, no doubt, we will hear from Iraq, Saudi Arabia, and Iran.

So, we really are asking for it even though this country has put out in the

last several years a total of \$66,385,270,-000, as follows:

Lend-lease.....	\$51,000,000,000
British credit.....	3,750,000,000
Total foreign credit authorizations by Export-Import Bank.....	3,458,771,000
United States quota in World Bank.....	3,175,000,000
United States quota in World Fund.....	2,750,000,000
Civilian supplies sent to liberated and occupied areas.....	1,400,000,000
Credits advanced to finance sales of United States surpluses abroad	851,486,000

Total..... 66,385,270,000

Certainly after a \$66,000,000,000 investment, we ought to be informed on our foreign policy, and the direction we are taking and what the eventual consequences may be so the American people will know exactly what it is all about.

This appears to be more than a relief and rehabilitation measure.

My record in this House and my votes on relief measures are well known. I have repeatedly supported these measures over the past several years.

I listened intently to the debate last week on the \$350,000,000 relief appropriation; however, the arguments expressed were the same old catalog arguments we have listened to repeatedly year after year on relief appropriations. There is nothing new. We are constantly threatened as to what will happen to us if we fail to go along.

When is this relief spending to stop, if it is ever to be stopped?

After the slashing action taken by the House on the Interior bill when a cut of approximately 44 percent was made at an estimated saving of \$134,000,000, I cannot understand, in fact I am amazed, why the Congress within a week would attempt to saddle on the backs of the overburdened American taxpayers, another \$400,000,000 after approving \$200,000,000, and which the other body, I am of the opinion, will increase to \$350,000,000. Or a total of \$750,000,000.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

Mr. EATON. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman two additional minutes.

Mr. JARMAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 3 additional minutes.

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Chairman, we now owe \$260,000,000,000 that must be eventually paid by us and paid by the generations that will follow us.

No one can say we have not done our part. I noted the remarks of Senator BYRD in the RECORD of April 22, page 3778, and I quote:

Let us say a word as to the statement that has so frequently been made in this debate: That it is either this bill or nothing; that a do-nothing policy will bring more dire results than to do something. If we are doing nothing in foreign affairs, then why has America in less than 2 years—since July 1945—spent and obligated herself to distribute money, credit, and goods in foreign countries, exclusive of military expenditures, aggregating the sum of \$16,000,000,000, to

which I have already referred? Out of this \$16,000,000,000 the sum of \$1,525,000,000 has been, or will be, given to Russia and her satellites. Again I ask, can we nourish communism with our left hand and crush communism with our right?

Our expenditures and commitments to Russia and her satellite nations since July 1, 1945, are as follows:

Russia.....	\$203,000,000
Poland.....	463,000,000
Czechoslovakia.....	202,000,000
Finland.....	92,000,000
Hungary.....	18,000,000
Yugoslavia.....	296,000,000

More than 10 percent of this amount was not distributed as of March 1, 1947, but is being daily expended.

In view of our program abroad, which already amounts to nearly \$16,000,000,000 since the war, it cannot be said that we are doing nothing. We are doing all and more than we can be expected to do within the framework of the United Nations. We have met every obligation that has been imposed upon us by the United Nations. Right today the State Department is urging the Congress to approve \$17,000,000 to Russia for the purchase of machinery to develop new processes for aviation gasoline, which will result in strengthening communism, yet, at the same time the State Department requested the Congress to approve \$400,000,000 to resist communistic aggression in Greece and Turkey. Such a contradictory foreign policy certainly requires clarification and adjustment.

And on April 21, Senator MALONE had inserted in the RECORD, page 3730, and I quote:

UNRRA and other U. S. Government aid given to the Greeks

UNNRA aid through Sept. 30, 1946.....	\$309,656,000.00
Lend-lease aid through Dec. 31, 1946.....	81,562,821.63
Credit through Export-Import Bank.....	25,000,000.00
Credit through the U. S. Maritime Commission for purchase of ships.....	45,000,000.00
Credit through the Office of Foreign Liquidation Commission.....	45,000,000.00
Total.....	506,218,821.63

Now this evidence certainly indicates we have been doing our share and more than our share, and I cannot for the life of me figure out how the Congress believes that we can afford to put up \$350,000,000 for relief purposes and then \$400,000,000 for Greece and Turkey—a total of \$750,000,000.

However, it appears that everyone thinks Uncle Sam is a rich uncle and that his pockets are inexhaustible and you can spend, spend, and spend, and there will be no day of reckoning. But I want to tell you that a day of reckoning is not far off.

I want more information on this proposed \$400,000,000 program; more definite facts than have been stated here. Not just a lot of glittering generalities and promises of what will and will not be done, but a clarification of what our foreign policy is to be. The American people are entitled to know the facts.

This bill should be recommitted for further study, and in the interim I think we should take inventory as to what we can actually afford to spend under the circumstances, or we will find ourselves wallowing in the sea of bankruptcy and

the old ship of state will be wrecked on the rocks of indifferent and careless thinking.

