

To be first lieutenants

Francis H. Anderson, JAGC, O1695624.
Theodore M. Behrmann, DC, O984102.
Robert J. Carson, MC.
John F. Christianson, MC, O960853.
Henry C. Cosand, Jr., MC, O978339.
George W. Cullum, MC, O975731.
Richard A. Doane, DC, O965226.
Glen S. Gamble, DC, O728634.
John F. Goodman, Jr., JAGC, O377159.
Byron J. Greany, DC, O969128.
William K. Howard, MC, O980543.
Thomas H. Reese, JAGC, O465269.
Eric Reiss, MC, O954962.
Richard E. Swisher, DC, O975842.
Charles M. Thompson, JAGC, O975167.
Nathan E. Vanaman, DC, O981281.
Maurice B. Wehr, MC.
Robert H. West, DC, O966002.

To be second lieutenants

Joan D. Archer, ANC, N792912.
Allen C. Brown, WMSC, R2543.
Lucile R. Hord, WMSC, M2855.
Margaret C. McDonough, ANC, N792476.
Mary J. Olssen, ANC, N754136.
Catherine M. Owen, WMSC, M2858.
Jessy R. Powell, WMSC, R2458.
Carolyn I. Regan, WMSC, M2861.
Agnes Spock, ANC, N804320.
Jane R. Wiley, ANC, N804164.

The following-named persons for appointment in the Medical Corps, Regular Army of the United States in the grade of first lieutenant, under the provisions of section 506 of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947 (Public Law 381, 80th Cong.); subject to completion of internship, and subject to physical qualification:

Walter M. Anglin, O975957.
Norman L. Arnett, O975356.
Theodore M. Badgley, O975342.
Richard R. Beckworth, O2051045.
Irving Berke, O975956.
Nelson R. Blemly, O975841.
Gordon W. Briggs, O975762.
John P. Briske, O975343.
John E. Canham, O975579.
Elwyn Cavin, O425163.
James R. Collier, O975559.
Calvin C. Cranfield, Jr., O975687.
Forrest G. Dannenbring, O974384.
Robert F. Dillon, O975768.
Charles R. Downs, O975542.
Donald C. Fox, O975355.
Charles E. Gahagen, O975756.
Richard H. Garrett, O975688.
James J. Gibbs, O975095.
Robert F. Glock, O975569.
Maurice J. Gonder, O971846.
Richard E. Green, O975079.
James E. Hansen, O976165.
Frank W. Hardy, O975901.
Louis E. Harman, Jr., O969836.
Robert F. Hood, O975900.
Vincent H. S. Hume, O969837.
Thomas J. Hurley, O977071.
Donald J. Jacobson, O975691.
Arnold W. Johnson, Jr., O966511.
Robert C. Jones, O975570.
Robert R. Keim, Jr., O975560.
Louis W. King, Jr.
Robert J. King, O975C93.
Gene N. Lam, O975354.
Samuel G. Latty, O975838.
Arthur G. Law, O975366.
Wendell F. Lienhard, Jr., O975544.
Bruce L. Livingstone, O975073.
Joseph H. Masters, O975759.
Laurence C. McGonagle, O975069.
Travis H. Mueller, O975693.
Stanley Newman, O975758.
Bernard F. O'Hara, O975694.
Robert E. Parmenter, O975353.
Harvey W. Phelps, O975C95.
Douglas E. Price, O975707.
John E. Reisner, O975341.
Francis J. Rigney, O975582.
Victor R. Rivera, O975757.
Eugene A. Rosenberger, O975895.

Milton E. Rubini, O975760.
Robert B. Schmidt, O975765.
Gerald J. Schwab, O976502.
Vernon M. Smith, O975764.
Reuel A. Stallones, O975958.
Charles M. Struthers, O975358.
Robert L. Sundre, O975896.
Elias M. Throne, O975075.
Thorndike C. Toops.
Joseph N. Tori, O976839.
Darl E. Vander Ploeg, O974387.
Walter Wartonick, O976194.
Charles H. P. Westfall, O976503.
Charles F. Wilkins, Jr., O2040984.
George S. Woodard, Jr., O975549.
Ray E. Yarbrough, O965993.

The following-named persons for appointment in the Regular Army of the United States, in the grade of second lieutenant, under the provisions of section 506 of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947 (Public Law 381, 80th Cong.), subject to physical qualification:

Milton Allen, O945726.
Fred M. Bristol, O520729.
Calvin W. Ellis, O955560.
John G. Engstrom, O1688760.
James A. Lillard, O1913282.
Herbert F. Neller, Jr., O948274.
Stanley I. Pilgrim, O979817.
Wyatt G. Price.
Ben L. Sanders, O542938.
Clifford H. V. Turner.
Kenneth S. Whittemore, Jr., O446101.

The following-named distinguished military students for appointment in the Regular Army of the United States in the grade of second lieutenant, under the provisions of section 506 of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947 (Public Law 381, 80th Cong.), subject to designation as distinguished military graduates, and subject to physical qualification:

Charles L. Anderson.
William S. Bice.
William M. Bradley.
George T. Burnop, O978761.
Henry C. Camp, Jr.
William G. Clemons.
William E. Dasch.
David W. Einsel, Jr.
David C. Fariss.
Ernest G. Grenier.
Richard P. Jameson.
Vance S. Jennings, O954108.
James H. Johnson.
Ben S. Malcom.
Kenneth A. Marden.
John L. McKinzey, O955388.
Richard V. Murphy.
Robert L. Peck III, O2204559.
Joseph B. Starker.
David P. Vielhaber.
Richard L. Walton.
Kenneth J. Williams, O954522.
George S. Woodson.
Doyle B. Wright.

The following-named distinguished military student for appointment in the Medical Service Corps, Regular Army of the United States, in the grade of second lieutenant, under the provisions of section 506 of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947 (Public Law 381, 80th Cong.), subject to designation as a distinguished military graduate and subject to physical qualification:

Charles H. Meacham.

The following-named graduated cadets, United States Military Academy, for appointment in the Regular Army of the United States in the grade of second lieutenant, to rank from June 2, 1950, under the provisions of section 506 of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947 (Public Law 381, 80th Cong.):

Ernest Thomas Hayes, Jr.
Richard Louis Kramer.
Charles Rufus Smith, Jr.

CONFIRMATION

Executive nomination confirmed by the Senate, June 22 (legislative day of June 7), 1950:

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Kenneth W. Spencer, to be a member of the Public Utilities Commission of the District of Columbia for a term of 3 years from July 1, 1950.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

THURSDAY, JUNE 22, 1950

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

Rev. Frank Dent, formerly pastor of the First Methodist Church of Galveston, now pastor of Oak Lawn Methodist Church, of Dallas, Tex., offered the following prayer:

Eternal God of our fathers, Thou hast said, "When thou prayest go into thy secret place and thy Father who seest in secret will reward thee openly."

These are days when our American people, our American officials, and leaders need the power of the secret place. Each of us has prayed before we came here this day, so we desire to fill the glory of the public with the beauty of the private devotion. We are not the first to seek to harmonize the beauty of the private and the glory of the public. Men of old have sought to bring into harmony the ideals which they feel within their hearts, with their desire to serve the public interests. One has expressed it in this way:

"The earth is the Lord's and the fulness thereof; the world, and they that dwell therein.

"For He hath founded it upon the seas and established it upon the floods.

"Who shall ascend into the hill of the Lord? or who shall stand in His holy place?

"He that hath clean hands and a pure heart; who hath not lifted up his soul unto vanity nor sworn deceitfully.

"He shall receive the blessing from the Lord and righteousness from the God of his salvation."

So, our Father, today, that we may bring the beauty of the private into the glory of the public, we pray that we may have clean hands and a pure heart.

It is easy for us to see impure hands. We can look across the sea and say, "Your hands are stained. They are dirty. They are filled with the blood of men." We can even look at the other end of Pennsylvania Avenue and say something about hands, or we might even look across the aisle and accuse our colleagues. Yet, even as we say this, our Father, we know that the only hands we are responsible for are the two that hang from our own shoulders, and the only heart that we are responsible for is the one that really and truly beats underneath our own shoulder.

So, give unto us this purity and cleanliness within our own private life that we may bring out that beauty, that hope, that harmony in the glory of our public living and service.

Bless these men who represent their people and the people whom they represent. Lead us through these days through which we go, that we may climb this hill and bring peace, and may others desire to follow with us.

So fill our public service with the power and strength that comes from the secret place.

