

Kruse	Noland	Sheppard
Lane	Norrell	Sikes
Lanham	Norton	Smathers
Larcade	O'Brien, III.	Spence
Lind	O'Hara, III.	Staggers
Linehan	O'Neill	Stanley
Lucas	O'Sullivan	Sullivan
McCarthy	O'Toole	Tauriello
McConnell	Pace	Thomas
McCormack	Passman	Thompson
McDonough	Patman	Thornberry
McGrath	Patten	Tollefson
McGuire	Peterson	Trimble
McKinnon	Philbin	Underwood
McSweeney	Pickett	Van Zandt
Mack, III.	Poage	Vinson
Madden	Poulson	Vorys
Magee	Preston	Wagner
Mahon	Price	Walter
Mansfield	Priest	Whitaker
Marcantonio	Rains	White, Idaho
Marsalis	Ramsay	Widnall
Martin, Mass.	Rhodes	Wier
Miles	Riehlman	Wigglesworth
Mills	Robeson	Willis
Morgan	Rodino	Wilson, Okla.
Multer	Rogers, Fla.	Wilson, Tex.
Murdoch	Rogers, Mass.	Woodhouse
Murphy	Rooney	Yates
Murray, Tenn.	Roosevelt	Young
Nelson	Sasser	Zablocki
Nixon	Shelley	

NAYS—91

Abernethy	Hall	Nicholson
Allen, III.	Leonard W.	Norblad
Andersen,	Halleck	O'Hara, Minn.
H. Carl	Harden	O'Konski
Anderson, Calif.	Harvey	Phillips, Calif.
Arends	Hill	Rankin
Barrett, Wyo.	Hoeven	Reed, III.
Bennett, Fla.	Hoffman, Mich.	Reed, N. Y.
Bennett, Mich.	Horan	Rees
Bishop	Jenison	Rich
Boggs, Del.	Jenkins	Scrivner
Brown, Ohio	Jennings	Scudder
Byrnes, Wis.	Jensen	Seeger
Case, S. Dak.	Jonas	Shaw
Clevenger	Kearney	Simpson, Ill.
Cole, Kans.	Keating	Simpson, Pa.
Colmer	Kunkel	Smith, Kans.
Crawford	Latham	Smith, Wis.
Cunningham	LeCompte	Stefan
Curtis	LeFevre	Taber
Davis, Wis.	Lichtenwalter	Tackett
D'Ewart	McCulloch	Talle
Dondero	McMillen, Ill.	Velde
Elston	Mack, Wash.	Vursell
Fellows	Martin, Iowa	Welch
Ford	Mason	Whitton
Savin	Meyer	Williams
Golden	Michener	Winstead
Graham	Miller, Nebr.	Withrow
Gross	Murray, Wis.	Wolcott
Hagen		Woodruff

NOT VOTING—130

Andresen,	Gamble	Lyle
August H.	Gary	Lynch
Auchincloss	Gillette	McGregor
Baring	Gilmer	McMillan, S. C.
Barrett, Pa.	Goodwin	Macy
Bates, Ky.	Gore	Marshall
Battle	Gorski	Merrow
Beall	Granahan	Miller, Calif.
Blackney	Granger	Miller, Md.
Bolton, Md.	Green	Mitchell
Eoykin	Gwinn	Monroney
Breen	Hall	Morris
Brehm	Edwin Arthur	Morrison
Brooks	Hend	Morton
Bryson	Hare	Moulder
Buckley, N. Y.	Hébert	O'Brien, Mich.
Bulwinkle	Heffernan	Patterson
Burdick	Heller	Perkins
Burke	Herlong	Pfeifer
Cannon	Hipshaw	Joseph L.
Carroll	Hobbs	Hobbs
Cavalcante	Hoffman, Ill.	William L.
Chudoff	Hope	Phillips, Tenn.
Cole, N. Y.	Irving	Plumley
Cotton	Jackson, Wash.	Polk
Coudert	James	Potter
Cox	Kearns	Fowler
Delaney	Keefe	Quinn
Dingell	Kelley, Pa.	Rabaut
Dolliver	Kelly, N. Y.	Redden
Durham	Kennedy	Regan
Eberhart	Keogh	Ribicoff
Engel, Mich.	Kerr	Richards
Fogarty	Lodge	Rivers
Frazier	Lovre	Sabath

Sadlak	Smith, Ohio	Walsh
Sadowski	Smith, Va.	Welch
St. George	Steed	Werdell
Sanborn	Stigler	Wheeler
Saylor	Stockman	White, Calif.
Scott, Hardie	Sutton	Whittington
Scott,	Taylor	Wickersham
Hugh D., Jr.	Teague	Wilson, Ind.
Shafer	Towe	Wolverton
Sims	Wadsworth	Wood

So the joint resolution was passed.  
The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Mr. O'Brien of Michigan with Mr. Gamble.  
Mr. Quinn with Mr. Potter.  
Mr. Heffernan with Mr. St. George.  
Mr. Lynch with Mr. Merrow.  
Mr. Gorski with Mr. Cole of New York.  
Mr. Herlong with Mr. Cotton.  
Mr. Delaney with Mr. August H. Andresen.  
Mr. Cox with Mr. Edwin Arthur Hall.  
Mr. Dingell with Mr. Beall.  
Mr. Steed with Mr. Hinshaw.  
Mr. Stigler with Mr. Sanborn.  
Mr. Wheeler with Mr. Smith of Ohio.  
Mr. Teague with Mr. Stockman.  
Mr. Sutton with Mr. Werdell.  
Mr. Polk with Mr. Kearns.  
Mr. Powell with Mr. Hope.  
Mr. Wickersham with Mr. Gillette.  
Mr. Redden with Mr. Hardie Scott.  
Mr. Regan with Mr. Wilson of Indiana.  
Mr. Welch with Mr. Miller of Maryland.  
Mr. Rabaut with Mr. Morton.  
Mr. Ribicoff with Mr. Keefe.  
Mr. Wood with Mr. Phillips of Tennessee.  
Mr. Irving with Mr. Plumley.  
Mr. Joseph L. Pfeiffer with Mr. Towe.  
Mrs. Kelly of New York with Mr. Taylor.  
Mr. Jackson of Washington with Mr. M. Coudert.  
Mr. Perkins with Mr. Auchincloss.  
Mr. Keogh with Mr. Wolverton.  
Mr. Green with Mr. Hand.  
Mr. Sadowski with Mr. James.  
Mr. Boykin with Mr. Blackney.  
Mr. Granahan with Mr. William L. Pfeiffer.  
Mr. Kennedy with Mr. Dolliver.  
Mr. Carroll with Mr. Shafer.  
Mr. Miller of California with Mr. Sadlak.  
Mr. Hébert with Mr. Macy.  
Mr. Gary with Mr. Hugh D. Scott, Jr.  
Mr. Moulder with Mr. Brehm.  
Mr. Gilmer with Mr. Gwinn.  
Mr. Sims with Mr. Lovre.  
Mr. Heller with Mr. McGregor.  
Mr. Morrison with Mr. Patterson.  
Mr. Eberhart with Mr. Engel of Michigan.  
Mr. Kelley of Pennsylvania with Mr. Hoffman of Illinois.  
Mr. Fogarty with Mr. Wadsworth.  
Mr. Frazier with Mr. Goodwin.

Mr. GULL changed his vote from "nay" to "yea."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The doors were opened.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

FURTHER MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A further message from the Senate, by Mr. McDaniel, its enrolling 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. 8567. An act making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1950, 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. MCKELLAR, Mr. HAYDEN, Mr. RUSSELL, Mr. BRIDGES, and Mr. GURNEY to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

ENLISTMENT OF ALIENS IN THE REGULAR ARMY

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I call up House Resolution 649 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

*Resolved,* That immediately upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (S. 2269) to provide for the enlistment of aliens in the Regular Army. That after general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and continue not to exceed 1 hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Armed Services, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill 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.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 1 minute.

Mr. Speaker, this resolution would make in order the consideration of S. 2269, a bill which has been requested by those in charge of the Armed Forces of this country, to permit certain aliens to be enlisted in our Armed Forces.

Mr. Speaker, I now yield 12 minutes to the distinguished chairman of the House Committee on Armed Services, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON], who will explain the purposes of the bill.

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

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Speaker, I will try to explain this new program which is to be inaugurated in the Army with respect to enlistments. The bill, which the pending resolution makes in order to be considered in the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, authorizes 2,500 aliens to be enlisted in the Army of the United States. Before these aliens can be enlisted in the Army they must first be screened by the Department of the Army and the program must have the approval of the Office of the Secretary of State. Every effort will be made in the screening process to have it so thorough that no one who should not serve in our Armed Forces will be permitted to enter. We prescribe that they not have dependents and they must be between the ages of 18 and 35.

I may say that this is a Senate bill. It was introduced and passed in the other body, the author of it being the distinguished junior Senator from the Commonwealth of Massachusetts [Mr. LONGE].

The reason why the Army feels it is necessary to have these aliens is based on several factors. In modern warfare

it is necessary to have technicians of the highest character, people who can handle modern weapons, people who are familiar with the language spoken in foreign countries, people who are familiar with the terrain, and people who know something about areas which are somewhat foreign to us. That is the reason why General Collins appeared before the committee in executive session as well as in public session and considered this new step highly important in the management of the Army. He feels it is necessary that there be a small number admitted into the Army.

What do we offer these people in return for enlisting? We say they must enlist for a period of 5 years. If at the end of that period they obtain an honorable discharge and have been ordered to the United States and have been brought to this country by that means, then they will be eligible for citizenship. That is all the bill does.

Mr. Speaker, I propose to offer an amendment to the committee amendment to strike out on page 3 the words "or earlier." The committee language was this: "pursuant to military orders shall, if otherwise qualified for citizenship, and after completion of 5 or more years of military service, or earlier if honorably discharged therefrom."

The reason that prompted us to put the words "or earlier" in was that after the person enlists and serves a year or so he might be found to have some physical disabilities and therefore we would not want to hold him to the 5-year requirement. But the more we thought about it, we thought we were on sounder ground if we struck out the words "or earlier" so that the person would have to be in the Army for at least 5 years.

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

Mr. VINSON. I yield.

Mr. RICH. What is the real purpose of taking a foreigner and putting him into our army when you can get men who have been naturalized who know all of these countries? We have people from all of these countries who already have become naturalized citizens of the United States.

Mr. VINSON. That is a very important question. General Collins feels, and the Army feels, that it is highly desirable at this time to have a small number of highly trained technicians, people who are familiar with every phase of life in other countries, so they can contribute their knowledge to the proper performance of military duty.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. VINSON. I yield.

Mr. RICH. If you want those men, do you know who they are?

Mr. VINSON. No. I do not know who they are. Probably the services do not yet know; but they know one thing, that there are types of people abroad who would like to get into the Army, who can contribute certain important knowledge to our Army, and by doing so, if honorably discharged and brought to this country—remember that—brought to this country, they will get citizenship. As a matter of fact, they may never come

to this country. The Army may not order them here. The Army may keep them abroad. If so, they do not get citizenship.

Mr. RICH. If he is a citizen of some foreign country, the Army cannot give him any orders at all that he will obey. He will obey the laws of his own country.

Mr. VINSON. But he cannot get into this country unless the Army orders him here.

Mr. RICH. We have 13,000 aliens in the State Department, and if you can tell me where they are doing a good job for this country, then I do not know anything about it.

Mr. VINSON. Well, we have all been considerably disturbed about various recent charges, but I am utterly confident that General Collins and the men who run the Army are not going to bring any Communists into the United States Army. I will speak without any reservation as far as the Army is concerned.

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

Mr. VINSON. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. WILLIAMS. It is my understanding that the Army needs these people to perform certain specialized duties, such as interpreters, and so forth. In the light of that, is there any reason why those people could not be employed in a civilian capacity, rather than to take them into the Army?

Mr. VINSON. Well, you would not have sufficient control over them. You must have people that you can direct and order in military matters.

Now, I repeat that we asked General Collins to come into executive session on this. I said, "Tell us how you are going to use these men," and he told us. I cannot divulge those things in public debate, but you can rest assured that the Army is not going to put any Communists in it knowingly, and these aliens are going to be in our service only after they have been most carefully screened.

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

Mr. VINSON. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. HOEVEN. Why is it necessary to have the approval of the Secretary of State?

Mr. VINSON. As far as I am concerned, I would just as soon have the approval of the Army. I will go further and say that I am perfectly willing to have the scrutinizing done by committees of Congress. We have plenty of precedent for that. I am perfectly willing to have the list of these men submitted to our Judiciary Committee for consultation with the Department of the Army before they are admitted to the service. But these men should be in the Army because they can render great service to the Army. Only 2,500 are involved.

Mr. HOEVEN. That is not the question; I want to know why we need the approval of the State Department?

Mr. VINSON. I do not need the approval of the Secretary of State as far as I am concerned. That can be stricken out.

Mr. HOEVEN. Why is it in the bill?

Mr. VINSON. Because Senator Lodge put it in the bill. So far as I am concerned it can be stricken out.

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

Mr. VINSON. I yield.

Mr. WALTER. What effect will the enactment of this legislation have on immigration quotas?

Mr. VINSON. This is outside of immigration quotas.

I will be perfectly willing to accept an amendment—now listen, because you will want to know what I am talking about—that before any of these aliens are accepted by the Army consultation must be had with the Judiciary Committees of the House and the Senate; because we all have the same objective, we do not want anybody in our Army who should not be in that service. I am willing to accept any safeguard to see that we get the right recruits, recruits who can be of service and benefit to carry out any Army mission that General Collins feels is absolutely necessary.

Mr. WALTER. I call attention to the picture at the left of the Speaker, the portrait of Lafayette; I remind the gentleman of Pulaski, Von Steuben, and others, men who took an illustrious part in our fight for independence.

Mr. VINSON. That is quite different; they did not enlist in the Army of the United States; they were allies. These men, however, are going to enlist.

Mr. WALTER. A moment ago the question was raised as to the reason for the inclusion of the Secretary of State. That is absolutely essential, as I see it, because the State Department occupies the position of screening all aliens that come to the United States. By including the authorization from the Secretary of State it is certain there is no question but what the proper visa would be issued.

Mr. VINSON. I hope the committee will give us a full opportunity to vote on the bill, so I trust the rule will be adopted; but I felt it necessary in advance of general debate to make some explanation of the reasons behind the bill.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. VINSON. I yield.

Mr. JAVITS. The gentleman emphasized the point about Communists; will the gentleman emphasize equally the fact that those with a Nazi or Fascist background are equally undesirable as far as our Army is concerned?

Mr. VINSON. They will be screened; we will not have anybody but whose heart beats in harmony with ours.

Mr. Speaker, I hope the committee will adopt the resolution, will debate the bill for an hour and will let the House vote on it.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ALLEN].

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may require.

Mr. Speaker, I am opposed to this bill, because in times like these when we hear about all our other departments of the Government having Reds and Commu-

nists and subversives in them, above all, I want to see that the United States Army is 100 percent American. That is the reason why I am opposing this measure. I know that for many years there were certain individuals in our Government who have been attempting to get these foreigners into it. First they wanted a foreign legion, then they wanted 25,000, but they found so much opposition among the membership of both bodies of Congress that they abandoned that and now they have finally got it down to 2,500.

I think there is a statement in the report that is nothing less than an insult to the American soldier. It states that these foreigners, "the citizen candidate on his part gives us a rare human talent in highly specialized fields and will certainly be of substantial value to our country."

Mr. Speaker, can you conceive that this bill provides for boys of 18 years of age coming in and joining the Army and being classified as specialists? As specialists they will naturally obtain the rank of master or technical sergeant. It would be an insult to these men whom the Armed Services Committee is calling into the service and who may be specialists if you do not give them the rank of master sergeant or technical sergeant. This putting of foreign boys 18 years of age over American boys who have been in the Army for many years is not fair.