Mr. EATON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MUHLENBERG].

Mr. MUHLENBERG. Mr. Chairman, what we are facing today is indeed a momentous decision in the domestic life of the United States of America. I face the coming hours with a good deal of uncertainty, and yet at the same time a serenity of mind in the feeling that the outcome of this debate today and tomorrow will be for the ultimate good of the United States.

Recrimination between us here on the floor is not that that establishes the kind of decision that we have to make. I believe that rather than spend our time in finding the weak points of the arguments that have been so far presented, we should be doing a little more solid thinking about the future of the United States and the destiny of the coming generation: for we are indeed faced with a decision today that is going to affect the second generation. In all our thinking we should be impressed with the idea that it is not today that we must think of, but tomorrow. I am firmly of the opinion, gentlemen of the House, that this decision which, while it may be based on matters of which we do not yet have full cognizance, is one in which we must take somewhat on faith the things that cannot or have not been said as well as to judge soundly those things that actually have been said.

I do not respond very much to oratory nor I believe do the Members of the House. But we do respond to sound thinking. If we can have a quiet and sober time of debate in trying to decide the issues, then I believe we shall be doing what the importance of the question warrants, and what we must do as Americans today. The question is: Shall we soberly follow the arguments that have been made to us about the importance of this matter or shall we rather be led by hysteria and by loud speaking? I do not care, frankly, as a veteran of both wars, whether the result carries the United States further into immediate debt because debt by itself means nothing if there might be at the end no United States to pay the debt. To me, what is important is that we formulate legislation here which when carried forward will result in the ultimate security of the United States, and then debt can be resolved.

Let us make one answer purely from the standpoint of the future security of the United States and let us so judge what is before us.

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MUHLENBERG. I yield.

Mr. OWENS. I like the statement of the gentleman very much. It made me think as I was listening to it of this question: Do you not feel that thinking calmly we are taking the first step which is a warlike move?

Mr. MUHLENBERG. I think we are taking a most important move, but whether the move will be toward war or peace is the question that we must

decide. I am frankly of the hope that what we are taking is a move toward peace and not toward war, if our first consideration is the ultimate security of the United States, because the ultimate security of the United States does not lie in war but in peace.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. EATON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the last speaker of the afternoon, the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. JAVITS], a member of the committee.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Chairman, it is probably appropriate that I should speak last today, because I think I represent the average Member's point of view on this issue. I do not know of anything in Congress that has troubled me as deeply as this decision. I think my concern is also attributable to the fact that I spent some years in the service in World War II, and I know what it means to be at war. I know, too, that our action on this bill may well be the decision for war or peace. I have thought it through and I would now like to tell the House the conclusions to which I have come.

There can be little difference between those in favor and those opposed to this bill about the ultimate objectives sought to be obtained by it. These ultimate objectives are those set forth in the preamble to the Charter of the United Nations:

To reaffirm faith in fundamental human rights, in the dignity and worth of the human person, in the equal rights of men and women and of nations large and small, to establish conditions under which justice and respect for the obligations arising from treaties and other sources of international law can be maintained, and to promote social progress and better standards of life in larger freedom.

The question is how may we best attain these objectives—by proceeding ourselves to help nations in need of assistance for their own reconstruction and even for their own defense, to help them on the side of democracy, or by doing the best we can within the compass of the United Nations, and if it is powerless at this time, to retreat again into splendid isolation.

It is our national will to strengthen and implement the United Nations and not to bypass it, but in seeking this assistance, says the President "the United Nations and its related organizations are not in a position to extend help of the kind that is required." In other words, the United Nations not being ready to do the job the President declares that the United States must do it—and that that is our foreign policy.

The urgency of the task seems to me to be incontrovertible—for while we seek to bring about that freedom of peoples which distinguishes democracy from totalitarianism we must be prepared to help ward off that hunger and the despair which open the door to an interim seizure of power by a minority trading on despair. Once seized, such power can be perpetuated by terror, propaganda, fixed elections, and the suppression of personal freedoms, and become so firmly entrenched that it cannot be

shaken off for years. Our experience in that respect is bitter. By internal disorder fed from without, as in Greece, or by a war of nerves, as in Turkey, we can be faced with the accomplished fact of such a seizure of power in either of these countries which the majority will then find it impossible to shake off.

If our policy in this bill be considered as an emergency means for dealing with the existing impasse, then, regrettable as it is, we must all recognize it as a necessary policy and support it. But if it be considered as a permanent doctrine of the United States by which we begin here and go on to take unilateral action with our men and money in every case to stop the institution of regimes we do not like and to attempt to impose our own political and economic ideas on other countries, then I would feel that the die had indeed been cast for armed conflict in our lifetime.