In Jesus' name we pray. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries, who also informed the House that on June 21, 1950, the President approved and signed bills of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 2386. An act to provide for the establishment and operation of a rare and precious metals experiment station at Reno, Nev.;

H. R. 3675. An act for the relief of Erik H. Lindman; and

H. R. 5920. An act to provide for payment of amounts due mentally incompetent personnel of the Army, Navy, Air Force, Marine Corps, Coast Guard, Coast and Geodetic Survey, and Public Health Service.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Carrell, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment a joint resolution of the House of the following title:

H. J. Res. 480. Joint resolution extending the time for the release, free of estate and gift tax, of certain powers.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the amendments of the House to a bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 2335. An act to make certain revisions in titles I and III of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947, as amended.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to 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. 1243) entitled "An act to amend the Hatch Act."

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 3181) entitled "An act to extend for 1 year the Housing and Rent Act of 1947, as amended."

TRANSFER OF CERTAIN REAL PROPERTY BY THE DEFENSE ESTABLISHMENT

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 5368) to authorize the Department of the Army, Navy, and the Air Force to participate in the transfer of certain real property and/or interest therein, with Senate amendments thereto, disagree to the amendments of the Senate, and ask for a conference.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none, and appoints the following

conferees: Messrs. VINSON, BROOKS, KILDAY, SHORT, and ARENS.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

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

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

There was no objection.

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

SEX CRIMINALS

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. DAVENPORT. Mr. Speaker, on April 4 of this year I introduced a bill, H. R. 7994, whose purpose was to make available to local police authorities the past records of sex criminals who had traveled in interstate commerce. In this way, local police officials will be able to maintain adequate surveillance over known criminals within their jurisdiction. In addition, H. R. 7994 makes it necessary for sex criminals who move from one State to another to register with the United States attorney's office and brings the full force of Federal law to bear on those who repeat their sex crimes in other States.

While I believe that H. R. 7994 is an absolute necessity today because of the growing tendency of sex criminals to move among the various States in order to avoid detection, I believe that a full-scale investigation of the entire problem of sex crimes is in order.

FBI tally sheets show that this type of crime is becoming a greater menace yearly. It must be stopped before it assumes terrible proportions. American mothers and our children are too dear to us to permit the continuation of the current depravities. These heinous crimes must be reduced as far as is humanly possible if our womenfolk and our children are to walk through our parks and our streets in safety.

I have, therefore, introduced a House resolution today to create a select committee of five Members of the House of Representatives to conduct a full investigation and study of the cause of sex crimes and to make such recommendations to Congress as it deems advisable. This committee will hold hearings throughout the country, covering as many localities as it can where such atrocities are a public menace. It will cooperate with the police officials and the political authorities in the various States in order to amass as complete a body of information as it can. And when it makes its report to Congress, we will have available a realistic over-all program to cope with this problem. We have no time to lose. We must act now.

YOUTHFUL AMERICANS VISIT NATION'S CAPITAL

Mr. MACK of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the

House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks and include the names of certain visiting school children.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MACK of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I am honored today by having as my guests in Washington 100 of the most deserving young men and women from the Twenty-first Congressional District of Illinois. These young people were recommended by their teachers, principals, and county superintendents of schools and were selected by nonpartisan committees who feel that these children are the most deserving children in the various counties of my district to make this educational tour to Washington. I am proud of the children they have selected and I am proud to have these children as my guests in Washington. They are today the youth of our Nation, but tomorrow they will be the ones who are called upon to guide the destiny of our country. The names of these outstanding Americans follow:

LIST OF CHILDREN ON MACK EDUCATIONAL TOUR BY COUNTIES

Sangamon: George Muller, Elsie Pavletich, John Norris, Charles Starling, Thomas Hoffman, Robert Dougherty, John Kelly, Ralph Klein, James Lard, Freda Spangler, Thelma Sebring, Barbara Silvens, William Bercot, Doris Motley, Nancy Ann Carter, Marie Weller, Arthur Fliege, Thomas Wilson, Dorothy Brummett, Jane Morgan, Phillip Pinney, George Bales, Arline Janoff, James McCabe, Earl Ellason, John Gatschenberger, Donald Snodgrass, Charles O'Hara, Charles Shymanski, Jr., Rita Hogarth, John Wolf, Olive Cooke, John Teer, Barbara Parks, Mary Louise Schmidt, Eleanor Rimini, Kenneth L. McGeath, Harry McLaughlin, Henry Harmony, Ronald Robison, Ronald D. Kane, Richard Jacobs, Ronald Hasten, Robert Brown, Earl Suggs, Darla Rudolph, Robert Dougherty.

Macoupin: Lois Eades, Charles Baker, Freddie Garst, Walter McKenzie, Earnest Richardson, Jimmy Kuenneth, Eugene Saatkamp, Angelina Markulakis, Marlene Johnson, Wilma Sauerwein, Anna Farmer, Sheridan Carroll, Ronald Lahey, Mary Kalvin, Jack Lehman, Geraldine Koniak.

Montgomery: Mildred Meffert, John Savage, Barbara Ann Hanisko, Rollie L. Henry, Richard Rompasky, Richard Bailey, Walter Weerts, Isabelle Barry, Wilda Mae Hill, Thomas Moroney, Barbara Sanders, Patricia McClaine.

Christian: Robert Cole, Aniti Credi, Howard Wise, Arthur Carter, Barbara Jean Sebaskey, Camille Beloit, William Hayes, James Duncan, William Southard, Donald Pembroke, Mildred Foster, Evelyn Pugh.

Mason: Franklin Gilmore, Yvonne Simpson, Ronnie Woll, Shirley Nall, James Fletcher.

Bond: Jesse Darnell, Carolyn Granda, Wayne Long, Thomas Frey, Max Lee Perch. Menard: Van Monroe Miller, Jimmie Elmore, Hank Abbott, Bob Dixon.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks and include certain material from the State Department.

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

There was no objection.

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

OIL IMPORT PROGRAM

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, over a period of many months the question of imported petroleum has been studied by committees in both branches of Congress. The inquiries have been exhaustive and they have served to develop all the facts needed to establish a policy on which the petroleum industry of the United States could depend.

My concern is that something be done. We need no more studies as a basis for action. I have watched the development of the greatest oil importing program in history with apprehension. No one who remembers the great and successful effort made by the petroleum industry to supply the oil needs during the war can fail to appreciate the vital necessity of maintaining the oil industry of the United States at top efficiency. The Nation's security is one issue that we cannot afford to ignore. Imports of petroleum are a threat to security.

Hearings have been held by three committees and subcommittees in this branch of Congress this year. The record that was developed was clear and conclusive. The independent oil producers and refiners have been hurt. Their markets have been narrowed by imports. Producers have produced and sold less oil in our own markets. Refiners have shut down in many instances and they have curtailed their runs of crude oil. The ability of the industry to explore for and develop new fields has been shrinking. State governments are losing tax revenues. Employment has decreased. Several thousand field and refinery workers have been made idle.

Independents in the oil industry three or more years ago tried to get executive or legislative action to prevent the injury that has come to pass. The coal and railroad industries have in recent weeks been before committees to tell of their unemployment due to foreign oil. Others will inevitably follow unless action is taken.

A remedy is in the hands of the executive branch of the Government. It has repeatedly been importuned by Members of Congress as well as by the independent petroleum industry and others to make use of the authority which it reserved in the trade agreements with countries where oil is produced. The executive branch has made no move to curb the increasing imports of oil. In fact, the principal spokesmen on the subject in the State Department and the Department of Commerce have been loud in their assertions that no action should be taken by the executive department and they have used every opportunity to engage in propaganda against action by Congress. The great corporations which produce and import

the oil from Venezuela and the Middle East have no more devoted allies than those in the two departments mentioned. Those who are styled petroleum specialists in those agencies adopt fully and give expression to all the arguments which the oil importers themselves advance.

Long ago—in 1932—Congress expressed its preference for the oil industry of the United States as against that of foreign countries. It did this in the form of an excise tax on imported crude petroleum and refined products. In 1939 the executive department began to whittle away at the tax schedule. Under various trade agreements it has cut the schedule in half. The rate is now one-fourth of a cent per gallon on crude oil and fuel oil, which are today the principal forms of petroleum imports. Such a rate constitutes no barrier whatever to the importing program.

The volume of imports has risen steadily. In the year 1946, the first full year after the end of the war, the daily average of imports was 377,000 barrels. In 1947 it was 436,000 barrels. In 1948 it was 514,000 barrels. In 1949 it was 641,000 and in the first quarter of this year the average was 820,000 barrels a day. Thus, the present rate is more than double the 1946 daily average.