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

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. VINSON. The gentleman is in error in the line of argument he is making because this covers original enlistments. When they originally enlist they go in at the lowest grade, so, therefore, could not come in as a technical sergeant.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. I am saying that this bill provides that these foreigners who come in are specialists at 18 years of age. The bill itself stipulates they must be specialists and, consequently, if they are specialists they would be entitled soon to become master or technical sergeants and our own American boys who have served for many years would be under the orders of these foreigners.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. It is nothing unusual for an alien who is a resident of the United States to enlist in our armed services. If the gentleman will go back through military history he will find resident aliens held responsible positions in the Army, Navy and Marine Corps and American boys submitted to their commands.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. As far as I am concerned if I were in the Army I would not want some 18-year-old boy to come in and be my master sergeant or technical sergeant.

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

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Where are these foreigners coming from?

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. I do not know what countries they are coming from.

Mr. GROSS. Is there a lack of men wanting to enlist in the Army at the present time?

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. At the present time I believe they have more who desire to enlist—more American boys—than they will take.

Mr. GROSS. Can the gentleman tell me what effect this sort of thing will have upon the 4,000,000 unemployed and on a lot of boys who have just come out of the high schools and colleges?

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Inasmuch as there are thousands of young boys—tens of thousands of them—coming out of the colleges with no work, who have engineering and other specialist learning, perhaps it would be well to regard them as specialists. They are the ones who have lived in America. We should give them the master sergeant's position.

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

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCORMACK. It is my impression that the age limit set out in this bill is between 18 and 35.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. That is correct, 18 to 35. In other words, this bill provides that a young foreigner 18 can be regarded as a specialist. They would come into the Army as specialists and consequently they would eventually receive a specialist's rank as technical or master sergeant.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. I yield to the gentleman from South Dakota.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I want to express the thought that if anybody enlisted at 18 comes in as an original enlistment and got any such rank there might be room for criticism.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. The bill provides he must be a specialist. I will ask the gentleman how the average foreigner could be a specialist at that age?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. It is not limited to those who are 18. The age is up to 35 and they have that long to qualify as a specialist.

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

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. JOHNSON. A great many boys enlist who want to become specialists and they enlist at 18. They have to work up through the ranks before they can attain the rank of technical sergeant. None of these boys will go in as sergeants; also, I want to point out to the gentleman that probably the vast majority of them will be over 21 years of age because very few minors come to America before they are 21.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. It is the practice of the Army if a specialist comes in for him to soon reach a sergeantcy. This bill provides that they must be specialists in order to qualify.

Mr. JOHNSON. The bill does not provide that at all.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. It provides that they must be a specialist.

Mr. JOHNSON. That is not in the bill.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. What does this language in the report mean, then? What is the purpose of writing it in the report?

Mr. JOHNSON. The purpose is to provide that they may become specialists.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. The purpose is stated. That is why they are brought in, because they are specialists.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. I am afraid the gentleman from Illinois does not understand the real job to be assigned these individuals. They must have certain qualifications which security reasons will not permit me to mention at this time. But, I can assure the gentleman the specialized ability of these individuals does not apply to the term "specialists" as the gentleman understands it.

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

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. KEATING. In that same connection I suggest to the gentleman that among the specialists, of course, would be those who had linguistic ability which some of our own people might not have, and that might enter into this picture; also I make the observation that in World War II there were a great many aliens who served in our Army and who served with great distinction and courage, and in recognition of that we passed a measure here to assist in their efforts to become American citizens.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, again I say that I personally would like to keep at least one department of this Government 100-percent American.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the distinguished majority leader, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK].

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed out of order.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, in relation to the pending bill, I think my distinguished and valued friend from Illinois [Mr. ALLEN] is unnecessarily alarmed. If I had any objection to the bill it would be the fact that it is confined to 2,500 only. But, that is satisfactory to me, because I recognize that committees have their problems, and I go along as far as I possibly can with committee reports. The committee has done an unusually fine job by the first amendment on page 2 which eliminates the possibility of any American foreign legion. I think the committee acted wisely in that respect, because in referring to the foreign legion of any country, without mentioning any one country in particular, and I do not like to, sometimes it brings about repercussions abroad that may be misunderstood when there is no offense intended, but, the first committee amendment on page 2 takes care of that and precludes, if it remains in the bill, which I assume it will, and becomes law, the possibility of any organization such as an American foreign legion being established.

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

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. JOHNSON. Regarding the number, the gentleman will note that Senator Long had 10,000 in it, and our committee, after considering it very carefully, determined it was sort of an experiment, pioneering, and that we would sooner have a small number, and if proved to be successful that we could enlarge it.

Mr. McCORMACK. I had that in mind. I recognize that when the committee reports out a bill, that it is the collective judgment of the committee, and while I might have some views in some respects to the contrary, I hesitate to go against a committee, even in part, when I am in agreement with the objective sought. I am supporting the bill. My remarks are not to be taken as criticism of any member of the committee reporting out this fine bill, and the two amendments adopted by the committee are excellent amendments. They are not merely perfecting, but strengthening amendments.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield to the gentleman from South Dakota.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I was hoping that the gentleman would oppose the amendment and let it stay at 10,000, because it seems to me the bill has merits on its face. If we cannot integrate 10,000 troops in the total Army, it would be surprising.

Mr. McCORMACK. Of course, this bill will go to conference, and what will be in disagreement will be 10,000 in one branch and 2,500 in the other.

What I wanted to talk about was a matter that I consider of historic importance today taking place in Paris. Delegates from France, western Germany, Belgium, Italy, The Netherlands, and Luxemburg met last Tuesday in Paris, France, in what may be a historic conference aimed at pooling their coal and steel production and to see if they can resolve the recent suggestions of Robert Schuman, Foreign Minister of France, and his French associates, into a practical and effective plan.

What a great ideal to try to bring into agreement, operation, and effect by these six countries.

As stated in part by Foreign Minister Schuman:

It is our desire to associate in a common and permanent work of peacetime nations which for centuries have fought one another in bloody conflicts.

He was referring, of course, to France and Germany.

Through the successful welding of France and Germany together in this common effort there would be assured, as he said, the "certainty thus to banish from our European community a latent cause of trouble, suspicion, and anguish," and this would be a basis to erect "a solid, European edifice accessible to all nations of good will."

What noble thoughts when he further said:

We feel we are not permitted to fail, nor to quit without finishing the job. But no

one has ever tried such a system as we have outlined. Never have the states conferred, nor even thought of delegating as a group a fraction of their sovereignty to an independent supranational organization.

He called for "a pioneering boldness which is too often absent from our international institutions."

I hope the representatives of the six countries attending this conference will do so with an understanding mind, not impugning the motives of anyone or any of the countries. If this is the animating spirit of the conference, and I am sure it is, no matter how far apart they may be during their deliberations they will be able to come to an agreement of historic importance.

We of America will watch the deliberations, and hope and pray they will come to a successful conclusion.

There is a great ideal that has been brought into this conference and which has brought the conference into being. It has as its objective the removal of some important economic factors that have caused Germany and France in the past to be suspicious of each other for centuries, all due to human weaknesses, and which have created fear, hostility, enmity, and war, instead of understanding and confidence in each other, and friendship and peace. For if any decided step forward in understanding and trust and real friendship can be and is taken by France and Germany and the other four participating nations, a historic step has been taken toward European unity and permanent peace throughout the world.

In connection with this conference a significant event happened in the elections a few days ago in a part of Germany, where the Communist Party candidates, who received 16 percent of the votes cast in the last election, received only about 5 percent of the votes cast a few days ago.

Over 150 years ago the fathers of our country met in a Constitutional Convention to establish a new government for the Thirteen Colonies who had successfully won their independence from Great Britain. The delegates to that convention met under most trying conditions. We know from history that they had a great and historic ideal in mind, the result of which is our country today, which we enjoy and possess. We know from history the opposition they met, of their uncertainties, their despair many times of success, but they persevered and finally were successful. We know the great difficulty they had in having three-fourths of the Original Thirteen States ratify the Constitution.

But conditions existed that required solution, and men with great ideals and courage lived then, and difficulties that appeared insurmountable were overcome.

Uncertainty and confusion vanished and a new notion was established, which is ours today.

The delegates to the convention were men with ideals. They were men with understanding minds. They were determined to succeed, and they did succeed. The framers of the Constitution and the founders of our Government had to meet honest misunderstanding on the part of some; jealousy and prejudice on the part

of others; they had to meet the doubting Thomases also. They always exist. They had to contend with the blind and deliberate opponents to any form of government other than a monarchy. They had to contend with those who, in their day, sought only personal or political advantage even against the best interests of the 13 floundering States operating under the Articles of Confederation.

While the conference now going on in Paris is not for the purpose of establishing a new nation, it is a conference of historic importance. Its ideals are high and noble. Its purpose is to chart a new journey in Europe. However, there is a basic resemblance between this conference and our Constitutional Convention of over 150 years ago. The delegates to the Paris Conference, I think it might also be called a convention, can learn much to guide and direct them in their deliberations and efforts from the deliberations of the Constitutional Convention which brought the United States of America into existence. The free world and countless of millions of persons in Communist-controlled countries are watching and will watch with hope and prayers the outcome of this conference. A successful outcome will be one of the outstanding constructive events in the history of the world. The delegates of the six countries have grave responsibilities resting upon them, for the benefit or disappointment of not only this generation, but of many generations to come.

Mr. Speaker, I consider this conference to be of such importance and the results which may flow from it to be of such historic importance to you and me and others of this generation as well as those of future generations to come, that notice should be taken of it in this body. I felt it was my duty to do so and to convey to the delegates to that conference representing the six participating countries the fact that we are watching it—not only countless of millions of Americans, but countless of millions of people everywhere, recognizing that if they can make a decided step forward, they will be overcoming human weaknesses that have brought about wars in the past and they will be thereby strengthening the will of God, which is everlastingly present, and that they will be accomplishing something of benefit to the entire world for many generations to come.

A successful outcome will be a decided step toward permanent peace.

Mr. Speaker, the entire text of Mr. Schuman's statement on the steel- and coal-pool plan is as follows:

TEXT OF SCHUMAN STATEMENT ON POOL PLAN

Six weeks to the very day have barely elapsed since in this very room with historic memories the French Government made known its plan. Six weeks—a very short interval for such a new and vast objective as pooling the coal and steel production of our countries; very short when one thinks of the customary slowness of international transactions.

France has been blamed for acting precipitately. There has been talk of rapid and brutal tactics. But experience has shown us that the best initiatives are frittered away when, after their birth, they are delayed in preliminary consultations.

In a world anguished by so many set-backs and by impotence, I think we had the right—in fact, the duty—to count on the strength of the idea, to take advantage of the impetus given by the hope it has aroused and the instinctive support of our peoples.

We are now here at the beginning of our task. It is to you, gentlemen, that our six governments have confided the task of justifying this hope. Your task is to express in elastic and clear language, with a view to preparing definite commitments, the principles that have determined the choice of our objectives and that constitute the basis of our deliberations.

We are agreed on the orientation of our work, on the goal we wish to reach. Our governments have agreed to seek in common, by a free confrontation of views and special situations, the best means of applying the principles that we have accepted by creation of new institutions without precedent in the present-day world.

#### DECLARES TASK IS GREAT

It is a great task, gentlemen, that the confidence of our governments has conferred upon us. We undertake it with pride and conscious of our responsibilities, we feel that we are not permitted to fall or to give up without result. Moreover, our conclusions, as you know, will be submitted for the approval of our governments and the sovereign decision of our parliaments.

No one among us is unaware of the exceptional difficulties of our undertaking. Admittedly, we all have voluminous statistics at our disposal. We shall make good use of the impartial studies made previously on a national scale, as well as those made by international bodies.

But never has a system resembling that which we have in view actually been attempted. Never have States entrusted nor even considered jointly delegating a fraction of their sovereignty to an independent supranational organization.

We shall have to set up a draft treaty that will define in broad outline the attributions of this joint authority, the way it will function, the means of appeal against its decisions and of making its responsibilities effective. We shall have to examine without, however, writing them into the treaty, the technical details that will be the objective of agreements to be concluded subsequently after ratification of the treaty. These conventions will have to be easy to revise so that they may be adapted to the lessons of experience.

We wish to substitute for the ancient practices of dumping and discrimination an enlightened cooperation. That is essential. But what is equally important, and what from the very beginning has been inscribed in the forefront of the plan, is our determination to associate in a joint and permanent task of peace two nations that for centuries have been opposed in bloody competition. It is the certainty of thus eradicating from our European community a latent cause of trouble, of mistrust, and anguish; it is the hope of erecting on this peaceful cooperation a solid European structure, accessible to all nations of good will.

We earnestly would have liked Great Britain to be present at our discussions. We cannot conceive of Europe without her. We know, and are reassured by this, that the British Government desires the success of our labors.

Certain difficulties that have prevented her participating, actively, at least, at the present stage, appeared in the course of discussions that were both frank and friendly. We preserve the hope that the doubts and scruples that a somewhat doctrinal reasoning has failed to overcome will finally yield to more concrete demonstrations.

The French Government certainly will act in conformity with the desires of all the participating governments when it keeps the British Government informed of the development of our deliberations, and thus will insure it the possibility, if not of coming and joining us—which we persist in hoping—at least of sending us all its useful observations, and thus prepare the way for future cooperation.

The conclusions we shall reach will be the fruit of our discussions. Each one of you will contribute your suggestions and criticisms. We shall have a joint determination to succeed, to do something constructive, on the basis of the principles already defined. We shall be inspired by a youthful rashness that is too frequently absent from our international institutions.

Without losing sight of the individual needs of our countries we must be aware that national interests in these times consist in finding beyond our national boundaries the means of achieving a more rational economic structure, more economical and more intensive production, and a greater and more readily accessible market.

Our initiative in no way is meant to ignore or misunderstand the attempts made elsewhere to give Europe a healthy economy. Mr. Stikker recently made an important and fruitful contribution to it. It is situated in a different sphere from our own. There is neither duplication nor contradiction between our two objectives.

The chief characteristic of the French proposal is that, aside from its economic importance, which is susceptible to developments that at the present moment cannot be guessed at, it has had and preserves a political value that from the very first moment struck opinion in different countries more than anything else.

For our part, we shall begin the work thus assigned to us. We shall first of all have to adopt a method of working. It will be work in teams instead of a conference with meticulous and rigid rules. We shall all of us wish above all to be efficient. Brilliant eloquence will not tempt us.

An informative meeting tomorrow will enable us to fix our ideas in this respect. They will be defined during personal contacts that we shall be anxious to establish and maintain.

The fundamentals of our problems will be taken up at the same time. The two cannot be separated. We shall pool our ideas, we shall put them up against each other and choose between them. The French Government will make known its ideas to you in the next few days. The draft text it will submit will form the basis for work it hopes will be useful and fruitful.

For today, I shall limit myself to welcoming you in my Government's name, and expressing ardent hopes that we shall not disappoint the expectations of the peoples who place their hope and confidence in you.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. CASE].

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed on the same subject that the distinguished majority leader just discussed.

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

There was no objection.

#### THE FREE STATES OF EUROPE

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, I am not authorized to speak for the minority on this matter, but it happens that during the Eightieth Con-

gress in the fall of 1947 I was chairman of a subcommittee for Germany and Austria of the so-called Herter committee, the Select Committee on Foreign Aid, and spent 6 weeks in Germany and Austria with a subcommittee of five members. The problem which the gentleman from Massachusetts has discussed was the basic problem with which we were concerned during the entire time that we were there, and that was the economic rehabilitation of western Europe and the part that western Germany might play in it.

In that capacity we conferred not only with the German leaders but the French leaders in the French zone of western Germany and with British leaders in the English zone. When we returned we made a report, which included this recommendation:

That the states of Germany which are free to do so be encouraged to form a constitutional government at the earliest possible date; a government with powers derived from the member states, a government which other German states could join when free to do so, and free itself to join any federation of free states looking toward the economic stability of Europe and world peace.

In concluding our report covering this and other recommendations, we said:

The committee believes that carrying out these recommendations will go far in putting Germany on her feet, relieve the United States taxpayer of immense occupation costs, bring to the cause of world stability and European recovery the great capacities of the German people and aid much in developing the free states of Europe as a bulwark of world peace and free institutions.