I believe this bill to reflect not a permanent but a stopgap policy. I have been in Greece as recently as about 4 months ago and I know the extent of the physical and psychological destruction which has resulted from the Nazi occupation and the ensuing civil disorder in that country. Greece is incapable of being free so long as her economy is shattered. A restoration of her economy will bring in its train the end of internal disorder and the reinvigoration of democracy and democratic forces. But we must show to the Greek people our solicitude for this reinvigoration of democracy and we must show them that we know why we come to their rescue, now, unconditionally. Accordingly, I shall at the proper time propose an amendment to this bill which will assure to the Greek people first, that the government with which we deal shall be truly representative of a majority of them; and second, that such government must take all measures necessary to help itself, too. The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 7, line 14, after paragraph (4) insert after paragraph (5) the following: "If the President finds that the government of any country receiving assistance hereunder is not representative of a majority of the people of such country."

Turkey is yet a different test of the real intent of the policy of this bill. For in Turkey we face a strategic problem. It is this problem of an open or a closed eastern Mediterranean. Either Palestine, Syria, Lebanon, Iran, Iraq, and the other countries of the Middle East, including the Suez Canal, are open to the commerce, communications, and transport of the whole world, including the U. S. S. R., or they are closed. For it is a basic tenet of a Communist society that it is closed, that it is foursquare for state trading, that it excludes the normal commerce and intercourse of the world. First, therefore, we must be sure that by immediate aid the strategic situation should not be irretrievably prejudiced, while at the same time we seek a more permanent solution through the United Nations to lift the pressure on Turkey.

In Turkey the need for assistance is said to be attributable to an international war of nerves. The United Nations is established for exactly the purpose of dealing with such sources of inter-

national friction. We must entrust to the United Nations—not later but now—a role in dealing with the problems of Turkey at the same time that we are realistic and come to Turkey's aid now—in the words of the President, "to maintain their free institutions and their national integrity against aggressive movements that seek to impose upon them totalitarian regimes."

I shall therefore propose at the appropriate time an amendment to the bill which will provide that the President set the machinery of the United Nations in motion to relieve the external pressures on Turkey, following the effective technique already developed in sealing off the northern borders of Greece at the same time that assistance is given to Turkey. The amendment follows:

Page 2, line 24, after paragraph (5), insert: "*Provided, however,* That the President, notwithstanding the assistance furnished to any country hereunder, shall initiate proceedings, unless such proceedings have theretofore already been instituted, bringing to the attention of the Security Council or the General Assembly of the United Nations, any situation which threatens the territorial integrity or political independence of any country assisted hereunder and makes necessary the maintenance of fully mobilized military forces by such country."

Secretary Marshall said in his magnificent definition of democracy at the recent Council of Foreign Ministers in Moscow:

To us a society is not free if law-abiding citizens live in fear of being denied the right to work, or deprived of life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.

This definition is equally applicable to nations. We cannot permanently guarantee the integrity and independence of individual nations by the aid of our money and our men on a unilateral basis. We must be ready to accept for ourselves the role of international law rather than the role of international force if we wish it to be the guide for others, too.

The United Nations has already labored effectively in the field of relieving externally induced pressures on independent nations. We must fortify it in that work. I look forward to further development in our acceptance of the judgments arrived at collectively in the United Nations by representatives of all the United Nations, at first in limited spheres, such as territorial boundaries, administration of occupied territories, disposition of enemy territories and assets, and disposition of mandates; and later in wider fields, the administration of colonies, international trade, access to the world's raw materials, international transportation and communications, international regulation of patents and copyrights and of cartels.

In summary, therefore, I urge the acceptance of the policy of this bill as a necessary and practical means for preventing the forced imposition by a minority upon the majority of a way of life the majority does not want in two threatened countries due to the pressure of economic conditions—and the resultant closing off of the Near and Middle East, but I urge coupling this action with simultaneous action to strengthen the only agency which prom-

ises to give us a century of peace in our time, the United Nations—and a simultaneous dedication by us to the human rights and fundamental freedoms within the countries we assist which are the very reasons for our own national existence.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JAVITS. I yield.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Earlier in his remarks the gentleman said he would offer an amendment to guarantee a democratic government in Greece.

Mr. JAVITS. Yes. I hope that we can bring that about.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. To bring it about. The gentleman therefore presupposes that they do not have a democratic government.

Mr. JAVITS. I presuppose that the Greek Government leaves something to be desired. I would not be as categoric as the gentleman is on that score.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Then in the event the gentleman's amendment is not adopted would the gentleman still support this policy?

Mr. JAVITS. I am likely to, I may say to the gentleman, although it has given me a very great deal of concern, but I shall try hard to get an amendment into the bill guaranteeing truly representative government for the countries assisted.

Answering the gentleman further, I maintain that the purpose of the United States will be to bring about a democratic regime in Greece. I think the whole of public opinion in the United States once we are in the situation will be directed, and successfully, toward that end.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. JAVITS. I yield.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. I think it will be conceded that that was the intention declared by the British when they went into Greece. They have been there with a powerful army and they have poured in millions and millions of dollars; yet as of March 12 when the President addressed this Congress on the subject it was admitted that the situation in Greece was the same as before the British went in.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. EATON. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman one additional minute.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Chairman, may I say to the gentleman that I have great faith in the democracy of the people of the United States—in the strength of our belief in democracy. We can do in Greece what the Government of Great Britain did not do on that subject, for they are weakened, beset with other troubles, and have a tradition of colonialism while we have a tradition of freedom.