The figures on the volume do not alone tell the story, for we had a substantial gain in consumption since the close of the war. But in percentage of total supply imports of oil have consistently occupied a larger place. In 1946 imports were 6.9 percent of the total supply in the United States. In the first quarter of this year they absorbed 13.1 percent of the supply.

The export market for our petroleum is fading fast. In 1946 it required 419,000 barrels daily. In the first quarter of 1950 the exports of crude oil and products were 265,000 barrels daily. Foreign markets are being filled with foreign production by substantially the same group of large corporations which are bringing the oil into the United States.

Are we to stand by and see the home markets as well as the export increasingly taken up by foreign oil?

The record is clear and unmistakable. The American consumer's greatest assurance of abundant supply lies in the maintenance of a vigorous, competitive industry. To continue with its historical effectiveness, the domestic industry must have a market for the oil it finds and develops. It must rely for the preservation of its home market on either the National Government or the importing companies. The record shows that voluntary restraint has not been practiced and their announced programs call for a much higher rate of imports for 1950 than in 1949, and announced programs can be changed without notice or consent.

There are bills in both branches of Congress to provide workable and dependable restraints on the imports of petroleum. It is my concern that we do something in this session. If we do not, we will find the trouble has increased and the present storm which petroleum imports have raised will have become a tornado.

FORMOSA

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, if we can believe the press reports of yesterday the defense arms of Government are now coming to the conclusion at a very late hour that Formosa is an extremely important piece of land in the world insofar as the defense of the United States is concerned. In my opinion the State Department, the Army, and the Navy had sufficient information as early as last October to know exactly what General MacArthur and his staff thought about that proposition, and at that time we should have taken all steps to protect Formosa the same as any section of the United States. As a matter of fact, and for our defense, we should not have surrendered control over Formosa until the Japanese peace treaty was signed. Certainly this is no time to turn Japan over to the Russian bear, unless we wish to commit suicide.

MILK

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. HESELTON. Mr. Speaker, 1,150,175,142 quarts of fluid milk could have been made from the dried milk held by the Federal Government in storage April 30, 1950.

More than 67 percent of that was purchased last year.

It cost the taxpayers \$3,717,096.60 up to April 30 just to keep these more than 157,000 tons of a wholesome food commodity in storage.

It costs eighty-seven one-thousandths of a cent to transport 1 pound of dried milk from Manawa, Wis., to New York City.

The Federal Government could have used this wasted storage money to pay the freight on all this milk to places where people would drink it. Beyond that, more than \$800,000 would still have been saved.

It is obvious now that those who have the power to bring about an immediate end to this insane situation have no intention of doing so. But they cannot escape the responsibility for their inexcusable and defiant continuing waste of the taxpayers' money. From July 1, 1949, to April 30, 1950, on dried milk alone the daily waste was \$12,227.32. On April 30, 1950, the Government had firm contracts to purchase an additional 27,656,941 pounds. Therefore the daily waste for storage alone must be over \$13,000 a day now.

It is equally obvious that, unless something is done promptly, this food will spoil. Apparently those who have the clear power to prevent this hold in utter contempt the reaction of the American public to such wanton destruction of

wholesome food. But, if the truth can be made clear to the public, I am convinced that its indignation will be swift and certain.

COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Ways and Means may have until midnight of Friday, June 23, to file its report on H. R. 8920, the tax bill, and that anyone desiring to file minority views may have the same time.

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

There was no objection.

ANNUITANTS RETIRED UNDER CIVIL SERVICE RETIREMENT ACT

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee submitted a conference report and statement on the bill (H. R. 4295) to provide certain benefits for annuitants who retired under the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, prior to April 1, 1948.

MEAT INSPECTION

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MCCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, I wish to call the attention of the House to another one of the very harmful effects of the so-called Taber amendment to the appropriation bill. This situation has been well described by an article by Alfred D. Stedman, the agricultural editor of the St. Paul Pioneer Press. He says that the biggest set-back in 46 years of fighting for pure food and public health is threatened by this House slash. Some 346 meat inspectors throughout the country will have to be dismissed as a result of this curtailment in the appropriation bill.

I think the contradiction is apparent when just this week we authorized the appointment of a committee to investigate chemical poisons or potential poisons in food, but at the same time are cutting appropriations to eliminate meat inspectors who are looking for causes of diseases which we know to exist.

I hope that the Senate will reconsider this arbitrary, unsound House action and provide adequate funds for the support of the meat-inspection program. I have included the full text of the Stedman article in the Appendix of the RECORD.

CLAIM OF AUF DER HEIDE-ARAGONA, INC.

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 1606) conferring jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims to hear and determine the claim of Auf der Heide-Aragona, Inc., and certain of its subcontractors against the United States, with a Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment as follows:

Page 1, line 9, strike out all after "Maryland" over to and including "expense" in

line 19, page 2, and insert " : *Provided, however*, That nothing contained in this act shall be construed as an inference of liability on the part of the United States Government."

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

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ANNUAL REPORT, OFFICE OF ALIEN PROPERTY—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read, and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

I transmit herewith for the information of the Congress the Annual Report of the Office of Alien Property, Department of Justice, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1949.

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

THE WHITE HOUSE, June 22, 1950.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an article, notwithstanding the fact that it is estimated by the Public Printer to cost \$218.68.

Mr. FLOOD asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in two instances, in one to include an editorial from the Havana Post, and in the other a statement supporting a resolution he introduced calling for a survey of the occupation of Japan.

Mr. HART asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include a resolution.

Mr. LANE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in three instances, in one to include a speech of his and in the others extraneous matter.

Mr. MACK of Illinois asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an address of Gov. Adlai E. Stevenson, notwithstanding the fact it is estimated by the Public Printer to cost \$273.34.

Mr. PHILBIN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include a newspaper article.

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

Mr. KLEIN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in five instances and include extraneous matter.

Mr. CLEMENTE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an article by Gen. Wendell Westover, notwithstanding the fact it is estimated by the Public Printer to cost \$191.34.

Mr. CROOK asked and was given permission to extend his remarks on the topic, Destruction on Our American Highways.

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

Mr. GRANT asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an address recently delivered by General Vandenberg.

Mr. MULTER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in three instances and include extraneous matter.

Mr. LEFEVRE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an editorial appearing in the New York Times.

Mr. JONAS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an address delivered by Brig. Gen. Julius Klein commemorating the fifty-fifth anniversary of the Jewish War Veterans of the United States.

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an address delivered by Mr. James S. Schramm.

Mr. CRAWFORD asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an editorial.

Mr. GROSS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks.

Mr. MACK of Washington and Mr. ASPINALL asked and were given permission to extend their remarks and include extraneous material.

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

Mr. WIER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an excerpt from a Minneapolis labor paper.

Mr. TAURIELLO asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in two instances and include in one an address by Hon. James A. Farley and in the other a letter he received from the American Zionist Council.

Mr. CANFIELD asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include two letters.

UNITED STATES PARTICIPATION IN INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS

The SPEAKER. The unfinished business is the question on the engrossment and third reading of House Joint Resolution 334, to amend certain laws providing for membership and participation by the United States in certain international organizations.

The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the joint resolution.

The joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the joint resolution.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were refused.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. RICH and Mr. BROWN of Ohio) there were—ayes 87, noes 29.