#### The report was signed:

The subcommittee for Germany: FRANCIS CASE, South Dakota, chairman; JOHN M. VORYS, Ohio; CHARLES W. VURSELL, Illinois; EUGENE E. COX, Georgia; OVERTON BROOKS, Louisiana.

So it is my sincere conviction, Mr. Speaker, that what is happening in Paris today is probably as important for the future of the world as anything can be. I would heartily endorse all that the distinguished majority leader has said as to the importance of what is going on there to all our deliberations here. All of these things that we talk about here—peace and the cost of Government—are definitely hitched up to what may come out of the Paris conference.

As a member of the minority I want to join in what the distinguished majority leader has said about the importance of what they are trying to do at the conference. So, for myself, and I am sure for those who were on that committee, I wish for Premier Schuman and his associates the greatest possible success in what they are seeking to do at this conference in Paris.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RICH].

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

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I hold in highest regard the members of the Military Affairs Committee on both sides of the aisle, but I am greatly surprised at



their bringing in a bill such as we have to consider today. They want to admit 2,500 more aliens, if necessary, into this country above the quota. That is the first objection I have to the bill.

The second objection I have to the bill is because they want the Secretary of State to pass on the men they are going to allow to come into the Army of the United States, and go into foreign countries where they learn everything about our own Army, and then, if they do not want to join up as an American citizen, they are free to tell everything they have learned about the American Army. If that is good policy and good business, then I do not know what I am talking about. It is silly to me.

Then I want to say further that I have the highest regard for the Military Affairs Committee, but I do not want to see them taken over like most of the members of our Foreign Affairs Committee is being taken over by foreign countries. We are getting so imbued with the ideology of these foreign countries that I wonder where our Americanism is going. I just cannot see it like they do. It is too much for me. It seems to me that these foreigners are pulling the wool over our eyes and we do not know it. This is poor judgment on the part of everybody who has any part in trying to pass this legislation. When you have 13,000 aliens in the State Department passing out the hard-earned dollars of our American taxpayers it is about time that the American people woke up and realized what is going on. I just cannot understand what you are trying to do, putting 2,500 aliens in the Army. It is just too terrible to contemplate the ultimate results if they turn against America.

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

Mr. RICH. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia, chairman of the committee, a man who I have the greatest respect for.

Mr. VINSON. The gentleman said he was surprised that the Armed Services Committee reported such a bill. Does the gentleman know who the author of this bill is—the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE]?

Mr. RICH. I do not care who the author of it is. I do not care whether he is a Republican or a Democrat, or what he is. All I want him to be is a good, sound American, and if he is a good, sound American, he will think deeper. These fellows who brought up this bill here have not been thinking deep enough, hard enough, sound enough for me.

Mr. VINSON. Does the gentleman know that the Chief of Staff, General Collins, personally is appealing for this legislation? What comment has the gentleman about the Chief of Staff? He has already made his comments about the committee and about the author of the bill. What is his comment about the Chief of Staff?

Mr. RICH. I want the Chief of Staff of the American Army to get Americans. We do not have to get a lot of foreigners to run our Army, it is a sad commentary. I want the Chief of Staff of the American Army to see that we educate our own American boys to be in our Army. We

have a lot of our American boys who are right here in America who want to go into the Army, men who know all about those countries, men whom you can trust, men who are good American citizens, born in America or naturalized American citizens, men that we are going to pay with American dollars, men that are Americans from the top of their head to the soles of their feet. That is what I want. I do not want any foreigners.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RICH. Yes; I yield to my colleague who was kind enough to give me this time.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. I asked the gentleman to yield in order that I might ask a question of the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON].

Does this deny the American boy, if we reach a certain quota in our own Army, where there may be thousands of American boys trying to get into our own Army—will this bill, according to its language, deny 2,500 American boys the right to serve the flag which they admire so much?

Mr. VINSON. I would say it probably would not, because you will hardly ever be up to within 2,500 of our enlisted strength. It will not interfere with any enlistment in the Army.

Mr. RICH. I will ask the gentleman from Georgia this question: There being a quota on the number of men in the Army, and we take in these 2,500 foreigners, will not that necessarily deny such positions to 2,500 American boys?

Mr. VINSON. Yes; it would, if you had only 611,000, and that is all the money you appropriated for. You might not have any money to pay for 2,500, so the 2,500 would not come in.

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

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman three additional minutes; and I will ask the able chairman of the Defense Committee this question: I think the gentleman from Pennsylvania made a very thought-provoking observation when he said that the State Department approves of these individuals coming into the Army. What will prevent left-wingers from coming over here, getting information from our Army in these enlistments and peddling it to their advantage to some other country in the event some crisis confronts us?

Mr. VINSON. If the gentleman from Illinois and the gentleman from Pennsylvania think that General Collins and the men who run the Army will permit aliens who are communistic in thought to enter into the armed services, then they should vote against this bill.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Well, I think it.

Mr. VINSON. And I want to say this in view of the way the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania has been criticizing the committee, criticizing the officers—

Mr. RICH. No; I said that the State Department was pulling the wool over the committee's eyes. I think you good men are being fooled terribly in this legislation.

Mr. VINSON. The gentleman was criticizing the committee; he was criticizing the author of the bill; he was criticizing General Collins.

Mr. RICH. No, no, no; first, I am criticizing the Foreign Affairs Committee—and I love every one of the members of that committee and the members of the Armed Services Committee—but you have just been hoodwinked. I want you to get your glasses on and see what is happening. That is the point I am trying to make here. Only sound Americans should be in the American Army.

Mr. VINSON. My glasses are on, and I am looking over them listening to the fallacy of the gentleman's argument; but at the same time I am trusting General Collins. Strike out the State Department if that disturbs you.

Mr. RICH. Well, you ought to do that; you should do it, and only let good Americans in our armed services.

Mr. VINSON. All right. I am going along with the bill. I have confidence in General Collins, and the American people have confidence in him. When General Collins comes behind closed doors after we had held this bill in committee for over a year and stated his reasons for wanting it, charged with the responsibility he is charged with, saying that we must have this small group, I am willing to trust him.

Mr. RICH. We have the gentleman's own statement now that he held this bill up 1 year. You just did not hold it up 1,000 years long enough; yes, better still, forever.

Mr. VINSON. That may be true. We would not have brought it out if General Collins, charged with this great responsibility, had not urged it.

Mr. RICH. Let me ask the chairman of the Armed Services Committee this question: Why in the world does General Collins, head of our Army, want to go out and get 2,500 foreigners instead of getting 2,500 equally well-trained and competent Americans? That is what I want to know.

Mr. VINSON. For the simple reason that he wants people in the Army who know the terrain, the language, the customs, the philosophy, and the psychology of the people in countries that probably he may have to deal with.

Mr. RICH. For years we have been taking men from every country in the world into this country; they have become American citizens—good American citizens, naturalized. To say that we do not have qualified Americans to fill this need is ridiculous. It is a poor admission by anybody in the Army or out of the Army.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has again expired.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield four additional minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Will the gentleman from Pennsylvania yield?

Mr. RICH. I yield.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. The chairman of the Armed Services Committee does not for one minute imagine that General Collins, great man that he is, but busy man that he is, could personally

1950

## CONGRESSIONAL RECORD—HOUSE

9229

supervise these enlistments and check against left wingers getting into the armed services.

Mr. VINSON. I will say this, that these men will be hand-picked and they will be combed and the authorities will know exactly what they are before they are taken in the Army. That is the reason we have limited it to 2,500 men.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. I have heard that expression before, especially in connection with the State Department and the Secretary saying how clean his Department was, yet other officials of the State Department came here at one time and stated that they knew there were two or three hundred homosexuals who should be fired.

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

Mr. RICH. No; I asked for this time to put across an idea, but I have not much of the time to myself. The idea is Americanism is and should be the best citizenship in all the world.

The head of the Army, great general that he may be, ought to realize that he should be able to get better results from American citizens than from any foreigner who was ever born. That is the point I make. If we here in the Congress are American citizens we ought to insist on having an army of American citizens. We should not hire other citizens to betray their own country. The Good Book says, "Lead not into temptation." We do not want an army of foreigners.

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

Mr. RICH. I yield to the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. BURNSIDE. I want to answer three questions that have been raised here. First, the Army is 25,000 under quota at the present time and this will not displace any persons in the Army; second, we were able to get many scientists to help us with our experiments in New Mexico which we could not have gotten if we had not used a method like this and, third, the 13,000 the gentleman is speaking about in the State Department are clerks and assistant clerks and if we went ahead and sent Americans over there to those places our cost of government would go up tremendously.

Mr. RICH. What does the gentleman care about the cost of government? He has been voting for everything. That does not seem to mean anything to a lot of Members over on that side.

I want soldiers who are Americans first and, second, I want fellows in the Army from the top to the bottom who are going to see that we have Americans to look after America. It is about time that we stop trying to meddle in all the affairs of every nation in the world. It is time that we look after the citizens of this country and do it through and by citizens of this country.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RICH. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. I would like to ask the chairman of the Committee on the Armed Services another question. In the event these people go in the Army do they have all of the benefits that the

American soldiers have for their service or do they get more benefits?

Mr. VINSON. They will be enlisted with the same rights, the same privileges and be dispersed through the Army like any other enlistee in the Army.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. They will not get more than the American soldier in benefits?

Mr. VINSON. Every benefit that the American soldier is entitled to he gets.

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

Mr. RICH. I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. TACKETT. With all the talk that has been going on I have not been able to ascertain yet, I have heard no one say yet, what the purpose of this bill is. Why do we need 2,500 aliens in the Army?

Mr. RICH. I say we do not need them. We have Americans enough, we have Americans who are sound men who are naturalized American citizens, who will fight for the country like our own boys have in all the wars that they have been in. I do not believe in taking a lot of aliens and putting them in our Army regardless of where they come from or what their nationality is or anything else. I think it is wrong. That is the matter I am talking about.

Mr. TACKETT. Does the gentleman understand this is a swap whereby we guarantee some person on foreign soil American citizenship if he will spy on his own country or some other country?

Mr. RICH. Yes; and when the 5 years are up he goes back to his own country and tells them all the secrets he learned while a member of the armed services of our country. It is wrong. I hope the committee will take this bill back and keep it for just 1,000 years longer in committee. America for Americans forever. Once an American always an American. An America that is worth citizenship is worth fighting for. Love of country is our greatest heritage.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 6 minutes to the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. TACKETT].

Mr. TACKETT. Mr. Speaker, I do not purport to know anything about this bill. For that reason I am not going to argue for it or against it. But I would like to have some facts in order that I may know whether or not it is the type of legislation I suspect it to be.

It is my opinion that this proposal enlists 2,500 aliens into our armed services for the purpose of obtaining information from foreign countries by giving some on foreign soil something they otherwise would not have less they be spies. We passed a bill of this sort last year. It was so secretive we did not even open our mouths about it. They said, "Do not talk about it at all. It is too secret." You were then authorizing the armed forces to enlist some 50 or 100 spies a year, as I remember it. Now you get into an argument as to whether 10,000 or 2,500 should be enlisted by virtue of this legislation. I have an idea you just want 2,500 because you just want 2,500 spies. I guess that is what it is all about. This is another matter that is so secret we are not supposed to talk about it. You

know, when things get that secret they do not usually amount to a hoot, anyway.

I want to know if there is any person within the United States or elsewhere who is worth a tinker's hoot to this country or any other country who would take the citizenship of some other country in order to sell out the people of his own country? If he has a certain philosophy in life and has a definite belief, and if he will swap that information that might be detrimental to his own people to some other nation because they will give him citizenship and a few more dollars than he could get by serving his own people, then I guarantee you that that information is not worth a hoot, anyway.

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

Mr. TACKETT. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. ABERNETHY. I do not know of anything that is dearer to the American people than their citizenship.

Mr. TACKETT. But we are selling it mighty cheap now.

Mr. ABERNETHY. American citizenship is something which is coveted around the world. Does not the gentleman think that we are lowering it to a very ordinary category when we use it as a lure to get spies into the Army of the United States?

Mr. TACKETT. I cannot imagine anything that we could do that would so lower respect of those things that our people have so prized in life as to offer American citizenship to somebody that will come here and give us some information about some other people—even his own people; in other words, we will give the sorriest man in the world citizenship if he will be a dirty spy.

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

Mr. TACKETT. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. RANKIN. To show you how easy it is for one of these spies to cover up, 135 years after the close of the Revolutionary War the British Government published a record that showed that Bancroft, Benjamin Franklin's secretary, while he was in France, was a British spy, and when Franklin would send him over to England to get information, instead of getting information, he would give information to the enemy.

It would be very easy for these spies who would come in under this kind of a provision to undermine this country and to take back the secrets that we are trying to protect.

Mr. TACKETT. I want to ask someone, if it is not too big a secret to tell, do we need 2,500 men who happen to live in Europe or on some other portion of this globe outside this country? Do we need them, have we run out of people to serve in our Army, is it necessary for us to have a hired army, or is it the fact that you are just trying to get some information by luring someone into believing that they should tell on their own people in turn for American citizenship?

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

Mr. TACKETT. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. JOHNSON. Does not the gentleman realize that in America there are a great many refugees from countries behind the iron curtain? There are thousands of them that have left their country because the government has changed and the entire life of the country has changed. They have ideas like we have, and it is those people that we would like to have in our Army, people who are thoroughly screened and who understand the situation in parts of the world where we have very meagre knowledge.

Mr. TACKETT. Why does not this bill say that?

Mr. JOHNSON. The bill could not spell all those things out, in the very nature of things, but that is what the situation is. I want to point out one thing, if I may. Some people seem to be so jittery about foreigners. Sitting right in this Congress, one out of every six men and women in this House of Representatives is the son or the daughter of an immigrant. Their parents were good American citizens. We think the screening process provided by our bill will guarantee beyond any question that these soldiers will be 100 percent American.

Mr. TACKETT. Well, I do not know that that is anything to be all elated over. The fact is, though I do not know but maybe we have two or three people here who are descendants from American Indians. I guess the rest of us come from somewhere; I do not know where. That is not the argument. My goodness alive, 150 years ago a lot of your people did some things that maybe you would not be proud of or I would not be proud of, I do not know, but that is the poorest argument I ever heard of.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield further, I want to call the attention of the gentleman from California to the fact that we had some of these refugees from behind the iron curtain, especially a couple of Eislers. When we turned the spotlight onto them we found that they were Communists, traitors to this country. Gerhardt Eisler is over there now leading a Communist drive in Germany.

Mr. TACKETT. I know if these 2,500 people are all perfect, and if General whoever he is is going to personally look after them, and he can keep his hands right on them and not make one mistake, it will be a wonderful idea, because we can get some good information from some other countries from some fellow that is willing to sell his own people down the river. At the same time, if you make one mistake, it will cost you a lot more than you will gain by taking in these 2,500 people.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 3 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, I can recognize and appreciate the differences of opinion that arise about this proposed legislation. I especially appreciate the fact that so much of the opposition to this proposed legislation that has been expressed today, openly and privately, comes from my section of the country. I have always prided myself and my section, justly or unjustly, and that is neither

here nor there, on the fact that when it came to real patriotism in this country my section had no superior. Therefore, I can understand the alarm and the concern of my friends and colleagues, as I say, particularly from my section. But now let us see where we are on this proposed legislation.

This is nothing new, to begin with, about having aliens in our armed forces. Why, in the very birth of this country, who contributed more, aside from George Washington, than the gentleman from France, Mr. Lafayette? Who contributed more in taking our green enlistees and turning them into trained soldiers than Von Steuben, of Germany? Who contributed more than Pulaski, of Poland, to whom monuments have been erected in this country?

Aside from that, modern warfare is conducted in modern times on a different basis, when every resource, when every technique has to be resorted to in order to win that war. We live in a small world, a world that has shrunk to a very small sphere compared with what it was a few years ago. We live in one world, whether we like it or do not like it. As far as I am personally concerned, and I have often said this, I should like to follow the admonition of the great father of this country to beware of these foreign alliances and entanglements and live within ourselves. If it were not for the smallness of this world today, I would be the rankest isolationist in this body. I should like to get away from all of that. But we have to face conditions as they are.

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

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. COLMER. I appreciate the courtesy of my friend.