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JAVITS. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. OWENS. I heard the gentleman use an expression that has been used here by a number of men today in which he said something about the splendid isolation. Would the gentleman say that

word is the antonym of splendid intervention?

Mr. JAVITS. I did not use the term "splendid isolation" in any disposition to agree with it. I think it is a policy which can hurt the United States very materially and endanger its own security and that of the whole world.

Mr. OWENS. Is it the antonym of "splendid intervention"?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. EATON. 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. Case of South Dakota, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 2616) to provide for assistance to Greece and Turkey, had come to no resolution thereon. DEPARTMENT OF LABOR, THE FEDERAL SECURITY AGENCY, AND RELATED INDEPENDENT AGENCIES APPROPRIATION BILL, 1948

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 2700) making appropriations for the Department of Labor, the Federal Security Agency, and related independent agencies, with Senate amendments thereto, disagree to the Senate amendments, and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, I object.

HOUR OF MEETING TOMORROW

Mr. AREND'S. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet at 11 o'clock a. m. tomorrow.

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

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MILLER of California asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a letter.

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

Mr. GORSKI asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include a resolution.

LIBRARY OF CONGRESS EXHIBITS ORIGINAL LETTERS OF THOMAS JEFFERSON AND OTHER IMPORTANT DOCUMENTS IN OBSERVANCE OF RELIGIOUS BOOK WEEK

Mr. HAYS. 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 Arkansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, Religious Book Week, under the auspices of the

National Conference of Christians and Jews, will be observed throughout the Nation from May 4-11. The date is important. It commemorates the book burning with which the Nazis began their career in power 14 years ago. The Nazis party was an instrument expressly shaped to destroy freedom, and almost the first blow which it struck was a blow against freedom of the press.

Europe has been immemorably the scene of assaults on freedom of thought carried out by assaults on the physical bodies of books. The Greeks burned the works of Protagoras. It was one of the normal functions of the Roman Senate to condemn books to death by fire. Livy and Tacitus both mention instances of such condemnation.

The practice survived pagan Rome. In medieval Europe there was hardly a state which did not make use of fire against books. By order of the Pope, Martin Luther's writings were condemned to the flames. Luther retaliated by burning the papal bull and other church documents. Calvin burned Servetus' works. The Reformation ushered in a variable conflagration—both sides contributing. This was human history. Books were the victims.

The grounds on which books were burned were always the same, in all countries and at all times, that is, the corruption of morals, political institutions and religion.

It is of accidental significance, of course, that the last book officially burned in England was *The Present Crisis in Regard to America Considered*, in the year of 1775. Our Nation, coming into existence out of that crisis put itself on record as defending religion and the press in one joint statute. It reversed the official attitude of the past, that religion and the freedom to write, publish, and read were incompatible. It defended human conscience.

Our religions, morals, and political institutions have flourished healthfully ever since. Censorship scares we have had, and attacks under cover on our free press but the enraged outcry which always greets these movements has been impressive.

Today, we can celebrate religion through the medium of books with no thought of paradox, and all the Christian churches may join hands with the Jews in making the observance.

Marking the celebration in the city of Washington is an exhibit in the main building of the Library of Congress. Famous writings on religious freedoms are being displayed, among them *The Bloody Tenent*, by Roger Williams, printed in London in 1644. This is the most famous work of Roger Williams, the liberal-minded clergyman, who in 1636 had led a small group of followers from Massachusetts into the wilderness of Rhode Island to form a community where religious liberties might be safeguarded. In this pamphlet, written after his return to England, Williams set forth his belief that "God requireth not an uniformity of religion" and held that men of all creeds were entitled to freedom of worship as a natural right. He further declared that the foundation of civil power lay in the people and that the

rulers of a land could not exercise more power than what the people themselves granted.

Another interesting volume in the exhibit is the Virginia statute of religious liberty, adopted in 1786. After independence had been declared and State constitutions had been adopted it became necessary to create new laws for new conditions and to change inherited colonial laws which no longer suited the increasingly liberal temper of the times. The report was presented to the assembly on June 18, 1779, and was published—upon the insistence of James Madison—5 years later. Chapter 82 consisted of Jefferson's bill for establishing religious freedom, which was finally passed in January 1786, after a State-wide campaign to create a realization of the need for reform. At the outbreak of the Revolutionary War dissenting religious groups were still being discriminated against in most of the Colonies, with civil rights often seriously affected. The Virginia statute, which Jefferson regarded as one of the three great achievements of his life, provided that no man should be compelled to attend or support any one church, and that no person should suffer loss of civil liberties because of his religious beliefs.