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—yeas 209, nays 91, not voting 130, as follows:

[Roll No. 180]

YEAS—209

Abbitt	Flood	Multer
Addonizio	Forand	Murdoch
Albert	Fugate	Murphy
Allen, Calif.	Fulton	Murray, Tenn.
Allen, La.	Furcolo	Nelson
Andrews	Garmatz	Nixon
Angell	Gathings	Noland
Aspinall	Gordon	Norrell
Bailey	Gossett	Norton
Barden	Grant	O'Brien, Ill.
Bates, Mass.	Gregory	O'Hara, Ill.
Beckworth	Gullit	O'Neill
Bentsen	Hale	O'Sullivan
Biemiller	Hardy	O'Toole
Blatnik	Harris	Face
Boggs, La.	Harrison	Passman
Bolling	Hart	Patman
Bolton, Ohio	Havener	Patten
Bonner	Hays, Ark.	Peterson
Bosone	Hays, Ohio	Philbin
Bramblett	Hedrick	Pickett
Brown, Ga.	Herter	Poage
Buchanan	Heseltun	Poulson
Buckley, Ill.	Holfield	Preston
Burleson	Holmes	Price
Burnside	Howell	Priest
Burton	Huber	Rains
Byrne, N. Y.	Jackson, Calif.	Ramsay
Camp	Jacobs	Rhodes
Canfield	Javits	Riehlman
Carlyle	Johnson	Robeson
Carnahan	Jones, Ala.	Rodino
Case, N. J.	Jones, Mo.	Rogers, Fla.
Celler	Jones, N. C.	Rogers, Mass.
Chatham	Judd	Rooney
Chelf	Karst	Roosevelt
Chesney	Karsten	Sasser
Chiperfield	Kean	Shelley
Christopher	Kee	Sheppard
Clemente	Kilburn	Sikes
Combs	Kilday	Smathers
Cooley	King	Spence
Cooper	Kirwan	Staggers
Corbett	Klein	Stanley
Crook	Kruse	Sullivan
Crosser	Lane	Tauriello
Dague	Lanham	Thomas
Davenport	Larcade	Thompson
Davies, N. Y.	Lind	Thornberry
Davis, Ga.	Linehan	Tollefson
Davis, Tenn.	Lucas	Trimble
Dawson	McCarthy	Underwood
Deane	McCormack	Van Zandt
DeGraffenried	McDonough	Vorys
Denton	McGrath	Wagner
Dollinger	McGuire	Walter
Donohue	McKinnon	Whitaker
Doughton	McSweeney	White, Idaho
Douglas	Mack, Ill.	Widnall
Doyle	Madden	Wier
Eaton	Magee	Wigglesworth
Elliott	Mahon	Willis
Ellsworth	Mansfield	Wilson, Okla.
Engle, Calif.	Marcantonio	Wilson, Tex.
Evin	Marsalis	Woodhouse
Fallon	Martin, Mass.	Yates
Feighan	Miles	Young
Fenton	Mills	Zablocki
Fernandez	Morgan	
Fisher		

NAYS—91

Abernethy	Elston	Kearney
Allen, Ill.	Fellows	Keating
Andersen,	Ford	Kunkel
H. Carl	Gavin	Latham
Anderson, Calif.	Golden	LeCompte
Arends	Graham	LeFevre
Barrett, Wyo.	Gross	Lichtenwalter
Bennett, Fla.	Hagen	McCulloch
Bennett, Mich.	Hall	McMillen, Ill.
Bishop	Leonard W.	Mack, Wash.
Boggs, Del.	Halleck	Martin, Iowa
Brown, Ohio	Harden	Mason
Byrnes, Wis.	Harvey	Meyer
Case, S. Dak.	Hill	Michener
Clevenger	Hoeven	Miller, Nebr.
Cole, Kans.	Hoffman, Mich.	Murray, Wis.
Colmer	Horan	Nicholson
Crawford	Hull	Norblad
Cunningham	Jenison	O'Hara, Minn.
Curtis	Jenkins	O'Konski
Davis, Wis.	Jennings	Phillips, Calif.
D'Ewart	Jensen	Rankin
Dondero	Jonas	Reed, Ill.

Reed, N. Y.
Rees
Rich
Scrivner
Scudder
Secret
Short
Simpson, Ill.

Simpson, Pa.
Smith, Kans.
Smith, Wis.
Stefan
Taber
Tackett
Taile
Veide

Vursell
Weichel
Whitten
Williams
Winstead
Withrow
Wolcott
Woodruff

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. Eberharter 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. Mr. Speaker, I will try to explain this new program which is to

NOT VOTING—130

Andresen,	Gwinn	Pfeiffer,
August H.	Hall,	William L.
Auchincloss	Edwin Arthur	Phillips, Tenn.
Baring	Hand	Plumley
Barrett, Pa.	Hare	Polk
Bates, Ky.	Hébert	Potter
Battle	Heffernan	Powell
Beall	Heller	Quinn
Blackney	Herlong	Rabaut
Bolton, Md.	Hinshaw	Redden
Boykin	Hobbs	Regan
Breen	Hoffman, Ill.	Ribicoff
Brehm	Hope	Richards
Brooks	Irving	Rivers
Bryson	Jackson, Wash.	Sabath
Buckley, N. Y.	James	Sadlak
Bulwinkle	Kearns	Sadowski
Burdick	Keefe	St. George
Burke	Kelley, Pa.	Sanborn
Cannon	Kelly, N. Y.	Saylor
Carroll	Kennedy	Scott, Hardie
Cavalcante	Keogh	Scott,
Chudoff	Kerr	Hugh D., Jr.
Cole, N. Y.	Lodge	Shafer
Cotton	Lovre	Sims
Coudert	Lyle	Smith, Ohio
Cox	Lynch	Smith, Va.
Delaney	McGregor	Steed
Dingell	McMillan, S. C.	Stigler
Dolliver	Macy	Stockman
Durham	Marshall	Sutton
Eberharter	Morrow	Taylor
Engel, Mich.	Miller, Calif.	Teague
Fogarty	Miller, Md.	Towe
Frazier	Mitchell	Wadsworth
Gamble	Monroney	Walsh
Gary	Morris	Welch
Gillette	Morrison	Werdel
Gilmer	Morton	Wheeler
Goodwin	Moulder	White, Calif.
Gore	O'Brien, Mich.	Whittington
Gorski	Patterson	Wickersham
Granahan	Perkins	Wilson, Ind.
Granger	Pfeifer,	Wolverton
	Joseph L.	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 Mrs. St. George.
Mr. Lynch with Mr. Morrow.
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. Werdel.
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. Pfeifer with Mr. Towe.
Mrs. Kelly of New York with Mr. Taylor.
Mr. Jackson of Washington with Mr. 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.

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. LODGE].

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 Communists 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 ser-

geants 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 Lodge 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 fail 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 Congress 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. VOYLES, Ohio; CHARLES W. VORSELL, 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. 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 Penn-

sylvania 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 admis-

sion 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 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 had much of the time to myself. The idea is Americanism 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 us 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 am 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 legisla-

tion. 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

Abbt	Cooley	Halleck
Addonizio	Cooper	Harden
Albert	Corbett	Hardy
Allen, Calif.	Crawford	Harrison
Andersen,	Crook	Hart
H. Carl	Crosser	Harvey
Andrews	Cunningham	Havener
Arends	Curtis	Hays, Ark.
Aspinall	Dague	Hedrick
Bailey	Davenport	Hertel
Barden	Davis, N. Y.	Heselton
Baring	Davis, Tenn.	Hoffman, Mich.
Bates, Mass.	Deane	Holfield
Battle	Delaney	Holmes
Beckworth	Denton	Howell
Bennett, Fla.	Dollinger	Huber
Bennett, Mich.	Donohue	Jackson, Calif.
Bentsen	Douglas	Jacobs
Biemiller	Doyle	Javits
Blatnik	Eaton	Jonson
Boggs, La.	Eberharter	Jennings
Bolling	Elliott	Jensen
Bonner	Ellsworth	Johnson
Bosone	Elston	Jones, Ala.
Bramblett	Engle, Calif.	Jones, Mo.
Brown, Ga.	Evins	Jones, N. C.
Brown, Ohio	Feighan	Judd
Buchanan	Fellows	Karst
Buckley, Ill.	Fenton	Karsten
Burleson	Fernandez	Keating
Burnside	Fisher	Kee
Burton	Flood	Kilburn
Byrne, N. Y.	Forand	Kilday
Eyrnes, Wis.	Ford	King
Camp	Fugate	Kirwan
Canfield	Fulton	Klein
Cannon	Furcolo	Kunkel
Carnahan	Garmatz	Lane
Carroll	Gavin	Lanham
Case, N. J.	Goodwin	Latham
Case, S. Dak.	Gordon	LeCompte
Celler	Gorski	LeFevre
Chatham	Graham	Lind
Chelf	Grant	Linehan
Chesney	Gregory	Lucas
Christopher	Gull	McCarthy
Clemente	Hagen	McConnell
Clevenger	Hale	McCormack
Colmer	Hall,	McCulloch
Combs	Leonard W.	McDonough

McGrath	O'Sullivan
McGuire	Patten
McKinnon	Peterson
Mack, Wash.	Philbin
Madden	Phillips, Calif.
Magee	Poulson
Marsalis	Preston
Martin, Iowa	Price
Martin, Mass.	Priest
Meyer	Ramsay
Michener	Rhodes
Miles	Riehlman
Miller, Nebr.	Robeson
Mills	Rodino
Morgan	Rogers, Mass.
Multer	Rooney
Murdock	Roosevelt
Murphy	Sasser
Murray, Tenn.	Scudder
Nelson	Sheppard
Nixon	Short
Noland	Sikes
Norblad	Simpson, Ill.
Norton	Smathers
O'Brien, Ill.	Spence
O'Hara, Ill.	Staggers
O'Konski	Stanley
O'Neill	Stefan