The chairman of the Committee on Armed Services says he would be glad to take the State Department out of this. I, too, have criticized the State Department, but the State Department, is put into this picture because it is the one agency that is best set up and qualified to screen these people who are going to be taken into the armed forces. If there is a better agency that can be set up, then substitute that when you have the bill on the floor.

Modern warfare, as I started to say, has changed. Conditions have changed over there. We have to have confidence in somebody. My first impression, when this legislation was brought up before the Committee on Rules, was to oppose it. As a layman, as a civilian, as a Member of Congress, I cannot say what we should have or should not have in our armed services. But when the Chief of Staff of the Army of the United States says that this is what we need, and that they want it, so that they can guard them and watch them and screen them, and if they commit sabotage against this country or prove unfaithful, they will be subject to court martial, I cannot argue against it.

Let us not get unduly excited about this. If, after giving mature judgment

and consideration to this, you do not believe that it is a wise, patriotic thing to do for our country, then vote against it. But let us not get into hysteria on the question.

Mr. RICH. Can you place more confidence in a foreigner than you can in an American citizen?

Mr. COLMER. Of course not, my friend, of course not. That is not the issue here. The issue is simply whether we have enough confidence in those in charge of our armed services and the national defense to give them the weapons to properly defend this country. They say that they can best do that job by having these trained aliens, familiar with certain countries of Europe, the habits and secrets of the people and the governments of those countries, in our armed service.

The Chief of Staff and his fellow officers are trained in warfare. I as a layman, I am forced to rely on their judgment.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 3 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, I did not think I was going to ask for a roll-call vote on the rule or on the bill itself, but after listening to the debate here and not hearing one reason why we should have this measure passed, I certainly am going to ask for a roll call on both the rule and the bill.

One thing has come out here. While General Collins, I believe, did come up and request this bill, there is nothing in the record where the Department of Defense or where Mr. Johnson or any of them came up and requested such a thing as this. I do not think anyone can dispute that some of these foreign boys would like to come into this country and get benefits forever under such a law as this. They would be happy to join the colors in order to receive these benefits as technical master sergeants and as specialists—benefits which they would get for the rest of their lives. Naturally they will join the American flag and perhaps it may be that some of them may turn over the information they receive as a result of holding these technical positions to the enemy.

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

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. I yield.

Mr. VINSON. In view of the fact that the gentleman from Illinois pays so much attention to Mr. Johnson, I want to call his attention to what Mr. Johnson said:

As indicated the Department of the Army testifies in support of the proposed legislation. In so testifying, the Army is representing the views of the Department as a whole.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Yes; that is right; that is the department as a whole.

With regard to the quota of enlistments, there are now many American boys who want to join the American Army. If you add these 2,500 that will be denying 2,500 American boys the right to serve under the American flag, boys who will probably do a much better job than some of these foreigners. I appreciate that under the bill that anyone



opposing this bill will not have an opportunity to speak.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. THOMAS). The question is on the resolution.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. ALLEN of Illinois and Mr. RICH) there were—ayes 73, noes 17.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present, and I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 232, nays 61, not voting 137, as follows:

[Roll No. 181]  
YEAS—232

Abbitt  
Addonizio  
Albert  
Allen, Calif.  
Andersen,  
H. Carl  
Andrews  
Arends  
Aspinall  
Bailey  
Barden  
Baring  
Bates, Mass.  
Battle  
Beckworth  
Bennett, Fla.  
Bennett, Mich.  
Bentzen  
Blemiller  
Blatnik  
Boggs, La.  
Bolling  
Bunker  
Ablett  
Brown, Ga.  
Brown, Ohio  
Buchanan  
Buckley, Ill.  
Burlison  
Burnside  
Burton  
Byrne, N. Y.  
Byrnes, Wis.  
Camp  
Canfield  
Cannon  
Carnahan  
Carroll  
Case, N. J.  
Case, S. Dak.  
Celler  
Chatham  
Chelf  
Chesney  
Christopher  
Clemente  
Clevenger  
Colmer  
Combs  
Cooley  
Cooper  
Corbett  
Crawford  
Crock  
Crosset  
Cunningham  
Curtis  
Cagie  
Cavenport  
Davies, N. Y.  
Davis, Tenn.  
Deane  
Delaney  
Denton  
Dollinger  
Donohue

Douglas  
Doyle  
Eaton  
Eberharter  
Elliott  
Ellsworth  
Elston  
Engle, Calif.  
Evins  
Feighan  
Fellows  
Fenton  
Fernandez  
Fisher  
Flood  
Fordand  
Ford  
Fugate  
Fulton  
Furcolo  
Garmatz  
Gavin  
Goodwin  
Gordon  
Gorski  
Graham  
Grant  
Gregory  
Guill  
Hagen  
Hale  
Hall  
Leonard W.  
Halleck  
Harden  
Hardy  
Harrison  
Hart  
Harvey  
Havener  
Hays, Ark.  
Hedrick  
Herter  
Heselson  
Hoffman, Mich.  
Hollifield  
Holmes  
Howell  
Huber  
Jackson, Calif.  
Jacobs  
Javits  
Jenison  
Jennings  
Jensen  
Johnson  
Jones, Ala.  
Jones, Mo.  
Jones, N. C.  
Judd  
Karst  
Karsten  
Keating  
Kee  
Kilburn  
Kilday  
King

Kirwan  
Klein  
Kunkel  
Lane  
Lanham  
Latham  
LeCompte  
LeFevre  
Lind  
Linehan  
Lucas  
McCarthy  
McCormack  
McCormack  
McCulloch  
McDonough  
McGrath  
McGuire  
McKinnon  
Mack, Wash.  
Madden  
Magee  
Marsalis  
Martin, Iowa  
Martin, Mass.  
Meyer  
Michener  
Miles  
Miller, Nebr.  
Mills  
Morgan  
Multer  
Murdock  
Murphy  
Murray, Tenn.  
Nixon  
Noland  
Norblad  
Norton  
O'Brien, Ill.  
O'Hara, Ill.  
O'Konski  
O'Neill  
O'Sullivan  
Patten  
Peterson  
Philbin  
Phillips, Calif.  
Foulson  
Preston  
Price  
Priest  
Ramsay  
Rhodes  
Riehlman  
Robeson  
Rodino  
Rooney  
Rosevelt  
Sasser  
Scudder  
Sheppard  
Short  
Sikes  
Simpson, Ill.

Smathers  
Spence  
Stagers  
Stanley  
Stefan  
Sullivan  
Taber  
Talle  
Tauriello  
Thomas  
Thompson

Thornberry  
Tollefson  
Trimble  
Underwood  
Van Zandt  
Vinson  
Vorvs  
Wagner  
Walter  
Welchel  
Whitaker

Widnall  
Wier  
Wigglesworth  
Wilson, Okla.  
Withrow  
Wolcott  
Woodhouse  
Woodruff  
Yates  
Young  
Zablocki

NAYS—61

Abernethy  
Allen, Ill.  
Allen, La.  
Angell  
Barrett, Wyo.  
Bishop  
Bolton, Ohio  
Carlyle  
Cole, Kans.  
Davis, Ga.  
Davis, Wis.  
D'Ewart  
Dondero  
Gathings  
Golden  
Gossett  
Gross  
Harris  
Hays, Ohio  
Hill  
Hoeven

Hull  
Jonas  
Kean  
Kearney  
Krusc  
Larcade  
McMillen, Ill.  
Mahon  
Mansfield  
Marcantonio  
Mason  
Murray, Wis.  
Nicholson  
Norrell  
O'Hara, Minn.  
O'Toole  
Passman  
Patman  
Pickett  
Poage  
Rains

Rankin  
Reed, Ill.  
Reed, N. Y.  
Rees  
Rich  
Rogers, Fla.  
Scrivner  
Secrest  
Smith, Kans.  
Smith, Wis.  
Tackett  
Teague  
Velde  
Vorse  
Whitten  
Williams  
Willis  
Wilson, Tex.  
Winstead

NOT VOTING—137

Anderson, Calif.  
Andresen,  
August H.  
Auchincloss  
Barrett, Pa.  
Bates, Ky.  
Beall  
Blackney  
Boggs, Del.  
Bolton, Md.  
Boykin  
Breen  
Brehm  
Brooks  
Bryson  
Buckley, N. Y.  
Bulwinkle  
Burdick  
Cavalante  
Chiperfield  
Chudoff  
Cole, N. Y.  
Cotton  
Coudert  
Cox  
Dawson  
DeGraffenried  
Dingell  
Dolliver  
Doughton  
Durham  
Engel, Mich.  
Fallon  
Fogarty  
Frazier  
Gamble  
Gary  
Gillette  
Gilmer  
Gore  
Granahan  
Granger  
Green  
Gwinn  
Hall  
Edwin Arthur Pfeiffer,  
Hand  
Hare

Hébert  
Heffernan  
Heller  
Herlong  
Hinshaw  
Hobbs  
Hoffman, Ill.  
Hope  
Horan  
Irving  
Jackson, Wash.  
James  
Jenkins  
Kearns  
Keefe  
Kelley, Pa.  
Kelly, N. Y.  
Kennedy  
Keogh  
Kerr  
Lichtenwalter  
Lodge  
Lovre  
Lyle  
Lynch  
McGregor  
McMillan, S. C.  
McSweeney  
Mack, Ill.  
Macy  
Marshall  
Merrrow  
Miller, Calif.  
Miller, Md.  
Mitchell  
Monroney  
Morris  
Morrison  
Morton  
Moulder  
O'Brien, Mich.  
Pace  
Patterson  
Perkins  
Pfeifer  
Joseph L.  
William L.  
Phillips, Tenn.

Mr. Redden with Mr. Miller of Maryland.  
Mr. Mitchell with Mr. Lichtenwalter.  
Mr. Rabaut with Mr. McGregor.  
Mr. Cavalcante with Mr. Auchincloss.  
Mr. deGraffenried with Mr. Blackney.  
Mr. Fallon with Mr. Morton.  
Mr. Welch with Mr. Dolliver.  
Mr. Wickersham with Mr. Gwinn.  
Mr. Perkins with Mr. Hand.  
Mr. Wood with Mr. Hoffman of Illinois.  
Mr. Brooks with Mr. James.  
Mr. Morrison with Mr. Sadlak.  
Mr. Sadowski with Mr. Wadsworth.  
Mr. Moulder with Mr. Boggs of Delaware.  
Mr. Keogh with Mr. Patterson.  
Mrs. Kelly of New York with Mr. Potter.  
Mr. Heller with Mr. Engel of Michigan.  
Mr. Heffernan with Mr. Beall.  
Mr. Kennedy with Mr. Anderson of California.

Mr. Joseph L. Pfeiffer with Mr. August H. Andresen.  
Mr. Buckley of New York with Mr. Brehm.  
Mr. Chudoff with Mr. Cole of New York.  
Mr. Green with Mr. Gillette.  
Mr. Barrett of Pennsylvania with Mr. Hinshaw.  
Mr. Lynch with Mr. Hope.  
Mr. Dingell with Mr. Taylor.  
Mr. Cox with Mr. Shafer.  
Mr. Fogarty with Mr. Simpson of Pennsylvania.  
Mr. Frazier with Mr. Stockman.  
Mr. Granahan with Mr. Hardie Scott.  
Mr. Regan with Mr. William L. Pfeiffer.  
Mr. Ribicoff with Mr. Gamble.  
Mr. Steed with Mr. Edwin Arthur Hall.  
Mr. Stigler with Mr. Hugh D. Scott, Jr.  
Mr. Irving with Mr. Werdel.  
Mr. Sutton with Mr. Wilson of Indiana.  
Mr. McSweeney with Mr. Sanborn.  
Mr. Mack of Illinois with Mr. Saylor.

Mr. SECRET and Mr. MARCANTONIO changed their vote from "yea" to "nay." The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The doors were opened.  
DEFICIENCY APPROPRIATION ACT, 1950  
Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 8567) making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1950, and for other purposes, with Senate amendments thereto, disagree to the Senate amendments, and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri? [After a pause]. The Chair hears none, and appoints the following conferees: MESSRS. CANNON, MAHON, THOMAS, WHITTEN, TABER, and WIGGLESWORTH.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the conferees on the bill H. R. 8567 have until 12 o'clock tonight to submit a conference report.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri? There was no objection. The conference report and statement follow:

CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT. No. 8567)  
The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 8567) "making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1950, and for other purposes," having met, after full and free

So the resolution was agreed to.  
The Clerk announced the following pairs:  
Mr. O'Brien of Michigan with Mr. Wolverton.  
Mr. Gary with Mr. Macy.  
Mr. Bates of Kentucky with Mr. Coudert.  
Mr. Burke with Mr. Towe.  
Mr. Jackson of Washington with Mrs. St. George.  
Mr. Gilmer with Mr. Horan.  
Mr. Boykin with Mr. Jenkins.  
Mr. Miller of California with Mr. Kearns.  
Mr. Hébert with Mr. Chiperfield.

conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 2 and 26.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 1, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 13, 15, 16, 17, 18, 20, 21, 25, 28, 29 and 30, and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 9: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 9, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment, insert "\$122,500"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 10: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 10, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment, insert "\$100,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 14: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 14, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter stricken and inserted by said amendment, insert the following:

"For 'Contributions for annuity benefits,' such additional amounts as may be necessary on account of the Act of September 1, 1916 (39 Stat. 718), as amended."

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 19: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 19, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by said amendment insert ", of which not to exceed \$20,000 may remain available for obligation until July 31, 1950"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 22: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 22, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by said amendment insert ", of which not to exceed \$127,000 may remain available for obligation until July 31, 1950"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 23: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 23, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by said amendment, insert:

**"CONTROL OF FOREST PESTS**

**"FOREST PEST CONTROL ACT**

"For an additional amount for 'Forest Pest Control Act', \$2,000,000, to remain available until June 30, 1951: *Provided*, That this appropriation shall be available from and including May 29, 1950, for the purposes of such appropriation."

And the Senate agree to the same.

The committee of conference report in disagreement amendments numbered 11, 12, 24 and 27.

CLARENCE CANNON,  
GEORGE H. MAHON,  
ALBERT THOMAS,  
JOHN TABER,  
R. B. WIGGLESWORTH,

*Managers on the Part of the House.*

KENNETH MCKELLAR,  
CARL HAYDEN,  
RICHARD B. RUSSELL,  
STYLES BRIDGES,  
CHAN GURNEY,

*Managers on the Part of the Senate.*

**STATEMENT**

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 8567) making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending

June 30, 1950, and for other purposes, submit the following report in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon and recommended in the accompanying conference report as to each of such amendments, namely:

**DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA**

Amendment No. 1 appropriates \$160,000 for general supervision and instruction, public schools, as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 2 appropriates \$32,400 for the municipal court, as proposed by the House, instead of \$40,360, as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 3 extends the availability of funds for Glenn Dale Sanatorium, as proposed by the Senate.

**LEGISLATIVE BRANCH**

Amendments Nos. 4 and 5 appropriate \$127,000 for contingent expenses of the Senate, as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 6 appropriates \$2,000 for folding documents, as proposed by the Senate.

Amendments Nos. 7 and 8 appropriate gratuities to the widows of deceased Representatives, as proposed by the Senate.

**DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE**

Amendment No. 9 appropriates \$122,500 for legal activities not otherwise provided for, instead of \$109,000 as proposed by the House, and \$145,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 10 appropriates \$100,000 for contingent expenses, instead of \$80,000 as proposed by the House and \$114,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 11 is reported in disagreement.

Amendment No. 12 is reported in disagreement.

Amendment No. 13 appropriates \$90,000 for fees of witnesses as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$185,000 as proposed by the House.

**TREASURY DEPARTMENT**

Amendment No. 14 appropriates an indefinite amount for contributions for annuity benefits, Secret Service Division, as proposed by the House, instead of \$11,900 as proposed by the Senate.

**POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT**

Amendment No. 15 appropriates \$54,200 for salaries of inspectors as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 16 appropriates \$10,000,000 for rural delivery service as proposed by the Senate instead of \$6,000,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 17 appropriates \$572,000 for salaries, custodial service as proposed by the Senate.