Also on exhibit at the library is the original letter from Thomas Jefferson to the six Baptist associations represented at Chesterfield, Va., dated November 21, 1808. The letter follows:

To the General Meeting of Correspondence of the Six Baptist Associations Represented at Chesterfield in Virginia

I thank you, fellow citizens, for your affectionate address. I receive with satisfaction your approbation of my motives for retirement. In reviewing the history of the times through which we have passed, no portion of it gives greater satisfaction, or reflection, than that which presents the efforts of the friends of religious freedom, and the success with which they were crowned. We have solved by fair experiment the great and interesting question whether freedom of religion is compatible with order in Government, and obedience to the laws. We have experienced the quiet as well as the comfort which results from leaving everyone to profess freely and openly those principles of religion which are the inductions of his own reason, and the serious convictions of his own enquiries.

It is a source of great contentment to me to learn that the measures which have been pursued in the administration of your affairs have met your approbation. Too often we have had but a choice among difficulties; and this situation characterizes remarkably the present moment, but fellow-citizens if we are faithful to our country, if we acquiesce with good will in the decisions of the majority, and the Nation moves en masse in the same direction, although it may not be that which every individual thinks best, we have nothing to fear from any quarter.

I thank you sincerely for your kind wishes for my welfare and with equal sincerity implore the favor of a protecting providence for yourselves.

Nov. 21, 1808.

TH JEFFERSON.

Jefferson's letter reflects his appreciation of the ardent support given his campaign for the bill establishing religious freedom, regarded by him as one of his three greatest accomplishments. Many historians assert that the Baptists were the most vigorous and persistent

advocates of religious liberty in the colonial and early national periods. Their ideals of democratic church and civil government and of religious freedom appealed to Jefferson and it is not surprising to find him taking notice of their activities.

Another item in the Religious Book Week exhibit is an original manuscript page from the autobiography of Thomas Jefferson referring to the great revision of the laws of Virginia, begun in 1776 upon his motion and including, in chapter 80, provision for religious liberty. The revision was effected only after much opposition and debate. Similar difficulties accompanied the passage of his bill for establishing religious freedom, and Jefferson here relates the failure of efforts to make it partial, and rejoices in the triumph of his ideas among the majority, who like him "meant to comprehend, within the mantle of its protection, the Jew and the gentile, the Christian and Mohammedan, the Hindoo and infidel of every denomination." In this respect his ideal agreed with that of Roger Williams, as expressed in the Bloody Tenent of Persecution, that all are entitled to religious liberty as a natural right.

Still another historical book exhibited this week is entitled "Laws of Maryland at Large" compiled by Thomas Bacon, rector of All Saints' parish in Frederick County. It was printed in 1765 at Annapolis by Jonas Green. For the exhibit, the book is opened at the page containing an Act Concerning Religion, adopted in April 1649.

This was one of the most important colonial acts of the province of Maryland. This notable act was well summarized, in its purpose and content, by Charles, third Lord Baltimore, as passed that the province might "have a general toleration settled there by law, by which, all of all sorts, who professed Christianity in general, might be at liberty to worship God in such manner as was most agreeable to their respective judgments and consciences, without being subject to any penalties whatsoever for their doing so, provided the civil peace were preserved. And, that for the securing the civil peace and preventing all heats and feuds which were, generally, observed to happen amongst such as differ in opinions upon occasion of reproachful nicknames and reflecting upon each other's opinions, it might, by the same law, be made penal to give any offense in that kind."

The Library of Congress is to be commended for arranging this display of important documents related to the freedom of religion. Our devotion to this tradition is shared by those of all religious faiths and all political creeds. It is a part of the American heritage.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. PATMAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in three instances and include in each statements and excerpts.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mr. McDOWELL (at the request of Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts), until May 19, on account of official business.

To Mr. THOMAS of New Jersey (at the request of Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts), until May 19, on account of official business.

BILL PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. LECOMPTÉ, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on May 2, 1947, present to the President, for his approval, a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 2157. An act to relieve employers from certain liabilities and punishments under the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, as amended, the Walsh-Healey Act, and the Bacon-Davis Act, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. ARENDTS. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 1 minute p. m.) the House, under its previous order, adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, May 7, 1947, at 11 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:

649. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting revised estimates for the fiscal year 1948 involving decreases of \$152,000 in an administration expense limitation on corporate funds and \$1,100,000 in appropriated funds for the National Housing Agency (H. Doc. No. 237); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

650. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation for the fiscal year 1948 in the amount of \$5,261,000 for the Office of Selective Service Records (H. Doc. No. 238); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

651. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting supplemental estimates of appropriation for the Treasury Department, in the form of amendments to the 1948 budget, amounting to \$15,079,000 (H. Doc. No. 239); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

652. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury; Comptroller General of the United States; and Director, Bureau of the Budget, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to establish a procedure for facilitating the payment of certain Government checks, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

653. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to amend the act entitled "An act to provide for the evacuation and return of the remains of certain persons who have died and are buried outside the continental limits of the United States," approved May 16, 1946, in order to provide for the shipment of the remains of World War II dead to the homeland of the deceased or of next of kin, to provide for the disposition of group and mass burials, to provide for the burial of unknown American World War II dead in the United States military cemeteries to be established overseas, to authorize the Secretary of War to acquire land overseas and to establish United States military cemeteries thereon, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

654. A letter from the Acting Secretary of Commerce, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to define the functions and duties of the Coast and Geodetic Survey, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

655. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to clarify the customs laws relating to the customs supervision of lading and unloading of carriers, the furnishing of customs services outside regular business hours, and the extra compensation payable to customs employees for overtime services, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

656. A letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting a report of the Archivist of the United States on records proposed for disposal; to the Committee on House Administration.

657. A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting the Fifteenth Report of the Attorney General, pursuant to section 12 of Public Law 603, Seventy-seventh Congress; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

658. A letter from the Director, Washington office, Philippine War Damage Commission, transmitting the First Semiannual Report of the United States War Damage Commission for the period ending December 31, 1946; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

659. A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting a report reciting the facts and pertinent provisions of law in the cases of 182 individuals whose deportation has been suspended for more than 6 months, together with a statement of the reason for such suspension; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

660. A letter from the Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting a letter suggesting that the Speaker of the House of Representatives ask the House Committee on Agriculture to initiate and schedule hearings to obtain views of various groups as to quota structure with a view to a percentage increase of sugar for Cuba; to the Committee on Agriculture.

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. VORYS: Committee on Foreign Affairs. S. 591. An act to amend the act of January 5, 1905, to incorporate the American National Red Cross; with amendments (Rept. No. 337). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. MUNDT: Committee on Foreign Affairs. H. R. 3001. A bill to provide further safeguards with respect to the issuance of passports by or under the authority of the Secretary of State, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 338). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. HEDRICK:

H. R. 3329. A bill to provide for the national security of the Nation by requiring that all qualified young men undergo a period of training; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. HOPE:

H. R. 3330. A bill to amend the Federal Farm Loan Act, as amended, and the Federal Farm Mortgage Corporation Act, as

amended, to make available to farmers through the Federal land bank system loans similar to those made by the Land Bank Commissioner on behalf of the Federal Farm Mortgage Corporation; to transfer the existing Land Bank Commissioner loans and related assets of the Federal Farm Mortgage Corporation to the Federal land banks; to provide for the Federal Farm Mortgage Corporation to repay its Government capital with interest; to authorize the Federal land banks to establish a Federal land bank system reserve fund; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. JONES of Washington:

H. R. 3331. A bill to reclassify the salaries of certain employees in the motor-vehicle service; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. KILBURN:

H. R. 3332. A bill creating the St. Lawrence Bridge Commission and authorizing said Commission and its successors to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across the St. Lawrence River at or near Ogdensburg, N. Y.; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. SEELEY-BROWN:

H. R. 3333. A bill to authorize the transfer of the Joseph Conrad to the Marine Historical Association, of Mystic, Conn., for museum purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania:

H. R. 3334. A bill granting the consent of Congress to Pennsylvania Power & Light Co. to construct, maintain, and operate a dam in the Susquehanna River; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. BATES of Kentucky:

H. R. 3335. A bill to provide for the establishment of the Albert Sidney Johnston National Monument; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. BREHM:

H. R. 3336. A bill to provide more efficient dental care for the personnel of the United States Army; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. BUTLER:

H. R. 3337. A bill to provide temporary additional compensation for employees of the Federal Government and of the government of the District of Columbia; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 3338. A bill to provide temporary additional compensation for employees in the field service of the Post Office Department; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. MORRISON:

H. R. 3339. A bill to amend the Social Security Act, as amended, so as to change the age for old-age and survivor benefits from 65 to 55; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PETERSON:

H. R. 3340. A bill to amend paragraph 1545 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, to provide for an increased rate of duty on honeycomb or Mandruka and certain other types of sponges; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 3341. A bill to provide for the payment of pensions to certain widows of veterans of the war with Spain; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. MUNDT:

H. R. 3342. A bill to enable the Government of the United States more effectively to carry on its foreign relations by means of promotion of the interchange of persons, knowledge, and skills between the people of the United States and other countries, and by means of public dissemination abroad of information about the United States, its people, and its policies; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. BARTLETT:

H. R. 3343. A bill to amend the Alaska game law; to the Committee on Public Lands.

H. R. 3344. A bill to amend the fourth paragraph of section 4, chapter 1, title 1, of "An act making further provision for a civil government for Alaska, and for other purposes," approved June 6, 1900 (31 Stat. 322; 48 U. S. C., sec. 101), as amended; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. JENKINS of Ohio:

H. R. 3345. A bill to assist States in collecting sales and use taxes on tobacco; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MANSFIELD of Texas:

H. R. 3346. A bill authorizing preliminary examinations and surveys of the streams, and their larger tributaries, flowing through the Brazoria-Galveston soil conservation district, the Trinity Bay soil conservation district, the coastal plains soil conservation district, and the Matagorda County soil conservation district, in Texas; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. PHILLIPS of California:

H. R. 3347. A bill to declare the policy of the United States with respect to the allocation of costs of construction of the Coachella division of the All-American canal irrigation project, California; to the Committee on Public Lands.