NAYS—61

Abernethy	Hull
Allen, Ill.	Jonas
Allen, La.	Kean
Angell	Kearney
Barrett, Wyo.	Kruse
Bishop	Larcade
Bolton, Ohio	McMillen, Ill.
Carlyle	Mahon
Cole, Kans.	Mansfield
Davis, Ga.	Marcantonio
Davis, Wis.	Mason
D'Ewart	Murray, Wis.
Dondero	Nicholson
Gathings	Norrell
Golden	O'Hara, Minn.
Gossett	O'Toole
Gross	Passman
Harris	Patman
Hays, Ohio	Pickett
Hill	Poage
Hoeven	Rains

Sullivan	Taber
Talle	Taurello
Thomas	Thomas
Thompson	Thornberry
Trimble	Tollefson
Underwood	Trimble
Van Zandt	Underwood
Vinson	Van Zandt
Vorys	Vinson
Wagner	Vorys
Walter	Wagner
Weichel	Walter
Whitaker	Weichel
Widnall	Whitaker
Wier	Widnall
Wigglesworth	Wier
Wilson, Okla.	Wigglesworth
Withrow	Wilson, Okla.
Wolcott	Withrow
Woodhouse	Wolcott
Woodruff	Woodhouse
Yates	Woodruff
Young	Yates
Zablocki	Young

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

NOT VOTING—137

Anderson, Calif.	Hébert	Plumley
Andresen,	Heffernan	Polk
August H.	Heller	Potter
Auchincloss	Herlong	Powell
Barrett, Pa.	Hinshaw	Quinn
Bates, Ky.	Hobbs	Rabaut
Beall	Hoffman, Ill.	Redden
Blackney	Hope	Regan
Boggs, Del.	Horan	Ribicoff
Bolton, Md.	Irving	Richards
Boykin	Jackson, Wash.	Rivers
Breen	James	Sabath
Brehm	Jenkins	Sadiak
Brooks	Kearns	Sadowski
Bryson	Keefe	St. George
Buckley, N. Y.	Kelley, Pa.	Sanborn
Bulwinkle	Kelly, N. Y.	Saylor
Burdick	Kennedy	Scott, Hardie
Burke	Keogh	Scott,
Cavalante	Kerr	Hugh D., Jr.
Chiperfield	Lichtenwalter	Shafer
Chudoff	Lodge	Shelley
Cole, N. Y.	Lovre	Simpson, Pa.
Cotton	Lyle	Sims
Coudert	Lynch	Smith, Ohio
Cox	McGregor	Smith, Va.
Dawson	McMillan, S. C.	Steed
DeGraffenried	McSweeney	Stigler
Dingell	Mack, Ill.	Stockman
Dolliver	Macy	Sutton
Doughton	Marshall	Taylor
Durham	Merrow	Towe
Engel, Mich.	Miller, Calif.	Wadsworth
Fallon	Miller, Md.	Walsh
Fogarty	Mitchell	Welch
Frazier	Monroney	Werdel
Gamble	Morris	Wheeler
Gary	Morrison	White, Calif.
Gillette	Morton	White, Idaho
Gilmer	Moulder	Whittington
Gore	O'Brien, Mich.	Wickersham
Granahan	Pace	Wilson, Ind.
Granger	Patterson	Wolverton
Green	Perkins	Wood
Gwinn	Pfeifer,	
Hall,	Joseph L.	
Edwin Arthur	Pfeifer,	
Hand	William L.	
Hare	Phillips, Tenn.	

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.
 Mr. Redden with Mr. Miller of Maryland.
 Mr. Mitchell with Mr. Lichtenwalter.
 Mr. Rabaut with Mr. McGregor.
 Mr. Cavalante 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. Sadiak.
 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. Pfeifer 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.

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 under-

standing 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 immedi-

ately. 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. KILDAY] 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 repug-

nant 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 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 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 grant-

ed 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. SHORT. 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 predicated 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 information 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 of not to exceed 10,000 qualified unmarried aliens (without dependents as defined in sec. 4 of the act of June 16, 1942 (56 Stat. 361), 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—yeas 201, nays 84, not voting 145, as follows:

[Roll No. 182]

YEAS—201

Abbitt	Fallon	McDonough
Addonizio	Feighan	McGrath
Albert	Fellows	McKinnon
Allen, Calif.	Fenton	McSweeney
Anderson, Calif.	Fernandez	Mack, Wash.
Arends	Flood	Madden
Aspinall	Forand	Magee
Bailey	Ford	Marsalis
Baring	Fugate	Martin, Iowa
Bates, Mass.	Fulton	Meyer
Beckworth	Furcolo	Michener
Bennett, Fla.	Garmatz	Miller, Nebr.
Bentzen	Gavin	Mills
Biemiller	Goodwin	Morgan
Boggs, La.	Gordon	Multer
Bolling	Gorski	Murdock
Bonner	Graham	Murphy
Bosone	Gull	Nelson
Boykin	Hall	Nixon
Bramblett	Leonard W.	Noland
Brown, Ga.	Halleck	Norblad
Brown, Ohio	Harden	Norton
Buchanan	Hardy	O'Brien, Ill.
Buckley, Ill.	Harrison	O'Konski
Burnside	Havener	O'Neill
Burton	Hays, Ark.	O'Sullivan
Byrne, N. Y.	Hedrick	Peterson
Byrnes, Wis.	Heselton	Philbin
Camp	Hollifield	Phillips, Calif.
Canfield	Holmes	Poulson
Cannon	Howell	Preston
Carnahan	Huber	Price
Case, N. J.	Jackson, Calif.	Priest
Case, S. Dak.	Jacobs	Ramsay
Celler	Javits	Rhodes
Christopher	Jenkins	Riehlman
Clemente	Jennings	Robeson
Colmer	Jensen	Rodino
Combs	Johnson	Rogers, Mass.
Cooley	Jones, Ala.	Roosevelt
Cooper	Jones, Mo.	Sasser
Corbett	Judd	Scudder
Crawford	Karst	Shelley
Crook	Karsten	Sheppard
Crosser	Kearney	Short
Cunningham	Keating	Sikes
Curtis	Kee	Simpson, Ill.
Dague	Kilburn	Smathers
Davenport	Kilday	Staggers
Davies, N. Y.	King	Stanley
Davis, Tenn.	Kirwan	Stefan
Dawson	Klein	Sullivan
DeGraffenried	Kunkel	Taber
Denton	Lane	Talle
Dollinger	Lanham	Tauriello
Dondero	LeCompte	Thomas
Donohue	LeFevre	Thompson
Doughton	Lind	Thornberry
Doyle	Linehan	Tollefson
Eaton	Lucas	Trimble
Elliott	McConnell	Underwood
Elston	McCormack	Van Zandt
Engle, Calif.	McCulloch	Vinson

Vorys
Wadsworth
Wagner
Walter
Weichel

Widnall
Wigglesworth
Wilson, Okla.
Withrow
Woicott

Woodruff
Young
Zablocki

NAYS—84

Abernethy
Allen, Ill.
Allen, La.
Andersen,
H. Carl
Andrews
Angell
Barden
Barrett, Wyo.
Battle
Bennett, Mich.
Bishop
Blatnik
Bolton, Ohio
Burlison
Carlyle
Carroll
Chelf
Chesney
Clevenger
Cole, Kans.
Davis, Ga.
Davis, Wis.
Deane
D'Ewart
Douglas
Ellsworth
Fisher
Gathings

Golden
Gossett
Grant
Gregory
Gross
Hagen
Harris
Hart
Harvey
Hays, Ohio
Hill
Hoeven
Hoffman, Mich.
Hull
Jenison
Jonas
Jones, N. C.
Kean
Kruse
Larcade
McCarthy
Mahon
Mansfield
Marcantonio
Murray, Tenn.
Murray, Wis.
Nicholson
Norrell
O'Hara, Ill.