**DEPARTMENT OF LABOR**

Amendment No. 18 appropriates \$64,127 for the office of the solicitor as proposed by the Senate instead of \$113,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 19 provides that not to exceed \$20,000 of the appropriation for the office of the solicitor shall remain available until July 31, 1950, instead of an indefinite amount as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 20 appropriates \$6,100 for the Bureau of Labor Standards as proposed by the Senate instead of \$9,500 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 21 appropriates \$655,000 for the Wage and Hour Division as proposed by the Senate instead of \$1,100,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 22 provides that not to exceed \$127,000 of the appropriation for the Wage and Hour Division shall remain available until July 31, 1950, instead of an indefinite amount as proposed by the Senate.

**DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE**

Amendment No. 23 appropriates \$2,000,000 for forest pest control instead of \$3,620,000 as proposed by the Senate, such amount

to be available from May 29, 1950, and all obligations for such purpose incurred after such date to be charged to the appropriation herein provided.

**EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT**

Amendment No. 24 reported in disagreement.

**PUBLIC HOUSING ADMINISTRATION**

Amendment No. 25 provides that the appropriation shall remain available until June 30, 1951.

**NATIONAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE FOR AERONAUTICS**

Amendment No. 26 appropriates \$75,000,000 as proposed by the House instead of \$78,500,000 as proposed by the Senate.

**DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE**

Amendment No. 27 reported in disagreement.

**PAY INCREASES—DEPARTMENT OF LABOR**

Amendment No. 28 provides that \$120,000 of the funds for the Bureau of Labor Statistics shall be derived by transfer, as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$85,000, as proposed by the House.

**CLAIMS, JUDGMENTS, ETC.**

Amendments Nos. 29 and 30 appropriate \$9,914,909.82 for payment of claims, etc., as proposed by the Senate instead of \$8,627,922.79 as proposed by the House.

CLARENCE CANNON,  
GEORGE H. MAHON,  
ALBERT THOMAS,  
JOHN TABER,

R. B. WIGGLESWORTH,

*Managers on the Part of the House.*

**ENLISTMENT OF ALIENS IN THE REGULAR ARMY**

Mr. VINSON. 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 (S. 2269) to provide for the enlistment of aliens in the Regular Army.

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 S. 2269, with Mr. CARROLL in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ALLEN] raised the question that the bill did not have the approval of the Secretary of Defense, Mr. JOHNSON. I desire to call to the attention of the committee the fact that in a letter dated January 25, 1950, written to me by the Secretary of the Army, the Secretary had this to say:

The Secretary of Defense has delegated to this department the responsibility of expressing the views of the Department of Defense. The Department of the Army favors the enactment of H. R. 5140 subject to the amendments hereinafter recommended.

So the committee can understand this is a departmental bill recommended by the Department of Defense and the responsibility for its consideration was given to the Department of the Army.

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

Mr. VINSON. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON. Will the chairman please advise the committee whether the vote on the bill in committee was unanimous?

Mr. VINSON. I point out to the Committee that after two or three hearings, after Senator LODGE, the author of the bill, appeared in person, after General Collins had testified in open hearings as well as in executive session, after thorough debate in committee, the Committee on Armed Services made a unanimous recommendation in support of this bill.

Mr. Chairman, in view of what has been said, I propose to offer an amendment to strike out the wording with reference to the Secretary of State. I am not sharing, by offering that amendment, in some of the criticisms that have been made of the Secretary of State or his department, but I am eliminating the opportunity that the retention of those words in the bill might give to some as a ground for objection.

So the bill will read, if that amendment is agreed to, "With the approval of the Secretary of the Army."

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON. I yield.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Did the Committee on Armed Services unanimously agree to the State Department doing the screening of everyone? Is it my understanding that the Armed Services Committee wanted the State Department to do all the screening and the final approval?

Mr. VINSON. If the gentleman from Illinois has the idea that the State Department does any screening, he is in error.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Did your committee unanimously approve doing the screening as the gentleman from California mentioned, when he said you had unanimously reported the bill?

Mr. VINSON. The whole theory of the bill is that all the screening and the selection and the enlisting shall be done by the Department of the Army. So I will offer an amendment at the proper time to strike from this bill "the Secretary of State," giving complete control of this legislation to the Department of the Army. That will eliminate the objection that some have made to the bill.

Then, I will also offer an amendment on page 3 of the bill to strike out the words "or earlier." The effect of that is this: Under the committee amendment, before anyone could get citizenship, he must be ordered to this country and must have served honorably for 5 years or have received an honorable discharge at the end of the enlistment or at an earlier date. So we will offer an amendment to strike out "or earlier." The effect of that is that he must serve not less than 5 years, must be honorably discharged, and he must be ordered to the United States. If he is not ordered to the United States, it makes no difference how long he serves, he never can become a citizen of the United States.

Now, let us be realistic about this. Suppose a certain alien is recruited in the Army from a country in Europe. He never comes to this country. He never becomes a citizen of the United States. If he is never ordered here, he does not become a citizen of the United States. If he is ordered here, and if he is otherwise qualified and has served 5 years honorably, then he is eligible for citizenship.

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

Mr. VINSON. I yield.

Mr. STEFAN. After 5 years can he take out his first papers, or does he automatically become a citizen?

Mr. VINSON. He must qualify after that, just like everyone else.

Mr. STEFAN. In other words, he will have to wait 5 years more before becoming a citizen?

Mr. VINSON. No.

Mr. STEFAN. Then, he automatically becomes a citizen. I am afraid the gentleman did not clarify that. After 5 years he takes out his first papers, does he? Under the regular immigration laws an alien takes out his first papers.

Mr. VINSON. He gets the same benefits automatically that the wartime alien received.

Mr. STEFAN. That would be 1 year, then.

Mr. VINSON. Yes. That is all the benefit he gets.

Mr. STEFAN. Then, after 5 years, the 1-year provision applies?

Mr. VINSON. Yes. Now, all this bill does is to permit the Department of the Army to recruit 2,500 people, to recruit them for a period of 3 years. They must be between the ages of 18 and 35.

Let me call your attention to this: The demands of modern war and of modern military machines for highly technical, scientific, professional, and specially trained individuals are insatiable. The time has passed when a general practitioner in the art of warfare will suffice. The military now is a grouping of vast numbers of specially trained technicians in every field of human endeavor.

This high degree of specialization and our world-wide interests, risks, and obligations have produced this program. It will open to our Army opportunities for obtaining exceptionally well qualified persons in fields which cannot be fully satisfied through our own manpower resources. Persons such as skilled linguists, persons who comprehend foreign customs, temperament, and psychology, who are intimately familiar with the terrain and local geographic features of various areas in the world, will be of extreme value to our Army and yet very difficult to obtain solely from among American citizens. It is such people that this bill contemplates will be admitted into our Army.

That is the whole purpose of the legislation, and it is also safeguarded as to citizenship.

With the number admissible so limited—only 2,500—there can be no doubt that those admitted will be of the very highest caliber and of the finest abilities. Because of these considerations the Army Chief of Staff, who appeared before our committee both in open and in executive session on this bill, is very eager for the early enactment of this measure in order to get this important program promptly under way.

Now, there is another important provision in this bill. It is section 4, appearing on page 3 of the bill.

This section will qualify for American citizenship, within certain limitations, the persons who enter the Army under this program.

In order to qualify, these persons must first enter the United States pursuant to military orders. In other words, the Army must order them into the United States before they may qualify for citizenship.

So, here is the situation on that: The alien enlists overseas if acceptable in all respects to the Army. He cannot get to the United States unless the Army orders him here. If the Army does not order him here, he can never become an American citizen in this program. He will remain an alien in our service abroad until and unless the Army terminates his service or he refuses to reenlist.

So you see when he enlists abroad he must be ordered by the Army to come here before the benefit of citizenship can be given to him. The Army can keep him 5 years in his Army enlistment abroad, and he gets no benefit as far as citizenship is concerned, but if the Army orders him here, he qualifies for citizenship and needs only to file a petition of naturalization, or if he and his witnesses are examined by a representative of the Army they may be naturalized immediately. Even then he must have completed 5 years of service before he can qualify.

I think that gives the committee all the information. There is nothing in this bill to get excited about. The Department of the Army sponsors it; General Collins is asking for it; and I think it is a bill that will strengthen the Army. It is a bill that will not permit the Army to have saddled upon it some 2,500 Communists enlisting in the services.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Georgia has consumed 12 minutes.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may desire.

Mr. Chairman, when this legislation was first proposed to our committee, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. KILPAT] and myself both hit the ceiling. To say that we were surprised is putting it very mildly. Naturally, one would think of foreign legions, of hired Hessians, and wonder if we have reached such a low level in this country that red-blooded Americans are not any longer willing to face danger and, if necessary, die for their country but would have to depend on foreign mercenaries. That was one of the things that caused us some apprehension in the beginning.

Another was the thought if we would bring in the original number asked for, 25,000, we might get enough rotten apples in the barrel of our own Army to contaminate our patriotic American soldier. That danger still exists to some extent because if we are frank and honest with you we will have to admit that this measure carries some calculated risk.

We run a risk when we bring aliens into our Army. They, I think, run an even greater risk because they give notice to their native countries as well as to America that their head is in a noose and they will have to exercise not only extreme caution but prove through trial under close surveillance, after being carefully screened, and combed with a fine-tooth comb, that they are loyal and

patriotic to the Army in which they have entered.

We all know of the deplorable state of affairs in Europe following the last global conflict, the complete destruction and utter devastation, the hopelessness and despair existing among the masses of the people. We know there are many people who because their forms of government have been changed, who because they suffered such political upheaval, social chaos and economic dislocation who now live in slavery and fear, would welcome the opportunity of entering the service of the United States Army in the hope of some day receiving citizenship, perhaps the greatest prize that could be offered to a distressed people in any section of this world.

Modern mechanized warfare is no longer a simple matter. It is highly complex and technical. Some of us here who visited the great underground factory at Nordhausen in Germany 3 or 4 weeks before the surrender of the Reich went through 33 miles of subterranean passages where the V-1 and V-2 bombs were being manufactured. We had witnessed the appalling destruction in both London and Antwerp that was done by these missiles of death. We will have to frankly admit that in many respects the Germans were scientifically ahead of us, not only when it came to making up these bombs of destruction but also in the development of submarines of the snorkel type.

If we can get some good German scientists, Czech engineers, and Balt brains, if we can get some men of high technical skill—men who love freedom as most of the Polish loved it—we might use them to advantage, and do not forget the magnificent contribution that the Polish volunteers in the last war made to the winning of our victory, particularly in Italy. Do not forget even what the Japanese out in Hawaii contributed in the same country—in Italy—in bringing victory to the American forces.

Look at the two portraits before you. George Washington, a British subject, led our American Revolution and Lafayette, a citizen of France, helped him win our independence. We do not have to question the patriotism of any of these foreigners or aliens who are willing to join us because of their comparable political background, because of their love of freedom, because of their devotion to liberty, because of their similar philosophy of life. Many of them are without a home or country and would not have to betray their native land.

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

Mr. SHORT. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. JOHNSON. Will the gentleman kindly add the Italians who joined the Fifth Army to help us fight in Italy and Germany?

Mr. SHORT. Not only the Italians who joined the Fifth Army but the underground in France and every other country invaded. Now, I think we learned, particularly you men here who were in active combat—certainly the author of this bill as an officer in the

United States Army in Sicily, in north Africa, and in Italy—he learned through his own experience, as has, I am sure, our friend the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. VAN ZANDT], out in the Pacific war—we learned the lesson in Africa, in Europe, in the Pacific, wherever men fought that if we had had the advantage and the benefit of certain skills, knowledge of the language, knowledge of the topography, the geography, the terrain, the conditions in a particular area to be invaded, we would have saved many, many American lives. It is all a question of intelligence and it is all a question of knowing not only how strong you are but how strong or weak your enemy is; and if we take 2,500 men, which are not many when they are dispersed, but integrated among over 600,000, I think perhaps they will be able to give their commanders certain knowledge in the event of conflict and before invasion that will save many, many American lives.

Let us be honest. This is a dirty business, but war is dirty. It is dangerous business, but war is dangerous. So while I was inclined at the beginning to vigorously oppose this bill, and while there are aspects to it that are repugnant to the conscience of any decent human being, I am convinced, after we sat on the bill and after we heard the representatives of both the State and Defense Departments, the bill should be passed. Because we do have to have a State Department—I hope—that Members will not allow any preconceived notions or prejudices to have too much weight as they consider this particular measure. We have our foreign embassies in all countries. We have our military and naval attachés. I think that today the Department of Defense and the Department of State must work more closely in unison and integration and cohesion than ever before. This last war taught us that lesson. But, whether you leave the State Department in the bill or take it out, I think that on the whole the measure is meritorious and should be passed in the interest of the security and the defense of the United States.

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

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

Mr. DONDERO. Are we taking a new step today or is there any precedent in American history for an act of this kind?

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Chairman, I would like to answer that question.

Mr. SHORT. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. GAVIN. I might call the attention of the gentleman from Michigan to the fact that during the war years of 1941 to 1945 we had 117,000 aliens in the service of the Armed Forces, so there is nothing new in this legislation before us today. We have already established the precedent of enlisting aliens into the Armed Forces.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHORT. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. It is a well-known fact that after World War I and World War II we granted citizenship to aliens who aided us to win both World Wars.

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

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

Mr. MARCANTONIO. While that statement is true, the fact should be pointed out that these so-called aliens, I prefer to use the term foreign born, who were residing in the United States and were called into the Army did not set up the fact that they were not citizens, but went in and served and served honorably and well for our country, and that is why they became citizens of the United States later. But this is a different situation. These are people who are living abroad and are not living in the United States and will become merely paid hirelings, present-day Hessians.

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

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

Mr. VINSON. Let me call the attention of the gentleman from New York to the fact that this involves the same principle and is the same thing seamen had. There are laws on the statute books today that an alien seaman can get citizenship after 5 years of service on a ship. The identical thing is in this bill.

Mr. SHORT. May I also call the attention of the gentleman from New York to the language on page 2, lines 5 to 8:

Persons enlisted under the provisions of this act shall be integrated into established units with citizen soldiers and not segregated into separate organizations for aliens.

So they are no more citizens than the people who resided for a brief period in the United States before they went into the armed services. A few months of residence makes little difference.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. I will tell the gentleman what makes the big difference. It is the fact that a person has migrated to the United States, together with the fact that he has chosen our country as the land in which he wants to live. That man has the right to fight for the United States and should be given citizenship. But there is certainly a big difference between that situation and the situation where you take a hireling abroad and confer citizenship upon him, for what?

Mr. SHORT. I may say to the gentleman, and the gentleman well knows it, and knows it as well or better perhaps than most of us, that there are hundreds of thousands of aliens and foreigners in other countries who have been more eager but less fortunate in getting to the United States than those who are already here.

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

Mr. SHORT. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. GAVIN. I should like to call to attention of the gentleman my remarks made when this proposal was before the House in June 1948 about people who have no country to turn to. They are

1950

## CONGRESSIONAL RECORD—HOUSE

9235

stateless people. They cannot go back to their own countries as they have no country to go to. I said at that time:

Now as far as availability of aliens is concerned for enlistment, it might be said there are a considerable number of Polish ex-servicemen; and in Britain alone it is estimated there are about 110,000 of these men. How many are in the United States and British zones of Germany who could be enlisted in our Armed Forces, I am unable to say. But I understand there are thousands of these stateless men and that a great many are being used by our forces for civilian guard duty.

There are also a great number of males from the Baltic States—Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania—and some from Czechoslovakia and Yugoslavia, who are most reliable and are potential soldiers. Many of these men have basic military training and are well qualified to serve in our Army.

So it is not a question of taking them into this country, they have no country to go to.

Here we have a group of men who are stateless, who would be anxious to enlist in the services of the United States; who understand the characteristics and language of the country in which they would serve; who would be good soldiers and do a fine job for us. In fact, we have used them in a civilian status. I think this legislation is of great importance and will give us an opportunity to tap this reservoir of manpower desirous of enlisting in our services.

