

a country like Rwanda. That was so destabilizing, because the politicians get hold of the money and they use it for political reasons. Money to help a country must go in because conditions are beneficial, that encourage investment, that encourage the market to work.

Mr. Speaker, I would argue that there is a different interpretation, but I know that the support for this measure is justified.

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. GEJDENSON].

Mr. GEJDENSON. Mr. Speaker, I cannot help but respond to my colleague's comments. While I think he is well-intentioned, there are some issues that I think have to be addressed.

The United States, at the end of World War II, spent \$16 billion in 1950's dollars in western Europe because we understood that while the best avenue may be the private-sector initiatives and other issues at hand, the reality was that without that economic assistance, there was a danger that western Europe would destabilize and that much of it would be taken over by Soviet influence. We recognized that short-term expenditure was the right thing to do for human rights, for economic opportunity, for political rights. I think to say that that model only worked about one time in history frankly does not meet the historical test.

If we take a look at the countries that are our biggest purchasers of grain products today, they are many of the countries that started off under a PL-480 program. To argue that there are still some countries in the world that have not recovered is not, frankly, an astounding argument. When we look at any program, it works best on certain areas, and other areas are more difficult to get to. It does not mean that there is not a benefit to us in that area.

Let me finish with these two points, and I will yield to the gentleman from Texas.

That is, every place we have played a major role in establishing democratic governments, governments that respect human rights, not only have we done the right thing, we then turn out to have the best markets there; but it has taken a cooperation between government and the private sector, and we cannot do it without both.

I would say the same thing has happened in agricultural sales: that in the countries where we have provided the most generosity of the American people to providing assistance, those are the countries that have turned out to be the largest purchasers of American agricultural products, which helps our trade balance immensely.

Lastly, I would say that if the gentleman thinks the tax burden in this country is distributed badly, I agree with that. Let us vote for a progressive tax. There is a very easy solution to that.

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

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

Mr. PAUL. Mr. Speaker, I would vote to change the taxes, but mainly to lower them for everybody. The point that I am trying to make is that the large amount of capital that helped Europe recover did not come from the taxpayers. That was a small amount. There were a lot of other investors that went into Europe. The key reason was the political stability and the good economic climate which Erhard helped to introduce. I think that is much important.

There is a difference between what happened in Europe versus the waste that we had in Rwanda. We did not do the people, the poor people of Rwanda, very many favors by sending money down there that became a political weapon to suppress the poor.

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume to respond to some of the observations the gentleman from Texas made.

I think the gentleman from Texas is correct in recognizing the importance of private investment flows to Europe. I think they played an absolutely critical role in European recovery. But I wonder whether he would not agree with me that without creating the framework of political stability, military security, the rebuilding of the infrastructure, the absolutely indispensable achievements of the Marshall plan, none of that capital would have flowed into Europe.

I was in Europe in 1945 and in 1946 and in 1947 and it was a continent of devastation, destruction, hopelessness and despair. No American company was interested in investing in a battlefield, which Europe was at the end of the Second World War. It was the creativity and the vision of American political leadership on a bipartisan basis that created the framework for all of the subsequent investments and trade which flowed after the basic preconditions were created by the Marshall plan.

My friend from Texas should rejoice with us that this was a shining moment of American history. It was one of the most beautiful moments of American history when we went in to do good and succeeded in doing well for us and for our European friends.

I do not see any point in diminishing this achievement of President Truman and Secretary of State Marshall and Senator Vandenberg and Congressman Christian Herter, who served in this body and who as a Republican did so much to support these measures. When the history of this century is written, there will be a shining moment of American bipartisan political leadership which is represented as we celebrate it with the Marshall plan.

What is called for now is a recognition that the Marshall plan, because of Soviet occupation of central and eastern Europe, could only do half the job.

It could only do the job in western Europe. We along with our European friends now have an opportunity to complete the job.

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

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

Mr. PAUL. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I think that there could not be an argument made that every dollar that we sent to Europe did not have some beneficial effect. Quite possibly it did. But my point is that if that money from the taxpayer had not been sent, there is nothing that says it might not have been sent through the investors, but it depended on the political climate and what they did. I do not want to deemphasize that. That is the important reason why this foreign aid was not as harmful as it usually is, and it had some benefits, mainly because of the political climate.

Mr. LANTOS. If I may reclaim my time, not only was it not harmful, it was the inevitable precondition of development. The gentleman should be open-minded enough to admit that this was an enormously statesmanlike and incredibly successful measure, and I have difficulty visualizing the need 50 years later, looking at a success story, trying to denigrate it.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I want to thank the distinguished gentleman from Texas for his important, constructive contributions to this debate. I would like to note to our colleagues, in our proposed Foreign Policy Reform Act, we are trying to move from government-to-government aid to aid that benefits the private and voluntary sectors. We are involved in trying to reform foreign aid and to encourage and stimulate private investment in the developing world.

Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BARRETT of Nebraska). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. GILMAN] that the House suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution, House Concurrent Resolution 63.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the concurrent resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on the concurrent resolution just agreed to.

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