O'Hara, Minn.
O'Toole
Passman
Patman
Patten
Pickett
Poage
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

NOT VOTING—145

Andresen,
August H.
Auchincloss
Barrett, Pa.
Bates, Ky.
Beali
Blackney
Boggs, Del.
Bolton, Md.
Broen
Brehm
Brooks
Bryson
Buckley, N. Y.
Bulwinkle
Burdick
Burke
Cavalcante
Chatham
Chiperfield
Chudoff
Cole, N. Y.
Cotton
Coudert
Cox
Delaney
Dingell
Dolliver
Durham
Eberharter
Engel, Mich.
Evens
Fogarty
Frazier
Gamble
Gary
Gillette
Gilmer
Gore
Granahan
Granger
Green
Gwinn
Hale
Hall,
Edwin Arthur
Hand
Hare
Hébert
Heffernan
Heller

Herlong
Herter
Hinsshaw
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.
Pfeifer,
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. McGuire for, with Mrs. Woodhouse against.

Mr. Mack of Illinois for, with Mr. Teague against.

Mr. Wolverton for, with Mr. Mason against.

Mr. Kearns for, with Mr. Macy against.

Mr. Herter for, with Mr. McMillen of Illinois against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Jackson of Washington with Mr. Keefe.

Mr. Rubicoff with Mr. Auchincloss.

Mr. Steed with Mr. Taylor.

Mr. Stigler with Mrs. St. George.

Mr. Regan with Mr. Gamble.

Mr. Miller of California with Mr. James.

Mr. Wickersham with Mr. Hinshaw.

Mr. Whittington with Mr. Gillette.

Mr. Redden with Mr. Stockman.

Mr. Wheeler with Mr. Simpson of Pennsylvania.

Mr. Mitchell with Mr. Gwinn.

Mr. Sutton with Mr. Hale.

Mr. Wood with Mr. Patterson.

Mr. Dingell with Mr. William L. Pfeiffer.

Mr. Barrett of Pennsylvania with Mr. Cole of New York.

Mr. Whitaker with Mr. Beall.

Mr. Green with Mr. August H. Andresen.

Mr. Perkins with Mr. Boggs of Delaware.

Mr. Joseph L. Pfeiffer with Mr. Latham.

Mr. Rabaut with Mr. McGregor.

Mr. Sabath with Mr. Werdel.

Mr. Evins with Mr. Wilson of Indiana.

Mr. Frazier with Mr. Shafer.

Mr. Hébert with Mr. Hardie Scott.

Mr. Keogh with Mr. Hugh D. Scott, Jr.

Mrs. Kelly of New York with Mr. Brehm.

Mr. Heller with Mr. Chiperfield.

Mr. Lynch with Mr. Cotton.

Mr. Heffernan with Mr. Engel of Michigan.

Mr. Delaney with Mr. Edwin Arthur Hall.

Mr. Kennedy with Mr. Hope.

Mr. O'Brien of Michigan with Mr. Sanborn.

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. THORNBERY 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

So the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Chatham for, with Mr. Whitten against.

Mr. Towe for, with Mr. Horan against.

Mr. Hand for, with Mr. Hoffman of Illinois against.

Mr. Lodge for, with Mr. Dolliver against.

Mr. Coudert for, with Mr. Smith of Ohio against.

Mr. Sadowski for, with Mr. Pace against.

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.

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. 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.

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

Mr. HALLECK. I yield.

Mr. HARRIS. I should like to ask the majority leader if under the circumstances that he has presented the rule is granted and the tax bill is considered on Tuesday and Wednesday and the vote should go over until Thursday, would the vote be the first order of business on Thursday?

Mr. McCORMACK. Exactly; the vote would be the first order of business on Thursday.

Mr. HALLECK. Then, I take it, unless something develops in the meantime, that the House would adjourn over until the following Monday.

Mr. McCORMACK. That is my intention, of course; that is always my intention, and the House has always cooperated where it could be carried out.

MONUMENT TO CONSTANTINO BRUMIDI

Mrs. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 5943) to provide for the erection of a monument on the grave of Constantino Brumidi, with Senate amendments, and concur in the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments, as follows:

Page 1, line 3, strike out "(a)."

Page 1, lines 4 and 5, strike out "accept on behalf of, and without cost to the United States, title to" and insert "install a bronze and stone monument at."

Page 1, line 10, after "Capitol" insert "":
Provided, That upon the installation of the monument the maintenance of the monument and perpetual care of the grave site shall be assumed by the trustees of Glenwood Cemetery, District of Columbia: *And provided further*, That the United States shall have no responsibility for the upkeep and care of the monument at the grave site."

Page 1, strike out all after line 10 over to and including line 4 on page 2.

Page 2, line 6, strike out "\$200 to carry out the purposes of this act" and insert "\$100 for the perpetual care and upkeep of the

monument and grave site by the trustees of Glenwood Cemetery, and the further sum of not to exceed \$400 for a suitable bronze and stone monument to mark the grave of the said Constantino Brumidi."

Amend the title so as to read: "An act to provide for the erection of a bronze and stone monument at the grave of Constantino Brumidi."

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

There was no objection.

The Senate amendments were concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

HONORARY DEGREE CONFERRED ON MRS. NORTON

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I seek recognition at this time—and the gentleman from New Jersey is not aware of the purpose for my doing so—to convey to my colleagues of the House information that I know will be pleasing to all of them.

We all have deep respect for the gentleman from New Jersey [Mrs. Norton] without regard to party. No matter what may be any Member's difference of opinion with her on legislation, there is profound respect for her because of her ability, her sincerity, and her courage.

I know the membership of the House will be pleased to learn that she received a great honor. The St. Bonaventure College, a great Catholic institution, recently conferred upon our colleague and friend, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mrs. Norton], the greatest honor any institution can confer upon anyone, an honorary degree, in her case the degree of LL.D., doctor of laws.

I know that in extending my congratulations I am extending the congratulations of all my colleagues to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mrs. Norton] on this additional honor she has received and which she so richly deserves.

JAMES S. ORR

Mrs. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I call up House Resolution 640 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That there shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House to James S. Orr, father of Reba M. Orr, late an employee of the House of Representatives, an amount equal to 6 months' salary at the rate she was receiving at the time of her death and an additional amount not to exceed \$350 toward defraying the funeral expenses of said Reba M. Orr.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MRS. DOROTHY W. UPTON

Mrs. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Admin-

istration, I call up House Resolution 642 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That there shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House to Mrs. Dorothy W. Upton, wife of Edward P. Upton, late an employee of the House of Representatives, an amount equal to 6 months' salary at the rate he was receiving at the time of his death and an additional amount not to exceed \$350 toward defraying the funeral expenses of said Edward P. Upton.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MRS. CATHERINE REGINA ANDREWS

Mrs. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I call up House Resolution 662 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That there shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House to Mrs. Catherine Regina Andrews, widow of John Andrews, late an employee of the House of Representatives, an amount equal to 6 months' salary at the rate he was receiving at the time of his death and an additional amount not to exceed \$350 toward defraying the funeral expenses of said John Andrews.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MRS. EDITH CHARON

Mrs. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I call up House Resolution 654 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That there shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House to Mrs. Edith Charon, wife of Jean E. Charon, late an employee of the House of Representatives, an amount equal to 6 months' salary at the rate he was receiving at the time of his death and an additional amount not to exceed \$350 toward defraying the funeral expenses of said Jean E. Charon.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CAMP JOSEPH T. ROBINSON

Mr. DEGRAFFENRIED. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 3783) authorizing the transfer of part of Camp Joseph T. Robinson to the State of Arkansas, with a Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Page 4, line 3, strike out all after "way" down to and including "property" in line 7.

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

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

TRANSPORTATION ON CANADIAN
VESSELS

Mr. HART. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (S. 3771) to provide transportation on Canadian vessels between Skagway, Alaska, and other points in Alaska, between Haines, Alaska, and other points in Alaska, and between Hyder, Alaska, and other points in Alaska or the continental United States, either directly or via a foreign port, or for any part of the transportation.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, what does this bill do?

Mr. HART. Mr. Speaker, that is fully explained in the title of the bill, which is "to provide transportation on Canadian vessels between Skagway, Alaska, and other points in Alaska, between Haines, Alaska, and other points in Alaska, and between Hyder, Alaska, and other points in Alaska or the continental United States, either directly or via a foreign port, or for any part of the transportation."

Under our general statutes this would be illegal, but permission has been granted to Canadian vessels which provide this service because American vessel service is not available.

This bill merely extends for an additional year the permission that has been given in prior years.

Mr. RICH. It would not interfere with any American enterprise by substituting Canadian enterprise.

Mr. HART. There is no American enterprise, I will say to the gentleman from Pennsylvania, and as to the necessity for the enterprise being there, the Canadian vessels alone are authorized to provide this service.