This would give these soldiers and prospective citizens something to work for, and during the 5-year period we could indoctrinate them with the fundamentals of Americanism and good citizenship. If after rendering honorable service and found qualified, they would be in excellent condition to make good sound American citizens. I think this is a great opportunity and this bill should pass overwhelmingly.

Mr. SHORT. God forbid that there should be another conflict, but if we are forced into it, I hope that when we invade certain sections of the world we will have some people, a few, just a few, from those regions who do speak the language, who do know the country, and who know conditions, and can advise our commanders intelligently as to the problems they are going to face when they go in there and take over. That is the purpose of this bill.

There is little that anyone else, I think, could add to what our chairman has already given you. It is something that we cannot tell you everything about. We would like to talk about it, but, as I said once in connection with the consideration of similar legislation, perhaps the least we said about this in public the better off we all would be.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHORT. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. The gentleman is familiar with General MacArthur's island-hopping program in the Pacific?

Mr. SHORT. Very.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Were it not for the fact he had aliens who knew the terrain, location of bridges, and so forth, on the

islands under attack, he would have lost thousands upon thousands of lives.

Mr. SHORT. There is no doubt about that. I think it is an accurate historical and military fact that has been established.

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

Mr. SHORT. I yield.

Mr. REES. The thing that disturbs me is that you have to put them in the United States Army to get the information you are talking about. Can you not secure the information without having to take these people and putting them in the United States Army to get that information which we are discussing now and which was mentioned by the gentleman from Pennsylvania? These people who gave us the information that he talks about were not in our armed forces, were they?

Mr. SHORT. No; but if they fought side by side with us and were a part of us, we would perhaps receive even greater help. If the thing does not become too top-heavy it would work out, there is your danger.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. SHORT. I yield.

Mr. DONDERO. In other words, this bill is intended really to make a contribution to our national defense.

Mr. VINSON. Yes.

Mr. DONDERO. That is what I gather from the gentleman's speech.

Mr. SHORT. Absolutely. That is the reason we reduced the number to 2,500 because it is more or less a new project. It is going to be a matter of trial and error. If it proves successful then we can expand it and enlarge it. If it does not, we can get rid of it.

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

Mr. SHORT. I yield.

Mr. SCRIVNER. What other benefits will these men receive, besides the opportunity to take out American citizenship if they are ordered to this country? I am referring definitely and particularly to veterans' benefits. What will they get?

Mr. SHORT. They will be entitled to the same rights, benefits, privileges, prerogatives and pay as any other enlistee in the United States Army and no more.

Mr. SCRIVNER. That is whether they come over here and take out American citizenship or not?

Mr. SHORT. No; they have to become American citizens and they will not become American citizens unless they are brought to this country.

Mr. SCRIVNER. The bill does not say that.

Mr. SHORT. Yes it does but I dare say that not very many of them will become citizens of the United States.

Mr. VINSON. The bill does say positively that they get no benefits until they become citizens of the United States. When the person becomes a citizen of the United States, he will enjoy every benefit that every other citizen enjoys.

Mr. SHORT. He gets no more and no less.

Mr. SCRIVNER. That still does not answer the question as to what veterans' benefits these men will get whether they become citizens or not.

Mr. VINSON. He gets no benefits until he becomes a citizen. He must become a citizen.

Mr. SCRIVNER. I think the committee should make that exceptionally clear in the bill.

Mr. VINSON. He is an alien until he becomes a citizen, so that he can enjoy any benefits under any of our laws.

Mr. SCRIVNER. He would be a veteran as soon as he is discharged.

Mr. VINSON. He will not be a citizen. He is an alien in every sense of the word until citizenship is conferred upon him.

Mr. SCRIVNER. Then I take it on the word of the chairman that he would not receive any veterans' benefit unless he becomes a citizen?

Mr. VINSON. That is correct.

Mr. SCRIVNER. Now the statement has just been made here that very few of them are going to take out citizenship papers—then where is the great reward that you are talking about in this bill?

Mr. SHORT. They will get the pay of a United States soldier while they are serving for five long years. Some will become citizens but by no means all.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHORT. I yield.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Is it not true they will be on probation for about 5 years before being granted citizenship?

Mr. SHORT. Absolutely. And they are watched and checked continually and carefully.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Also they will be under the strict observation of their commanding officer who will have to recommend whether or not they shall be granted citizenship?

Mr. SHORT. They will be combed when they are brought in by the Army and they will be combed by the Department of State as well before they have the rights of citizenship bestowed upon them.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHORT. I yield.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. The statement has been made that about 115,000 or 116,000 aliens were in the Army in the last war which just closed, and they were not citizens of the United States, as I understand it. Do they get benefits under the GI bill of rights, the same as men who are citizens of the United States?

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

Mr. SHORT. I yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. KEARNEY], who is a member of the Committee on Veterans Affairs, to answer that question.

Mr. KEARNEY. If they are honorably discharged members of the armed services, they are entitled to the benefits of veterans legislation.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. But under this bill unless they become citizens of the United States they are not entitled



9236

## CONGRESSIONAL RECORD—HOUSE

JUNE 22

to any of the benefits of the GI bill of rights?

Mr. SHORT. That is right.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHORT. I yield.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. What would be the position of the individual soldier in the event that the United States went to war against his country? Does he have to give up any allegiance to his own country while serving under the Stars and Stripes?

Mr. SHORT. Why, certainly, absolutely. If he does not, he would in all probability lose his head if he went back to his own country.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. What does he have to do with regard to serving his allegiance to his own country?

Mr. SHORT. When he goes into the United States Army he pledges allegiance and swears loyalty and fealty to the flag, Constitution, and institutions of the United States.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. He takes the oath?

Mr. SHORT. Yes. If he is caught reneging or cheating, of course, it is his neck through court martial in our own forces; or, if he tries to go back to his own country, they would put him before the firing squad the following morning.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHORT. I yield.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Is it not true veterans of World Wars I and II were granted a short cut to citizenship as a result of their honorable service during the wars?

Mr. SHORT. Yes; that is true.

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

Mr. SHORT. I yield.

Mr. VELDE. Certain mention has been made of possibilities of war. I presume you include in the realm of possibilities a war with Russia. In what way would this help to get information from Russia about various facilities in Russia?

Mr. SHORT. I am hopeful, myself, that several of the Slavic countries behind the iron curtain can furnish us with a few of this quota, because they possess a great deal of knowledge, not only about their own countries behind the iron curtain, but they possess considerable knowledge about Russia itself.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Will the gentleman yield for one further question?

Mr. SHORT. I yield.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Was there any testimony that this was the beginning of a one-world army?

Mr. SHORT. No. None whatever.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. It is not the forerunner to bring us under one general army?

Mr. SHORT. No, no. I think I can allay the gentleman's fears and apprehensions on that score.

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

Mr. SHORT. I yield.

Mr. ELSTON. As a matter of fact, there are three safeguards. First, they must serve 5 years in the Armed Forces of the United States.

Mr. SHORT. Yes.

Mr. ELSTON. And, in the second place, they must be sent to this country on orders of military authorities?

Mr. SHORT. Yes, sir.

Mr. ELSTON. And, in the third place, which has not been mentioned, they must otherwise possess all other qualifications of a citizen.

Mr. SHORT. Oh, yes. Yes. Absolutely.

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

Mr. SHORT. I yield.

Mr. GROSS. It is presumed that these men are going to win stripes soon after they get into the American Army? Is that not right?

Mr. SHORT. Yes. I hope so; they will be no good if they do not.

Mr. GROSS. What effect will that have upon the morale of the American Army?

Mr. SHORT. I think the American is willing to compete with anybody at any time, and if he is not willing to do it, then he should be ashamed to call himself an American.

Mr. GROSS. But you are going to bring those men in here and almost automatically bestow stripes on them.

Mr. SHORT. Oh, no. Not at all. They come in as enlisted men, and they serve through the grades. However, I dare say the men who are chosen will be men who possess many skills and specialized knowledge and are much smarter in some ways even than many Americans. I know they are much smarter than I am.

Mr. GROSS. Of course I would not admit that.

Mr. SHORT. And we need that scientific training and technological development. Americans should not think that we have a monopoly on all the wisdom and virtue there is in this world.

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

Mr. SHORT. I yield.

Mr. VINSON. I think the gentleman should make it clear, and the committee should understand, that anyone enlisting now will get no benefits of the GI bill of rights, because they all had to serve during the other war. They apply only during that time, and they get no rights that the GI obtains on account of his service during the war. He would get all benefits of an enlisted man, clothes, rations, pay, and then he cannot get anything until he becomes an American citizen.

Mr. SCRIVNER. Not even peacetime disability pensions?

Mr. VINSON. We have no peacetime disability pensions.

Mr. SCRIVNER. Oh, we most certainly do.

Mr. SHORT. Yes; we have peacetime disability pensions.

Mr. SCRIVNER. The question I want to ask is this: As I read this bill, when these men enlist they are to be unmarried aliens, men without dependents.

Mr. VINSON. Men without dependents; so it will be cheaper.

Mr. SCRIVNER. How long will they have to remain unmarried and without dependents? There is nothing in the bill

which says how long they shall remain so.

Mr. SHORT. During his term of enlistment, I should think.

Mr. VINSON. No. You cannot enlist anyone unless he is a single man.

Mr. SCRIVNER. But he can enlist today and get married the next day and develop a line of dependents, and in 5 years he could have at least three.

Mr. VINSON. They could not do that without permission of the service.

Mr. SCRIVNER. There is nothing in the bill that says so.

Mr. VINSON. He cannot do it, because that is during the term of his enlistment.

Mr. SHORT. That is my understanding.

Mr. SCRIVNER. There is not any bar on it.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 2 minutes to clear up this matter.

Anyone serving outside of the United States cannot get married without the permission of the commanding officer under whom he serves. That applies to citizens, and it will apply in cases of this kind.

Mr. SCRIVNER. Let us follow that a little. Here, for instance, the enlistee could be the elder son or any son of the family; the parent dies; he has four or five brothers and sisters dependent upon him. If they are actual dependents he is entitled to benefits for them under the pay bill, just the same as our men are.

Mr. VINSON. He would be entitled as an enlisted man to any benefits other enlisted men in the Army are entitled to.

Mr. SCRIVNER. That is just exactly what I figured.

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

Mr. VINSON. I yield.

Mr. GROSS. The gentleman predicates his answer on overseas service. There is nothing in this bill that states that the man will be in overseas service or any part of it.

Mr. VINSON. He has to enlist from overseas, and he is kept overseas until the Army orders him here.

Mr. GROSS. The bill does not say so.

Mr. VINSON. Then if he is ordered here, after serving 5 years honorably, he is eligible for citizenship. That is all the bill does.

Mr. GROSS. But this bill makes no such provision.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Texas [Mr. GOSSETT].

Mr. GOSSETT. Mr. Chairman, the distinguished chairman of the committee said this was not a bill to get excited about, and I am not going to get excited about it; but I am opposed to the bill, and I want to explain briefly the reasons for my opposition.

Last year, if you will recall, out of this same committee we passed a bill to permit the CIC—I believe that is right, anyway the intelligence forces—to bring in 100 persons; they could bring in anyone they wanted to. It was thought at that time and it was argued at that time that such would take care of the emergency cases of persons furnishing infor-

1950

## CONGRESSIONAL RECORD—HOUSE

9237

mation to the armed services. Recently, in this session of Congress—and I want the gentleman to follow me here—recently, in this session of Congress we passed the Walter bill for selective immigration, and we provided that a board should be set up composed of a representative from each of Commerce, State, Justice, Labor, and the armed services—five on this board—to pick 2,500 per year. They could just give an immigration visa to any person they wanted, regardless of who he was or his place in line. That would take care of persons of peculiar skills or those whom we thought might be of service to this country.

My opposition to this bill is that it is a new gadget, of which we have too many already, for obtaining American citizenship. My guess is that if this bill should become law probably a million aliens would like to enlist, because it certainly would be a bonanza for them; the emoluments and privileges of service in the American Army certainly exceed those of most jobs and professions abroad. I am just a little tired of passing legislation year in and year out, multitudinous legislation, because some general in the armed services, or some secretary comes in and says, "We need it; we want it." I do not know the parentage of this particular bill, but I fear it is ill-conceived.

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

Mr. GOSSETT. I yield.

Mr. VINSON. I certainly trust the gentleman will not try to convey the thought to this committee that we 35 men are pushed around by generals because they just want this or just want that done. If there is any committee of Congress that is independent and that is independent in its thinking, it is the Armed Services Committee.

Mr. GOSSETT. I concede to my good friend that he has a very distinguished committee; but, unfortunately, the committees of this Congress—and that applies to all of us—generally tend to lean too heavily upon the bureaus and agencies whose business they handle.

Mr. VINSON. This committee does not do it; this committee does its own thinking. That is the reason why we are oftentimes in controversy with the departments.

Mr. GOSSETT. And there are some members of the gentleman's committee who are not very well sold on this bill, I might say, notwithstanding the atmosphere of unanimity the gentleman seeks to throw around it.

What I am trying to say is that we have already taken care of this situation in the bill passed last year and in the bill now pending in the other body.

And let me make this point: The distinguished Member of the other body who authored this bill, after his return from Europe, recommended the discharge of all aliens in the State Department. Now he wants to employ aliens abroad in the American Army.

Reference has been made here to the citizenship provisions that we extended to aliens serving in wartime. Those were aliens resident in this country.

This bill sets up a complete new departure from any policy that has ever

heretofore been followed in this country, and I submit it is a dangerous policy, a needless policy, an unnecessary policy, and that we should not pass this type of legislation.

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

Mr. GOSSETT. I yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. REES. There is another thing that disturbs me. Under this bill, we are holding out to a foreigner, a man who lives in a foreign country, the promise that, if he will relinquish his citizenship, his allegiance to his own country, then he can join the American Army and have the benefits same as our armed forces. It seems to me it is a rather strange situation when we have to go through this process to protect ourselves and our country against a potential enemy or an enemy we think we may have later on. We tell a fellow in some foreign country who joins our forces that, in the event we have to go to war with his country or any country, "You must give up all of your rights and relinquish your citizenship and join the American Army."

Mr. GOSSETT. We are asking the man to forswear his allegiance, assuming thereby we will make him a better servant of our own.

Mr. REES. Which to me is a rather strange situation, especially considering this is a peacetime measure.

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

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

Mr. VINSON. In answer to the gentleman from Kansas, my viewpoint would be that a great many people are in countries that are dominated by outside countries, and therefore this gives an opportunity to serve where he feels he can be of some benefit.

Mr. GOSSETT. We are not setting up the American Army as an escape avenue for people who may want to run away from their own country.

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

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman one additional minute. Let me ask the gentleman from Texas this question: Is it not a fact that a similar kind of provision exists in reference to serving by aliens under the seamen's law?

Mr. GOSSETT. That is true, and I think that act ought to be repealed. It is bad legislation.

Mr. VINSON. I have a copy of it before me. We are doing no more by this bill than is already on the statute books in reference to serving on ships as seamen, is that not correct?

Mr. GOSSETT. That is correct, but one bad law does not justify another bad law. These persons who are going to forswear and repudiate allegiance to their own country would not be the sort of individual we would want to make an American citizen. That is the sort of person you are inviting by this legislation. If he is not a good citizen of the country for which he refuses to fight and the country that he deserts, he is not going to be a very good citizen of this country.

Let me remind the committee that this bill obligates us, as a matter of fact, to give the enlisted alien citizenship.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has again expired.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 1 minute.

Mr. Chairman, I want to call the committee's attention to the fact that for 10 years there has been on the statute books an act providing that aliens who volunteer, and serve honorably for a period of 3 years on our ships at sea, automatically get citizenship if their service has been satisfactory. So what is the use of getting disturbed about this legislation?

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

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

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Does not the statute provide that these seamen must have been lawfully admitted?

Mr. VINSON. No; it does not provide that at all. He is not even admitted. He enlists when the ship goes abroad and he makes a contract and serves for 3 years. We already have a law like this, and everybody is getting excited about extending almost the same provisions to the Army.

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

Mr. VINSON. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON. The big point is that the people we propose to enlist are without a country. They are all over there in the occupied areas.

Mr. VINSON. That is it exactly.