H. R. 3348. A bill to declare the policy of the United States with respect to the allocation of costs of construction of the Coachella division of the All-American canal irrigation project, California; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. RANKIN:

H. R. 3349. A bill to provide an award for arrested tuberculosis cases of World War I and World War II veterans, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. WEICHEL:

H. R. 3350. A bill relating to the rules for the prevention of collisions on certain inland waters of the United States and on the western rivers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. WOLCOTT:

H. R. 3351. A bill to provide for control and regulation of bank holding companies, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. CORBETT:

H. J. Res. 190. Joint resolution authorizing the printing and binding of a revised edition of Cannon's Procedure in the House of Representatives and providing that the same shall be subject to copyright by the author; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. HOEVEN:

H. Con. Res. 46. Concurrent resolution creating a joint committee to investigate certain matters affecting agriculture; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts:

H. Con. Res. 47. Concurrent resolution to refer the plight of Archbishop Stepinac to the United Nations; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. HOFFMAN:

H. Res. 207. Resolution providing for expenses of conducting the studies and investigations authorized by rule XI (h) (1); to the Committee on House Administration.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the Territory of Alaska, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to broaden the statutory authority of the Rural Electrification Administration to enable it to participate with municipalities in Alaska irrespective of their size; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, memorial-

izing the President and the Congress of the United States to ratify the proposed amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to the terms of the President of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to amend section 83 of the Hawaii Organic Act so as to remove the present limitation on juries to men; to the Committee on Public Lands.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Nevada, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to retain the name "Boulder Dam"; to the Committee on Public Lands.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Oklahoma, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to enact H. R. 2868, transferring the horses, property, and program of the remount section of the United States Army to the United States Department of Agriculture; to the Committee on Armed Services.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the Territory of Alaska, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to protection of Alaska's fisheries against encroachment by any foreign power into the Alaska zone; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the Territory of Alaska, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to adopt special legislation in favor of the Territory of Alaska authorizing expenditures of Federal funds for airport purposes in excess of the sums now available for expansion of the airport facilities in said Territory; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the Territory of Alaska, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to extending to Alaska the present tuition system being used in continental United States, for the payment of tuition to Territorial schools for Indian and native children; 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. BOYKIN:

H. R. 3352. A bill for the relief of Emeline Lartigue; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 3353. A bill to authorize the sale of certain land in Alabama to the Chicago Mobile Development Co., a corporation; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. CUNNINGHAM:

H. R. 3354. A bill for the relief of Alma Wharff; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DONDERO:

H. R. 3355. A bill to quit title and possession with respect to certain land in the town of Cheverly, Prince Georges County, Md.; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. ELLSWORTH:

H. R. 3356. A bill for the relief of Eleonore M. Hannon; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. POTTS:

H. R. 3357. A bill for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. John L. McCabe; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. REED of New York:

H. R. 3358. A bill for the relief of Dr. Timothy C. H. Liang; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts:

H. R. 3359. A bill for the relief of Peter E. Kolesnikoff; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HUGH D. SCOTT, JR. (by request):

H. R. 3360. A bill for the relief of Meyer R. Brody; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SIKES:

H. R. 3361. A bill for the relief of J. Rutledge Alford; 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:

439. By Mr. GRAHAM: Petition of 44 residents of Beaver, Beaver County, Pa., urging the passage of S. 265, a bill to prohibit the transportation in interstate commerce of advertisements of alcoholic beverages, etc.; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

440. By Mr. HART: Petition of the members of Lieutenant Robert P. Grover Post, No. 377, Jewish War Veterans of the United States, Jersey City, N. J., urging the Congress to take immediate action toward the establishment of Palestine as the homeland for Jews; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

441. Also, petition of the New Jersey State Patrolmen's Benevolent Association, Inc., of Glen Ridge, N. J., respectfully requesting the Congress of the United States to enact legislation to relieve income taxation on incomes of retired public employees up to \$1,440; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

442. Also, petition of the Life Underwriters Association of Northern New Jersey, favoring enactment by the Eightieth Congress of legislation amending the National Service Life Insurance Act of 1940, as amended; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

443. By Mr. LECOMPTÉ: Petition of Mr. L. E. Williamson and other citizens of Charlton, Iowa, in the interest of S. 265, S. 623, H. R. 142, and H. R. 2408; to the Committee on Armed Services.

444. Also, petition of Mrs. Anna Gustafson and several citizens of Charlton, Iowa, in the interest of S. 265, S. 623, H. R. 142, and H. R. 2408; to the Committee on Armed Services.