Mr. RICH. We want to help the Canadians all we can, but I do not want to let any other country interfere with American enterprise.

Mr. HART. I may say to the gentleman that this bill passed the Senate and was unanimously reported by the House Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

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

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

Be it enacted, etc., That, until June 30, 1951, notwithstanding the provision of law of the United States restricting to vessels of the United States the transportation of passengers and merchandise directly or indirectly from any port in the United States to another port of the United States, passengers may be transported on Canadian vessels between Skagway, Alaska, and other points in Alaska, between Haines, Alaska, and other points in Alaska, and between Hyder, Alaska, and other points in Alaska or the continental United States, either directly or via a foreign port, or for any part of the transportation: *Provided,* That such Canadian vessels may transport merchandise between Hyder, Alaska, and other ports and points herein enumerated.

XCVI—574

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

A similar House bill was laid on the table.

COMMITTEE ON EXPENDITURES IN THE
EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENTS

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments may have until midnight Saturday night to file reports on H. Res. 647 and H. Res. 648.

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

There was no objection.

ATTEMPT TO SILENCE CRITICS

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. BUCHANAN] heads a select committee of the House appointed to investigate lobbying activities. He is proceeding with his investigation. But apparently he is doing so without the slightest public indication of what he hopes to accomplish or of how to accomplish it. This is true only if one ignores the crassly political motives which evidently inspired the Democratic majority to create the committee.

In the first place, the present law to regulate lobbying on legislative matters before the Congress of the United States fails specifically to define lobbying. The purpose of the law is to compel paid lobbyists to register with the Congress, and to disclose the sources and amounts of incomes earned by lobbying. Presumably it is intended to keep the lobbyists out in the open, where their activities can be restricted if need arises.

Questioned on the floor, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. BUCHANAN] refused to define lobbying; said further that he did not think it necessary to adopt a definition. This, of course, is in line with the purposes obviously in the minds of Democratic leaders when the committee was created. But when he opened the hearing he said lobbying was "any attempt by individuals or groups to influence governmental decisions."

Recently, in an effort to get at the real purpose of the committee staff, I questioned the gentleman from Pennsylvania, Congressman BUCHANAN, on the floor of the House. When he refused, or was unable, to define lobbying, I described lobbying as "any attempt, other than through the presentation of facts, expressions of opinion labeled as such, or appeals to reason, by individuals or groups, through pressure, political or economic, the offer of reward or threat of punishment, to influence enactment or administration of legislation or governmental activities."

This definition, if adopted and followed, would police all those who, in an

effort to influence legislation or governmental decisions, abuse the right of free speech, a free press, the right to petition the Congress. It would, however, keep open the way to regulate those who for corrupt purposes or by corrupt means misuse free speech, a free press, the right of petition.

But apparently the adoption and the adherence to such a definition would not be consistent with the real objective of some of the staff of the Lobbying Committee.

One of the objectives of that staff seems to be the silencing through intimidation of all critics of the administration, of all those who are fighting either waste, corruption, or communism in the executive departments.

One reason for this suspicion lies in the questionnaire sent out by the committee staff and in the selection of the 166 business and educational organizations to whom it was sent.

It was notable that this list was confined exclusively to those companies and firms which have opposed the socialistic proposals of the Fair Deal and who have stood firm for constitutional government. It was notable, too, that many large companies, and left-wing organizations and labor unions, which have supported the Fair Deal, were conspicuously absent from the list.

Even a cursory reading of the questionnaire reveals that it was intended to harass and embarrass the companies and organizations formed to support constitutional government to which it was addressed. The questionnaire contained questions which many with a pencil and paper, a file of newspapers and magazines, and an advertising rate book could answer for themselves. But the questions relating to paid advertising on legislative subjects were only a small part of the questionnaire.

Other questions were included, relating to expenses and donations to organizations, such as the Committee for Constitutional Government, Inc., and to the Constitutional Educational League, which are fighting nobly for the things their names imply. Officials of these, and other organizations of the kind, earlier had been smeared by New Deal supporters and one of them jailed, for refusal to list their subscribers and contributors and thus lay them open to smears and persecution at the hands of Government officials and others who support such left-wing propaganda machines as the Friends of Democracy and the Anti-Defamation League.

The whole thing added up to a demand for information which would cost hundreds of thousands of dollars to gather and collate over a period of some months. Yet the committee staff gave those presented with the questionnaire only about 3 weeks in which to do the job.

There are those who are willing to say that this questionnaire was just a trap, that and nothing more; a means of accomplishing a purpose far afield from that for which the committee was authorized.

Some people say that the CIO or left wing furnished a part of the staff for the

committee; that it was not intended that companies and patriotic organizations receiving the questionnaire should be able to comply with committee demands.

These people say that the real purpose of the questionnaire was to provide an excuse for CIO representatives and tools of the Friends of Democracy and the Anti-Defamation League, working through the committee staff, to get a look at corporation books, a privilege hitherto denied the unions.

In any event, it appears that some members of the Buchanan committee staff are not such as one should select to guide the activities of the committee. All of them, no doubt, are known as respectable citizens, against whom no charge of moral turpitude would be made. But it would seem that their ideas and purposes, as indicated by their past activities, are not such as to qualify some of them for the positions they now occupy.

The real purpose in this, a campaign year, appears to be an attempt to silence critics of the administration.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mr. SADLAK (at the request of Mr. WOODRUFF), for today and Friday, to attend the funeral of a close personal friend.

To Mr. SMITH of Virginia (at the request of Mr. HARRISON), for Thursday, June 22, on account of official business.

ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

Mrs. NORTON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills and a joint resolution of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H. R. 1243. An act to amend the Hatch Act; H. R. 4895. An act to permit the prospecting, development, mining, removal, and utilization of the mineral resources within the national forests in Minnesota, and for other purposes;

H. R. 8198. An act to provide for the organization of the Army and the Department of the Army, and for other purposes; and

H. J. Res. 480. Joint resolution extending the time for the release, free of estate and gift tax, of certain powers.

The SPEAKER announced his signature to enrolled bills of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 1165. An act to provide relief for the sheep-raising industry by making special quota immigration visas available to certain alien shepherders;

S. 118. An act for the relief of Clemente Sabin Dopic;

S. 330. An act for the relief of George Gabriel Herrmann, Greta (Marketa) Herrmann (wife), and Alice Herrmann (daughter), known also as George Gabriel Herman, Greta Herman, and Alice Herman;

S. 1452. An act for the relief of Dr. Juan A. Queralt Balleste;

S. 1484. An act for the relief of Augustino Marlia;

S. 1637. An act for the relief of Marie Henriette de Bruyn;

S. 2107. An act for the relief of Georges Gregory Alpiar;

S. 2265. An act for the relief of Marina George Papadopoulos;

S. 2309. An act for the relief of Oscar (Ozkar) Nemenyi, Marianna Nemenyi (wife), and Thomas John Nemenyi (son);

S. 2397. An act authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to convey certain lands in the State of Minnesota to Signa M. Lodoen and Neils R. Lodoen;

S. 2510. An act to authorize and direct the Secretary of the Interior to issue to Anson Harold Pease, a Crow allottee, a patent in fee to certain lands;

S. 2511. An act for the relief of Dr. John R. Portaria;

S. 2551. An act to authorize the sale of certain allotted land on the Pine Ridge Reservation, S. Dak.;

S. 2552. An act to authorize the sale of certain allotted land on the Pine Ridge Reservation, S. Dak.;

S. 2556. An act for the relief of Mrs. Billy J. Knight and Dorothea Knight;

S. 2629. An act for the relief of Marianne Bruchner;

S. 2714. An act for the relief of Thomas Pfeiffer;

S. 3029. An act authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to issue a patent in fee to Wilbur J. Scott;

S. 3128. An act to authorize the sale of certain allotted inherited land on the Winnebago Reservation, Nebr.;

S. 3130. An act to authorize the sale of certain allotted inherited land on the Winnebago Reservation, Nebr.;

S. 3639. An act providing for an extension of the time during which annual assessment work on mining claims held by location in the United States, including Alaska, may be made, and for other purposes; and

S. 3181. An act to extend the Housing and Rent Act of 1947, as amended, and for other purposes.

BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mrs. NORTON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on this day present to the President, for his approval, bills of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 1082. An act conferring jurisdiction upon the United States District Court for the Southern District of New York to hear, determine, and render judgment upon a claim of the Bunker Hill Development Corp.;

H. R. 2230. An act for the relief of Arthur S. Horner, Leah B. Horner, and Maude Brewer, doing business as the A. S. Horner Construction Co.;

H. R. 2803. An act for the relief of Albert J. Peterson;

H. R. 3254. An act for the relief of Iva Gavin;

H. R. 4371. An act for the relief of Shiro Takemura;

H. R. 4692. An act to provide for the extension of the term of certain patents of persons who served in the military or naval forces of the United States during World War II;

H. R. 5019. An act for the relief of Fella H. Holbrook;

H. R. 5682. An act for the relief of William T. Orton;

H. R. 5846. An act for the relief of Mrs. Lillian Coolidge;

H. R. 6691. An act for the relief of Paul D. Banning, Chief Disbursing Officer, Treasury Department, and for other purposes; and

H. R. 6934. An act for the relief of E. H. Corrigan.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 18 minutes p. m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, June 26, 1950, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1508. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated May 10, 1950, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and an illustration on a preliminary examination and survey of Webster Cove, Somerset County, Md., with a view to constructing a jetty in the project channel, authorized by the river and harbor act approved on March 2, 1945 (H. Doc. No. 619); to the Committee on Public Works and ordered to be printed, with one illustration.

1509. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated April 28, 1950, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and an illustration, on a review of reports on Toledo Harbor, Ohio, requested by a resolution of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, House of Representatives, adopted on July 23, 1945 (H. Doc. No. 620); to the Committee on Public Works and ordered to be printed, with one illustration.

1510. A letter from the Acting Secretary of Defense, transmitting a draft of legislation together with appropriate justifications covering proposed legislation entitled "A bill to eliminate the additional internal-revenue taxes on coconut oil coming from the trust territory of the Pacific Islands, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1511. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting the report on the audit of Federal Housing Administration for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1949 (H. Doc. No. 621); to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments and ordered to be printed.

1512. A letter from the Secretary, National Gallery of Art, Smithsonian Institution, transmitting a draft of a proposed joint resolution entitled "Joint resolution excluding from gross estate of a nonresident alien works of art on loan to the Trustees of the National Gallery of Art"; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee: Committee of conference. H. R. 4295. A bill to provide certain benefits for annuitants who retired under the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, prior to April 1, 1948 (Rept. No. 2304). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. RANKIN: Committee on Veterans' Affairs. S. 3582. An act to authorize revision of the procedures employed in the administration of certain trust funds administered by the Veterans' Administration; without amendment (Rept. No. 2305). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. RANKIN: Committee on Veterans' Affairs. H. R. 8619. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to establish a Department of Medicine and Surgery in the Veterans' Administration," approved January 3, 1946, to provide for the appointment of dental specialists, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 2306). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. RANKIN: Committee on Veterans' Affairs. H. R. 8845. A bill to provide for the conveyance of a tract of land in Kennebec County, Maine, to the town of Chelsea; without amendment (Rept. No. 2307). Referred

to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. BRYSON: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 17. A bill to provide for trials of and judgments upon the issue of good behavior in the case of certain judges; with amendment (Rept. No. 2308). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. WILSON of Texas: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 2864. An act to authorize certain administrative expenses for the Department of Justice, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 2309). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. WILSON of Texas: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 4192. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, section 220, relating to receipt of commissions or gifts for procuring loans; without amendment (Rept. No. 2310). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. O'TOOLE: Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries. S. 3771. An act to provide transportation on Canadian vessels between Skagway, Alaska, and other points in Alaska, between Haines, Alaska, and other points in Alaska, and between Hyder, Alaska, and other points in Alaska or the continental United States, either directly or via a foreign port, or for any part of the transportation; without amendment (Rept. No. 2312). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. O'TOOLE: Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries. H. R. 6536. A bill to provide transportation on Canadian vessels between Skagway, Alaska, and other points in Alaska, between Haines, Alaska, and other points in Alaska, and between Hyder, Alaska, and other points in Alaska or the continental United States, either directly or via a foreign port, or for any part of the transportation; without amendment (Rept. No. 2313). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mrs. NORTON: Committee on House Administration. House Resolution 640. Resolution for the relief of James S. Orr; without amendment (Rept. No. 2314). Ordered to be printed.

Mrs. NORTON: Committee on House Administration. House Resolution 642. Resolution for the relief of Mrs. Dorothy W. Upton; without amendment (Rept. No. 2315). Ordered to be printed.

Mrs. NORTON: Committee on House Administration. House Resolution 662. Resolution for the relief of Mrs. Catherine Regina Andrews; without amendment (Rept. No. 2316). Ordered to be printed.

Mrs. NORTON: Committee on House Administration. House Resolution 654. Resolution for the relief of Mrs. Jean E. Charon; without amendment (Rept. No. 2317). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. CANNON: Committee of conference. H. R. 8567. A bill making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1950, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 2318). Ordered to be printed.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. ENGLE of California: Committee on Public Lands. H. R. 6038. A bill to provide for issuance of a supplemental patent to Charles A. Gann, patentee No. 152,419, for certain land in California; without amendment (Rept. No. 2311). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. FORAND:

H. R. 8919. A bill to provide for an unemployment reinsurance fund; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DOUGHTON:

H. R. 8920. A bill to reduce excise taxes, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BATES of Kentucky:

H. R. 8921. A bill to authorize the attendance of the United States Marine Band at the annual meeting of the Kentucky Education Association to be held in Louisville, Ky., on May 13, 1951; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. MILLER of Nebraska:

H. R. 8922. A bill authorizing and directing the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to prescribe regulations with respect to milk and milk products, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee:

H. R. 8923. A bill to provide improved procedures with respect to the financial control of the Post Office Department, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. RAINS:

H. R. 8924. A bill to authorize the creation of private mortgage corporations and to modify the Government's secondary market for FHA-insured and VA-guaranteed residential mortgages; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee:

H. R. 8925. A bill to provide a recruitment procedure for the competitive civil service in order to insure selection of personnel on the basis of open competition and merit, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. REES:

H. R. 8926. A bill to provide improved procedures with respect to the financial control of the Post Office Department, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. SMATHERS:

H. R. 8927. A bill to authorize aid to needy American nationals in connection with their repatriation from foreign countries, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. FLOOD:

H. R. 8928. A bill to foster economic development in areas of chronic unemployment; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. DAVENPORT:

H. Res. 663. Resolution creating a select committee to conduct an investigation and study of sex crimes; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. FLOOD:

H. Res. 664. Resolution requesting the President to appoint a bipartisan commission relating to American policy in Japan; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. NIXON:

H. Res. 665. Resolution creating a select committee to conduct an investigation and study of the administration and apportionment of hospital facilities for veterans; to the Committee on Rules.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. CASE of New Jersey:

H. R. 8929. A bill for the relief of Vincent F. Leslie; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CASE of South Dakota:
H. R. 8930. A bill authorizing the issuance of a patent in fee to Matthew High Pine; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. CHELF:

H. R. 8931. A bill for the relief of Franz Furtner, his wife, Valentina Furtner, and her daughters, Nina Tuerck and Victoria Tuerck; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LEONARD W. HALL:

H. R. 8932. A bill for the relief of William Yinson Lee; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JONES of North Carolina:

H. R. 8933. A bill for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Horace S. Ritch; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LANE:

H. R. 8934. A bill for the relief of the American Barrel Co., Inc.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LEFEVRE:

H. R. 8935. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Jaye Kuru Maddox; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MARCANTONIO:

H. R. 8936. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Marguerite A. Brumell; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'TOOLE:

H. R. 8937. A bill for the relief of Miriam Rosenblum; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WILLIAM L. PFEIFFER:

H. R. 8938. A bill for the relief of Sport-service, Inc.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROONEY:

H. R. 8939. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Marianna Di Spigna, nee Di Meglio; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

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

2212. By Mr. CANFIELD: Resolution adopted by the New Jersey State Bar Association, Trenton, N. J., at its annual meeting on May 27, 1950, opposing the passage of the national health insurance and public health bill; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

2213. By Mr. MILLER of Maryland: Resolution of the Cecil County Farm Bureau, Inc., opposing any form of compulsory health insurance or any system of political medicine; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

2214. By the SPEAKER: Petition of C. L. Queen, secretary, Pineapple Growers Association of Hawaii, San Francisco, Calif., against any form of compulsory health insurance; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

SENATE

FRIDAY, JUNE 23, 1950

(Legislative day of Wednesday, June 7, 1950)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Our Father God, as noontide marks the hurrying day and our words are hushed to silence, we would bathe our hearts and minds in the glorious thought