Mr. JOHNSON. They cannot go back to the Baltics and the other countries.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, if there are no further requests for time, I ask that the bill be read for amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read. The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That, with the approval of the Secretary of State, the Secretary of the Army, under such regulations as the Secretary of the Army may prescribe, is authorized until June 30, 1951, to accept original enlistments in the Regular Army for periods of not less than 5 years or not to exceed 10,000 qualified unmarried aliens (without dependents as defined in sec. 4 of the act of June 16, 1942 (56 Stat. 381), as amended), who are not less than 18 years of age or more than 35 years of age; and, with the approval of the Secretary of State, to accept reenlistment of any such alien upon the expiration of his original term of enlistment for such period or periods as the Secretary of the Army may determine.

Sec. 2. Provisions of law prohibiting the payment of any person not a citizen of the United States shall neither apply to aliens who enlist in the Regular Army under the provisions of section 1 of this act nor to their dependents and beneficiaries.

Sec. 3. So much of section 2 of the act approved August 1, 1894 (28 Stat., chs. 179, 216; 10 U. S. C. 625), as amended, as reads "and in time of peace no person (except an Indian) who is not a citizen of the United States or who has not made legal declaration of his intention to become a citizen of the United States, shall be enlisted for the first enlistment in the Army" is hereby suspended until June 30, 1951, with respect to enlistments made under section 1 of this act.

Sec. 4. Notwithstanding the periods set forth therein, the provisions of section 324A of the Nationality Act of 1940, as added by the act of June 1, 1948 (Public Law 567,

80th Cong.), are applicable to aliens enlisted or reenlisted pursuant to the provisions of this act. Any alien enlisted or reenlisted pursuant to the provisions of this act who subsequently enters the United States or an outlying possession thereof (including the Panama Canal Zone, but excluding the Philippine Islands) pursuant to military orders shall be deemed to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence within the meaning of such section 324A.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 5, strike out "1951" and insert "1953."

Page 1, line 6, after the word "enlistments", insert "or reenlistments."

Page 1, line 8, strike out "ten thousand" and insert "two thousand five hundred."

Page 2, line 5, after the colon, insert "Provided, That persons enlisted under the provisions of this act shall be integrated into, established units with citizen soldiers and not segregated into separate organizations for aliens."

Page 2, line 21, strike out "1951" and insert "1953."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment: Page 3, line 10, after the word "shall", insert the following: "If otherwise, qualified for citizenship, and after completion of five or more years of military service, or earlier if honorably discharged therefrom."

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment to the committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. VINSON to the committee amendment:

Page 3, line 11, strike out the words "or earlier."

The amendment was agreed to.

The committee amendment as amended was agreed to.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. VINSON:

On page 1, strike out lines 3 and 4 and insert in lieu thereof the following: "That the Secretary of the Army, under such regulations as the Secretary of."

And on page 2, strike out lines 1 and 2 and insert in lieu thereof the following: "35 years of age, and to accept reenlistment of any such alien upon."

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I desire to state that this is the language that I offered to strike out, so that no one has any authority over this except the Secretary of the Army.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I listened very carefully to the debate on this particular phase of this bill, that is, that part of it which relates to the Department of State. I hope the gentleman will withdraw this amendment, and I will tell you why. The United States has about 300 missions scattered over the world today. They are expected to be our first line of defense. In each of these missions we have the chief. He is the sole representative of the United States in that part of the world. Under him we have various employees who are the eyes and ears of our Government. In some of

these missions we have military, naval, and air attachés. All foreign affairs and contacts with foreign governments must be cleared through these missions and eventually through the Department of State at home. These missions handle all of our foreign problems including the questions of immigration. This bill is in part a problem of immigration but mainly it is part of the stockpiling against a probable future emergency. It stockpiles men into our service. The Chief of National Defense and the Chief of our Army say it is necessary. That is a must in the plans for future defense. But the plans for future defense is an all-inclusive one. It brings together not only the armed services but our Foreign Service and the State Department are on this defense team. Each is part of the defense wheel and the Foreign Service and the State Department are most important spokes in this wheel. The amendment of the chairman of the Armed Services Committee is dangerous because it tears out two important spokes and entirely bypasses the State Department which now deals with these problems of aliens in foreign lands who want to come to our country. No matter what any of you think personally about the Secretary of State or the State Department I urge you to vote against this amendment. This country must have a good Department of State and a good Foreign Service and neither should be bypassed in legislation dealing with our serious defense problems. If we want teamwork do not start breaking up the team with amendments such as this one.

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

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

Mr. VINSON. I would say in response to the gentleman's observation that the State Department further than being mentioned in this bill is bound to be in the picture. The State Department under the National Security Act is in all phases of the Army, Navy, and Air defenses. Under that act they are conversant with each other. Even though you leave out the Secretary of State, no man, I am satisfied, would be enlisted unless the Secretary of State was cognizant of the importance of these various enlistments. So I do not think it would hurt to leave out that phrase. The reason the gentleman has just advanced was the reason we put it in, but the gentleman heard the debate.

Mr. STEFAN. I have heard the debate, and I think it is a dangerous precedent you are setting by your amendment.

Mr. VINSON. It might be. So let us do this. The committee heard the debate. If the committee want to leave it out, let them leave it out. If they want to keep it in, let them keep it in. It is immaterial to me. The committee wanted it in, but to meet certain objections that were being raised to this bill I offer this amendment to give the committee an opportunity to decide on it. Now, if they want to vote it out, let them vote it out, but let us vote on it.

Mr. STEFAN. In spite of my admiration for the chairman of the Committee on Armed Services, I must oppose his

amendment. It shows lack of confidence of a very important part of our national defense team.

I urge the Committee to vote against the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. ALLEN of Illinois) there were—ayes 14, noes 58.

So the amendment was rejected. Mr. GOSSETT. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. GOSSETT: On page 1, line 9, after the word "unmarried", insert "male."

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, we accept the amendment. It was never intended that anyone except male aliens would be enlisted in the service.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. GOSSETT].

The amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the committee rises.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. CARROLL, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (S. 2269) to provide for the enlistment of aliens in the Regular Army, pursuant to House Resolution 649, he reported the bill back to the House with sundry amendments adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment? If not, the Chair will put them en gross.

The amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the third reading of the bill.

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

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. ALLEN of Illinois) there were—ayes 80, noes 21.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present, and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—ayes 201, noes 84, not voting 145, as follows:

[Roll No. 182]

YEAS—201

Abblitt	Bentsen	Burnside
Addonizio	Biemiller	Burton
Albert	Boggs, La.	Byrne, N. Y.
Allen, Calif.	Bolling	Byrnes, Wis.
Anderson, Calif.	Bonner	Camp
Arends	Bosone	Canfield
Aspinall	Boykin	Cannon
Bailey	Bramblett	Carnahan
Baring	Brown, Ga.	Case, N. J.
Bates, Mass.	Brown, Ohio	Case, S. Dak.
Beckworth	Buchanan	Celler
Bennett, Fla.	Buckley, Ill.	Christopher

Clemente  
Colmer  
Combs  
Cooley  
Cooper  
Corbett  
Crawford  
Crock  
Crosser  
Cunningham  
Curtis  
Dague  
Davenport  
Davies, N. Y.  
Davis, Tenn.  
Dawson  
DeGraffenried  
Denton  
Dollinger  
Dondero  
Donohue  
Doughton  
Doyle  
Eaton  
Elliot  
Elston  
Engle, Calif.  
Fallon  
Feighan  
Fellows  
Fenton  
Fernandez  
Flood  
Forand  
Ford  
Fugate  
Fulton  
Furcolo  
Garmatz  
Gavin  
Goodwin  
Gordon  
Gorski  
Graham  
Gull  
Hall  
Leonard W.  
Halleck  
Harden  
Hardy  
Harrison  
Havehner  
Hays, Ark.  
Hedrick  
Hesseltin  
Hollfield

Holmes  
Howell  
Huber  
Jackson, Calif.  
Jacobs  
Javits  
Jenkins  
Jennings  
Jensen  
Johnson  
Jones, Ala.  
Jones, Mo.  
Judd  
Karst  
Karsten  
Kearney  
Keating  
Keo  
Kilburn  
Kilday  
King  
Kirwan  
Klein  
Kunkel  
Lane  
Lanham  
LeCompte  
LeFevre  
Lind  
Linehan  
Lucas  
McConnell  
McCormack  
McCulloch  
McDoneugh  
McGrath  
McKinnon  
McSweeney  
Mack, Wash.  
Madden  
Magee  
Marsalls  
Martin, Iowa  
Meyer  
Michener  
Miller, Nebr.  
Mills  
Morgan  
Multer  
Murdock  
Murphy  
Nelson  
Nixon  
Noland  
Norblad  
Norton

O'Brien, Ill.  
O'Konski  
O'Neill  
O'Sullivan  
Phillip  
Phillips, Calif.  
Poulson  
Preston  
Price  
Priest  
Ramsay  
Rhodes  
Riehlman  
Robeson  
Rodino  
Rogers, Mass.  
Roosevelt  
Sasser  
Scudder  
Shelley  
Sheppard  
Short  
Sikes  
Simpson, Ill.  
Smathers  
Stagers  
Stanley  
Stefan  
Sullivan  
Taber  
Talle  
Tauriello  
Thomas  
Thompson  
Thornberry  
Tollefson  
Trimble  
Underwood  
Van Zandt  
Vinson  
Vorys  
Wadsworth  
Wagner  
Waiter  
Weichel  
Widnall  
Wigglesworth  
Wilson, Okla.  
Withrow  
Wolcott  
Woodruff  
Young  
Zablocki

Hébert  
Heffernan  
Heller  
Herlong  
Herter  
Hinshaw  
Hobbs  
Hoffman, Ill.  
Hope  
Horan  
Irving  
Jackson, Wash.  
James  
Kearns  
Keefe  
Kelley, Pa.  
Kelly, N. Y.  
Kennedy  
Keogh  
Kerr  
Latham  
Lichtenwalter  
Lodge  
Lovre  
Lyle  
Lynch  
McGregor  
McGuire  
McMillan, S. C.  
McMillen, Ill.  
Mack, Ill.  
Macy  
Marshall  
Martin, Mass.

Mason  
Merrow  
Miles  
Miller, Calif.  
Miller, Md.  
Mitchell  
Monroney  
Morris  
Morrison  
Morton  
Moulder  
O'Brien, Mich.  
Pace  
Patterson  
Perkins  
Pfeifer  
Joseph L.  
Pfeiffer  
William L.  
Phillips, Tenn.  
Plumley  
Polk  
Potter  
Powell  
Quinn  
Rabaut  
Redden  
Regan  
Ribicoff  
Richards  
Rivers  
Sabath  
Sadlak  
Sadowski

St. George  
Sanborn  
Saylor  
Scott, Hardie  
Scott,  
Hugh D., Jr.  
Shafer  
Simpson, Pa.  
Sims  
Smith, Ohio  
Smith, Va.  
Spence  
Steed  
Stigler  
Stockman  
Sutton  
Taylor  
Teague  
Towe  
Velde  
Walsh  
Welch  
Werdel  
Wheeler  
Whitaker  
White, Calif.  
White, Idaho  
Whitten  
Whittington  
Wickersham  
Wilson, Ind.  
Wolverton  
Wood  
Woodhouse

Mr. Eberharter with Mr. Potter.  
Mr. Kelley of Pennsylvania with Mr. Phillips of Tennessee.  
Mr. Gary with Mr. Miller of Maryland.  
Mr. Morrison with Mr. Martin of Massachusetts.  
Mr. Hobbs with Mr. Saylor.  
Mr. Gilmer with Mr. Velde.  
Mr. Herlong with Mr. Sadlak.  
Mr. Cavalcante with Mr. Morton.  
Mr. Chudoff with Mr. Merrow.  
Mr. Irving with Mr. Plumley.

Mr. O'Hara of Illinois changed his vote from "present" to "nay."  
Mr. THORNBERRY changed his vote from "nay" to "yea."  
Mr. WIER changed his vote from "yea" to "nay."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.  
The doors were opened.  
A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

STILL FURTHER MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A still further message from the Senate, by Mr. Carrell, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed a joint resolution of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. J. Res. 190. Joint resolution extending the period of effectiveness of the Selective Service Act of 1948 15 days.

EXTENDING SELECTIVE SERVICE ACT OF 1948

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of Senate Joint Resolution 190, extending the period of effectiveness of the Selective Service Act of 1948 15 days.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

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

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I realize if I objected to the present consideration of the resolution, a rule would be obtained and it would be called up tomorrow. That would only inconvenience the membership so that they would have to come back here tomorrow when I understand it is intended that we adjourn over until Monday.

Therefore, nothing would be accomplished by objecting at this time except to delay the matter 24 hours.

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

Mr. MARCANTONIO. I yield.

Mr. MCCORMACK. In order that the RECORD might show that the assumption of the gentleman from New York is correct, I will state that that is correct.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. I thank the gentleman. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I shall not object to the present consideration of the resolution. However, I want the RECORD to show my consistent and conscientious opposition to any form of selective-service legislation.

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

There was no objection.

NOT VOTING—145  
Andresen  
August H.  
Auchincloss  
Barrett, Pa.  
Bates, Ky.  
Beall  
Blackney  
Boggs, Del.  
Bolton, Md.  
Boeh  
Borch  
Brooks  
Byson  
Cackley, N. Y.  
Eulwinkle  
Eurdick

O'Hara, Minn.  
O'Toole  
Passman  
Patman  
Patten  
Fickett  
Foage  
Rains  
Rankin  
Reed, Ill.  
Reed, N. Y.  
Rees  
Rich  
Rogers, Fla.  
Rooney  
Scrivner  
Secrest  
Smith, Kans.  
Smith, Wis.  
Tackett  
Vursell  
Wier  
Williams  
Willis  
Wilson, Tex.  
Winstead  
Yates

Fogarty  
Frazier  
Gamble  
Gary  
Gillette  
Gilmer  
Gore  
Granahan  
Granger  
Green  
Gwinn  
Hale  
Hall  
Edwin Arthur  
Hand  
Hare

9240

## CONGRESSIONAL RECORD—HOUSE

JUNE 22

The Clerk read the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 190), as follows:

*Resolved, etc.*, That subsection (b) of section 17 of the Selective Service Act of 1948 as amended by striking out "the second anniversary of the date of enactment of this title" and inserting in lieu thereof "July 9, 1950."

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.

## ADJOURNMENT OVER

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet on Monday next.

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

There was no objection.

## SIGNING OF ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that notwithstanding the adjournment of the House it may be in order for the Clerk to receive any messages from the Senate, and the Speaker be authorized to sign any enrolled bills and joint resolutions duly passed by both Houses and found truly enrolled.

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

There was no objection.

## EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. PATTERSON (at the request of Mr. MICHENER) was given permission to extend his remarks.

Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana asked and was given permission to extend his remarks.

Mr. PETERSON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include a citation issued to his colleague, Mr. BENNETT of Florida.

Mr. TEAGUE (at the request of Mr. PRIEST) was given permission to extend his remarks in two instances and include extraneous matter.

Mr. WICKERSHAM (at the request of Mr. PRIEST) was given permission to extend his remarks.

Mr. GAVIN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks made in Committee of the Whole.

Mr. STEFAN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks made in Committee of the Whole.

Mr. DAVENPORT asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. DONOHUE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

## PROGRAM FOR NEXT WEEK

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. HALLECK. I would like to inquire of the majority leader if he can advise as to the program for next week.

Mr. McCORMACK. I should be very glad to do so.

Monday is District Day. There are seven bills on the District Committee agenda. I am not sure if they will be called up in this order, but I am stating them in the following order for the information of the House.

H. R. 2887, known as the architect's registration bill.

H. R. 6669, the rent control bill.

H. R. 7881, known as the dead human bodies bill.

H. R. 8055, relating to banks, demand items.

H. R. 8709, relating to the health officer and assistant.

H. R. 8710, relating to the Eastern High School Stadium.

H. R. 8782, relating to nurseries and nursery schools.

On Monday we are hopeful that the Rules Committee will report out a rule making in order consideration of the tax bill. I have no knowledge now what period of time the rule will provide for, but upon the assumption that there will be 2 days' debate, then the tax bill will be taken up Tuesday and Wednesday. Of course, Wednesday is primary day in Georgia, and in accordance with the policy of respecting that in the case of all States, if the program is carried out, the roll call will take place on Thursday. If we are not fortunate enough to have the Rules Committee report out a rule on Monday—and I hope it will—and they report it out later in the week, of course the tax bill will come up next week.

Any conference reports, of course, are always in order for consideration. That is subject to giving the membership proper notice, if they are important ones.

Any further program I will announce later on, if there is any for next week.

I would like to get in as much as I can next week because, while I cannot make any definite commitment now, I am hopeful that the week of July 4 will be a very light one. The only difficulty may be the conference report on the selective-service legislation. We have extended it until July 9, which is on a Sunday, as the Senate passed the resolution. I am hopeful that if there is any requirement for a conference that the conferees may be able to iron out their differences next week.

Mr. HALLECK. Of course since the 9th of July does come on Sunday and would be the expiration date of the 15-day extension just passed, might it not be possible that another temporary extension could be had, that would not necessitate the presence of all Members during the Fourth of July week?

Mr. McCORMACK. Exactly. That could be done. I am glad the gentleman from Indiana referred to it, because that is a very proper contribution to make. In other words, if the conferees cannot get together next week and there is a prolonged conference, both branches could provide for a further extension of time.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HALLECK. I yield.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I have asked the gentleman to yield in view of the

statement made relative to a possible rule being granted in connection with the tax bill. I have just informed the majority leader and the minority leader that both the chairman of the Ways and Means Committee and the ranking Republican member have informed me that they will request a rule for 2 days' debate on the bill.

Mr. McCORMACK. I am very glad to get that information. I did not have that information and my announcement of the program was predicated upon the assumption which the gentleman kindly confirms.

Mr. HALLECK. I might say to the gentleman from Massachusetts that, of course, I am in complete accord with the arrangement in respect to the Members from Georgia and their primary on next Wednesday. It just so happens, however, that out in Indiana both parties are having their State conventions, which is a matter of some consequence to all of us from Indiana.

I take it the leadership will be seeking a closed rule on the tax bill.

Mr. McCORMACK. Yes.

Mr. HALLECK. If that is granted, then on Thursday the business would simply be calling the roll on the motion to recommit and the passage of the bill, if a roll call should develop.

Mr. McCORMACK. Exactly.

I find it difficult at times to make a program that will be pleasing to everyone, but I am sure the Members know I do my best to have the program of the House that will be pleasing as far as humanly possible to the membership on both sides. If by meeting an hour earlier on Thursday next it would be of assistance I would be glad to do it, and I am sure that the membership of the House would concur in such action.

Mr. HALLECK. I was on the point of suggesting, in view of the situation of the Georgia Members with respect to their returning to Washington and other Members who would be away, that it would be a good thing. I am glad the majority leader has that in mind, because I am convinced that it would be of considerable assistance to the Members.

Mr. McCORMACK. If the gentleman from Indiana desires that, I hope he will confer with me next week.

Mr. HALLECK. Yes; I shall be glad to do that, and I may say to the gentleman that I am glad to hear his announcement for the week of the 4th of July. We have been working here quite steadily, and as far as I can discover, the House is right well up with its work.

Mr. McCORMACK. The House has been most cooperative. I have expressed my appreciation before, and I cannot emphasize it too strongly. We are caught up, and I do not know of anything now which will not permit an exceedingly light week, if there be anything at all for the week of the Fourth. But, of course, I would like just a slight leeway to protect myself, because I feel obligated to carry out any absolute statement I make to the House. I should like a slight leeway in case something should develop.



1950

## CONGRESSIONAL RECORD—SENATE

9259

of June 30, or some such date. However, Mr. President, there is no deadline so far as the adoption of this conference report is concerned. There is no reason in the world why the Secretary of Agriculture has not already announced his 1950 wheat program, unless he arbitrarily sees fit to hold it up in an attempt to force Congress to adopt this conference report. If any farmer in the Midwest or elsewhere is having any trouble in getting his loans, I wish he would tell us about it, because there is absolutely nothing which prohibits the Secretary of Agriculture from taking care of all the farmers in this matter; and certainly they should be taken care of, regardless of whether we as individual Senators agree on the law which is now on the statute books.

I am not going to object to the proposal to postpone the vote on the conference report until Monday; but I do not wish the Senate to be under the misapprehension that a deadline is involved, or to operate under any alleged threat from the administration that there is a deadline which much be met or otherwise the agricultural program will be sabotaged.

The Secretary of Agriculture has ample funds now on hand to carry out his announced programs and I will discuss this phase further Monday.

Furthermore I call particular attention to the fact that this Corporation which is seeking another \$2,000,000,000 has still not submitted their audited reports to the Congress for their operations during the period since June 30, 1947. And as I pointed out last week, the Corporation as of June 30, 1947, found it necessary to write off over \$96,000,000 in order to balance their books.

So far as I am concerned those books for the years 1948, 1949 are going to be delivered to the Senate before they get another dime.

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

Mr. MYERS. I yield.

Mr. THYE. The Senator from Delaware has said there are ample funds, and that there is no reason why the Secretary of Agriculture cannot announce the program. The Senator is correct, in that the funds available are ample to permit announcement of a support program for wheat, and possibly to permit announcement of a support program for some of the other basic commodities which may come to harvest early in this particular calendar year.

However, let us remember that the diversified farmer and the other type of farmer—as distinguished from wheat, cotton, or corn farmers—have just as much right to the Commodity Credit Corporation funds as any other groups of farmers do. If the Secretary of Agriculture were to obligate all the present funds to the crop now coming on—

in other words, the crop now in harvest—there would be no funds left to support poultry, pork, dairy products, citrus fruits, or some of the other nonbasics. I think the Secretary of Agriculture has in mind that when he announces the program, he must know whether he has sufficient funds to go through with

it in regard to the perishables or the nonbasics, as well as the basic commodities, the price of which by law the Secretary of Agriculture is mandatorily bound to support.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the unanimous consent request of the Senator from Pennsylvania? The Chair hears none.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I should like to reply to what the Senator has just said, but before doing so, I have no objection to having the unanimous-consent agreement entered into.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator reserve the right to object?

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, is the unanimous-consent request agreed to? If it is, I shall then be happy to yield to the Senator from Delaware for the purpose of making the reply.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair has not finally announced that it was agreed to. Does the Senator from Delaware object?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I do not object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the unanimous consent entered into.

The unanimous-consent agreement, as reduced to writing, is as follows:

*Ordered*, That on the calendar day of Monday, June 26, 1950, at the hour of 4 o'clock p. m., the Senate proceed to vote, without further debate, upon the question of agreeing to the conference report on the bill (H. R. 6567) to increase the borrowing power of the Commodity Credit Corporation.

*Ordered further*, That the time between 12 o'clock and 4 o'clock p. m. on said day be equally divided between those favoring and those opposing the report and controlled, respectively, by Mr. ELLENDER and Mr. MAGNUSON.

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, I yield to the Senator from Delaware.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I merely desire to say, in reply to what the Senator from Minnesota has just said, that the Senator from Minnesota was pointing out the fact that the combines are now operating in the Midwest, and that the farmers there were going to be confronted with a serious problem.

Mr. THYE. If the Senator will permit a correction, I did not refer to combines operating in the Midwest, but in the extreme Southwest.

Mr. WILLIAMS. The extreme Southwest is what I meant. The farmers of that area will not be up against any problem at all, if the Secretary of Agriculture will carry out the instructions of the Congress and will administer the law, for which he has the necessary money available. The only reason in the world why he would place any farmer in an embarrassing position today is because he wants to put a little pressure on Congress to give him this \$2,000,000,000 increased borrowing power.

## ENLISTMENT OF ALIENS IN REGULAR ARMY

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. STENNIS in the chair) laid before the Senate the amendments of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 2269) to provide for the enlistment of aliens in the Regular Army, which were, on page 1, line 5, strike out "1951" and insert "1953"; on

page 1, line 6, after "enlistments", insert "or reenlistments"; on, page 1, line 7 and 8, strike out "ten thousand" and insert "two thousand five hundred"; on page 1, line 8, after "unmarried", insert "male"; on page 2, line 4, after "determine", insert "; Provided, That persons enlisted under the provisions of this Act shall be integrated into established units with citizen soldiers and not segregated into separate organizations for aliens"; on page 2, line 17, strike out "1951" and insert "1953", and on page 3, line 3, after "shall", insert "if otherwise qualified for citizenship, and after completion of five or more years of military service, if honorably discharged therefrom."

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, this is a Senate bill which was reported unanimously by the Armed Services Committee of the Senate. It was passed by the Senate unanimously. The purpose of the bill is to authorize the enlistment in the Army of 10,000 selected aliens. The House took the Senate bill as reported by the Senate Armed Services Committee, but reduced the number from 10,000 to 2,500. It was then passed by the House, yesterday.

Let me say that the bill is strongly desired by the Chief of Staff of the Army, which is due to the fact that World War II proved that it is vitally necessary that we have within the ranks men who understand the languages, customs, people, terrain, and weapons of different nations. I know of no objection to the bill. The change from 10,000 to 2,500 has the approval of the chairman of the Armed Services Committee, the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS], with whom I have consulted. I therefore move that the Senate agree to the House amendments.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Massachusetts.

The motion was agreed to.

## INCREASE IN BORROWING POWER OF COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION—CONFERENCE REPORT

The Senate resumed the consideration of the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 6567) to increase the borrowing power of Commodity Credit Corporation.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, the Senate now has under consideration the conference report agreed upon by the conferees appointed by this body, on H. R. 6557. I may say the House has already adopted the report, and it is now up to the Senate to do likewise, in order that the bill may be sent to the President for his signature.

I thought it might be advisable at this time for me to give a brief history of the amendment to section 22 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act, as it has been made part of the report we are now considering. It will be recalled that the Senate adopted the House version of the bill and added to it the so-called Magnuson-Morse amendment, which seeks to amend section 22 in three respects. Under section 22 of the present law, whenever the President has reason

to believe that any article or articles are being or are practically certain to be imported into the United States under such conditions and such quantities as to render or tend to render ineffective, or materially interfere with, any farm program, he may require the Tariff Commission to investigate the matter and, upon the finding of that Commission, he may decide under that section whether to increase the tariff, or impose a quota on goods being imported into this country.

The Magnuson amendment, in the first instance, changes that portion of section 22 and places the responsibility on the Secretary of Agriculture to initiate these proceedings. Second, instead of having the Tariff Commission make the final investigation, as is now provided by the law, the Magnuson amendment would make it read so that the Department of Agriculture would investigate the matter and make all findings and reports to the President.

The third and most important change is with respect to subsection (f) of section 22 of the present law.

Subsection (f) provides specifically that no proclamation under section 22 shall be enforced in contravention of any treaty or other international agreements to which the United States is or hereafter becomes a party. The significant change made by the so-called Magnuson amendment to that particular subsection (f) is that it reverses the order, in that it provides that no international agreement may hereafter be entered into or present agreements extended beyond their termination dates which do not reserve the right of this country to invoke section 22 whenever the President decides to do so. That is the distinction between the present law and the provisions of the Magnuson amendment. The House did not pass upon that issue.

We went into conference, and of course met with strenuous opposition to the Magnuson amendment on the part of the House conferees. We met on two occasions, and finally came to an agreement. It is true that the Senate conferees did not get all they sought, but I believe that some progress has been made toward carrying out the policies and protective provisions of section 22 of the present law. The conferees agreed to reenactment of the present law, with two changes. Instead of the President's initiating the investigation as to whether goods should be prevented, under the provisions of section 22, from coming into the United States, the Secretary of Agriculture is to initiate the inquiry, the same as is provided in the Magnuson amendment, with the addition that after the Secretary of Agriculture makes his finding he shall so advise the President, and if the President shall agree that there is reason for such relief, the President is required to cause an immediate investigation to be made by the United States Tariff Commission to determine the facts.

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

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. THYE. Has the Senator seen the letter sent out by the American Farm Bureau Federation relative to section 22?

Mr. ELLENDER. I may state to the distinguished Senator that I have received many letters, but I do not recall that particular letter.

Mr. THYE. If the Senator will yield, I should like to read one paragraph of the letter, because it is relevant to the remarks which the Senator has made with reference to the entire question.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the entire letter be printed in the RECORD at this point. It is a letter addressed to me by Mr. J. Don Parel, associate director of the Washington office of the American Farm Bureau Federation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HILL in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

The letter is as follows:

AMERICAN FARM BUREAU FEDERATION,  
Washington, D. C., June 15, 1950.  
Hon. EDWARD J. THYE,  
United States Senate,  
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR THYE: In compliance with your request concerning the views of the American Farm Bureau Federation relative to the conferees' action on section 22 of H. R. 6567, they are as follows:

Section 22 was designed to protect United States agriculture from imports when such imports would cause undue hardships to domestic producers of like commodities.

The proposed conference amendment to section 22 does not accomplish the original objective of section 22 to which we are committed by American Farm Bureau Federation resolution.

If the Congress accepts the conference report, the situation will be improved if the legislative history includes an interpretation of the conference amendment showing it was the intention of the Congress that under the conference amendment section 22 could be invoked when acreage allotments, marketing quotas, or marketing agreements are in force with regard to any agricultural commodity or when surpluses of agricultural commodities are being used for school-lunch and other domestic-consumer programs.

Sincerely,

DON PAREL,  
Associate Director, Washington Office.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, the last paragraph of the letter covers the main question. It reads as follows:

If the Congress accepts the conference report, the situation will be improved if the legislative history includes an interpretation of the conference amendment showing it was the intention of the Congress that under the conference amendment section 22 could be invoked when acreage allotments, marketing quotas, or marketing agreements are in force with regard to any agricultural commodity, or when surpluses of agricultural commodities are being used for school-lunch and other domestic-consumer programs.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, in the course of my remarks I shall bring out that point. I believe, as the letter states, that the language contained in the conference report is an improvement on the present law. Under the present law it is optional that the President continue the safeguards that are contained in article XI of the general agreement on tariffs

and trade, but this new language makes it obligatory on him to incorporate these safeguards in any future agreements or amendments to existing agreements.

Mr. THYE. If I may ask a further question of the Senator, if that becomes mandatory on the President, then why was the Magnuson amendment emasculated in the manner in which it was?

Mr. ELLENDER. I may state to my distinguished friend that we were dealing in conference; we dealt with House Members who had not considered this proposal, and they made us a proposition which we accepted. I think it is a decided improvement on the present law.

Mr. THYE. As the Senator so well knows, I was a member of the conference committee, and the Senator knows as well as I do that we did not yield until we felt that every effort on the part of the Senate conferees had been exhausted. Some of us felt it was useless to debate it any longer, and we either had to report that we were in disagreement or we had to sign what we had before us and report it to the Senate. I was most unhappy when I signed it, because I felt we were suggesting to the President what we hoped he would do, but I did not feel that we wrote anything into the law which made it mandatory on the part of the President to do something. That is why I read the paragraph from this letter, so as to make certain that the very able Senator from Louisiana would agree specifically that what we, as members of the conference committee and Members of the Congress, want, so far as the Senate is concerned, is the application of the very position stated in the letter from the American Farm Bureau Federation. That is what we expect of the President and what we expect of the officials of the Commodity Credit Corporation, including the Secretary of Agriculture. What we hoped for and what the Magnuson amendment intended, was to do that which is stated in the paragraph of the letter which I read.

Mr. ELLENDER. I propose to discuss with the Senate a little later the provisions of the general agreement dealing with the very subjects to which the Senator has referred. It makes it obligatory on the President when negotiating new agreements or changes in existing agreements to include the pertinent provisions now contained in GATT.

Mr. President, just before I was interrupted—

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

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. THYE. I thank the Senator for yielding to me. I realize that he yielded for more than a question. He permitted me to speak my real thoughts and convictions on the question.

Mr. ELLENDER. I was very glad to yield to my distinguished friend from Minnesota.

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

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I shall not get into a discussion with the distinguished Sen-