445. By Mr. LYNCH: Petition of Knights of Columbus, the city of New York (Aquinus Council, 757), urging congressional action to make Good Friday a national holiday and urging further the support of the Sasser bill for that purpose; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

446. By Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin: Petition of 59 citizens of Janesville, Wis., and vicinity, urging support of S. 265, a bill to prohibit the transportation of alcoholic-beverage advertising in interstate commerce and the broadcasting of alcoholic-beverage advertising over the radio; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

447. Also, petition of a group of citizens of Elkhorn, Wis., urging support of S. 265, a bill to prohibit the transportation of alcoholic-beverage advertising in interstate commerce and the broadcasting of alcoholic-beverage advertising over the radio; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

448. By Mr. WELCH: Resolution No. 6457, passed by the Board of Supervisors of the City and County of San Francisco, memorializing Congress to enact legislation which will enable municipalities to collect taxes from the Federal Government for any of its properties therein; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

449. By the SPEAKER: Petition of members of the Moultrie Townsend Club, No. 1, of Moultrie, Ga., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to endorsement of the Townsend plan, H. R. 16; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

450. Also, petition of membership of the Orlando Townsend Club, No. 2, Orlando, Fla.,

petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to request for enactment of a uniform national insurance program; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

451. Also, petition of membership of the Sarasota Townsend Club, No. 1, Sarasota, Fla., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to request for enactment of a uniform national insurance program; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

SENATE

WEDNESDAY, MAY 7, 1947

(Legislative day of Monday, April 21, 1947)

The Senate met at 11 o'clock a. m., on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Peter Marshall, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O God, our Father, who hast given us life and made our earth so fair, reveal to us this day Thy heart of infinite tenderness yearning for our love.

Make us to feel Thy spirit brooding over us, longing to help us in our decisions, to save us from the pressures that drive us and the tensions that break us down.

How strange it is, O lover of our souls, that Thou who art love, who dost give love to hungry human hearts, shouldst Thyself be the great unloved. Give us love to love Thee for Thy love, and to love Him who first loved us and gave Himself for us. Loving Thee, we shall love one another, and loving one another, we shall do Thy will, and doing Thy will, we shall always do right.

We make our prayer in the lovely name of Jesus. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. WHERRY, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Tuesday, May 6, 1947, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

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

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed the bill (S. 591) to amend the act of January 5, 1905, to incorporate the American National Red Cross, with amendments in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message also announced that the House had passed the following bills, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. R. 334. An act for the relief of the legal guardian of James Harold Nesbit, a minor;

H. R. 407. An act for the relief of Claude R. Hall and Florence V. Hall;

H. R. 765. An act for the relief of Elwood L. Keeler;

H. R. 770. An act for the relief of Norman Abbott;

H. R. 821. An act for the relief of Charles W. Taylor, Jr.;

H. R. 889. An act for the relief of Russell F. Taylor;

H. R. 1015. An act for the relief of Fred Pittelli;

H. R. 1087. An act for the relief of S. C. Spradling and R. T. Morris;

H. R. 1788. An act for the relief of the estate of John F. Hopperton, a minor, deceased;

H. R. 1866. An act for the relief of Paul Goodman;

H. R. 1954. An act for the relief of Robert Hinton;

H. R. 1956. An act for the relief of Hugh C. Gilliam; and

H. R. 2257. An act for the relief of Southeastern Sand & Gravel Co.

THE AMERICAN NATIONAL RED CROSS

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair lays before the Senate the amendments of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 591) to amend the act of January 5, 1905, to incorporate the American National Red Cross.

The amendments of the House of Representatives were, on page 3, line 13, to strike out all after "treaties" down to and including "adhere" in line 15; and on page 9, line 4, after "1905", to insert "as amended."

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. With the indulgence of the Senate, the Chair would like to say that these are technical amendments to the Senate bill amending the act to incorporate the American National Red Cross. The Senate unanimously passed the bill several weeks ago. Without objection, the Senate will concur in the House amendments. The Chair hears no objection, and the amendments are concurred in.

MIGRATORY BIRD CONSERVATION COMMISSION

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair wishes to announce that on recommendation of the minority leader, the Senator from Kentucky [MR. BARKLEY], the Chair appoints the Senator from Virginia [MR. ROBERTSON] to the minority vacancy on the Migratory Bird Conservation Commission.

SUPPLEMENTAL ESTIMATE, INTERIOR DEPARTMENT (S. DOC. NO. 52)

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a communication from the President of the United States transmitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation for the Department of the Interior amounting to \$715,000 and proposed authorizations for the expenditure of Indian tribal funds, in the form of amendments to the budget, fiscal year 1948, which, with the accompanying paper, was referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

EXPRESSIONS OF SYMPATHY ON TEXAS CITY DISASTER

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a letter from the acting legislative counsel of the Department of State transmitting a telegram addressed to the President of the National Congress by Ricardo Rivas Vides, president of the assembly, San Salvador, El Salvador, expressing sympathy on the Texas City disaster, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations and