

to save the rural main streets of Minnesota.

Minnesota's labor organizations see plants closing and jobs declining and join in the appeal for their farmer neighbors.

Minnesota, where Candidate Eisenhower stood at Kasson to make bewitching promises to America's agriculture, feels it has a right to protest and demand that the promises of the respective political parties be fulfilled—and I mean both political parties.

ADJOURNMENT TO 10 O'CLOCK A. M.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, if there be no further business to come before the Senate, I move that the Senate stand in adjournment until 10 o'clock tomorrow morning.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 8 o'clock and 56 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, August 5, 1954, at 10 o'clock a. m.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate August 4 (legislative day of July 2), 1954:

DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY

Frank H. Higgins, of New York, to be Assistant Secretary of the Army.

Charles C. Finucane, of the State of Washington, to be Assistant Secretary of the Army.

ST. LAWRENCE SEAWAY DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION

Martin W. Oettershagen, of Illinois, to be Deputy Administrator of the St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation.

UNITED STATES ATTORNEY

Robert Vogel, of North Dakota, to be United States attorney for the district of North Dakota, vice Powless W. Lanier, resigned.

UNITED STATES MARSHAL

Harry R. Tenborg, of North Dakota, to be United States marshal for the district of North Dakota, vice Chester M. Forseman, resigned.

COAST AND GEODETIC SURVEY

Subject to qualifications provided by law, the following for permanent appointment to the grade indicated in the Coast and Geodetic Survey:

To be commissioned ensign

James P. Randall

POSTMASTERS

The following-named persons to be postmasters:

COLORADO

James A. Smith, Dillon, Colo., in place of E. F. Kongable, resigned.

William Donald Durrett, Eads, Colo., in place of J. M. Lancaster, deceased.

James W. Martin, Florence, Colo., in place of J. M. Faricy, retired.

MINNESOTA

Leonard F. Ramberg, Minneapolis, Minn., in place of J. R. Coan, retired.

NEW JERSEY

Chester A. Newton, Milltown, N. J., in place of C. V. L. Booream, retired.

NEW YORK

James H. Graham, Levittown, N. Y. Office established July 1, 1952.

PENNSYLVANIA

Clayton E. Hollinger, Lebanon, Pa., in place of D. E. Walter, removed.

Marcellus J. Hepp, Saint Davids, Pa., in place of M. M. Loughrey, deceased.

Howard J. Short, Willow Grove, Pa., in place of H. T. McEvoy, removed.

WITHDRAWAL

Executive nomination withdrawn from the Senate August 4 (legislative day of July 2), 1954:

POSTMASTER

Robert S. McKeen to be postmaster at Mondamin, Iowa.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WEDNESDAY, AUGUST 4, 1954

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, may this be a day when we shall accept wholeheartedly the God-appointed and God-revealed way of life and seek to walk in it faithfully and without fear.

Grant that we may never place the supreme emphasis upon material gains and temporal rewards but may every hour be hallowed by lofty aspirations and sincere endeavors to achieve that which is spiritual and eternal.

Inspire us with a greater longing to emulate and manifest in our daily character and conduct those spiritual realities and qualities which were always regnant in the life of our blessed Master.

Give us now some special token of Thy covenant love and may we live out each day in faith, in faithfulness, and in the fear of the Lord.

Hear us in Christ's name. Amen.

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

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

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

S. 3769. An act to amend section 709 of title 18, United States Code, so as to protect the name of the Federal Bureau of Investigation from commercial exploitation.

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

S. 2408. An act to amend the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, to provide a national defense reserve of tankers and to promote the construction of new tankers, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed, with an amendment in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 9678. An act to promote the security and foreign policy of the United States by furnishing assistance to friendly nations, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendment to the foregoing bill, requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. WILEY, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. HICKENLOOPER, Mr. GEORGE, and Mr. GREEN to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also 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. 9936. An act making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1955, 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. BRIDGES, Mr. FERGUSON, Mr. CORDON, Mr. SALTONSTALL, Mr. HAYDEN, Mr. RUSSELL, and Mr. MCCARRAN to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

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 amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 2098) entitled "An act to provide for the compensation of certain persons whose lands have been flooded and damaged by reason of fluctuations in the water level of the Lake of the Woods."

The message also announced that the Vice President has appointed Mr. CARLSON and Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina members of the joint select committee on the part of the Senate, as provided for in the act of August 5, 1939, entitled "An act to provide for the disposition of certain records of the United States Government," for the disposition of executive papers referred to in the report of the Archivist of the United States numbered 55-4.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts asked and was given permission to address the House for 10 minutes today, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered.

ONE HUNDRED AND SIXTY-ACRE LIMITATION OF FEDERAL RECLAMATION LAW

Mr. HAGEN of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. HAGEN of California. Mr. Speaker, I have this day introduced legislation dealing with the controversial subject of the 160-acre limitation of Federal reclamation law, and I would like to comment briefly on the legislation and the problem it relates to.

My proposal is almost identical with that contained in H. R. 9862 introduced July 12, 1954, by Congressman ENGLE, of California, the able ranking Democrat

on the House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

The rule presently obtaining with respect to eligibility to receive federally developed water is that those lands under single ownership in excess of 160 acres are ineligible to receive water unless the owner agrees to sell the same after a period of 10 years of service at a Government appraised price which will reflect no windfall increment attributable to Federal expenditure for water supplies. According to the discretion of the owner this rule operates either to deprive such excess lands of water or to require their sale after 10 years at a price which contains no Federal gratuity.

This rule has been justified on the reasonable assumption that there is a large measure of subsidy in a federally produced water supply and that only a limited amount of subsidy to any one individual is justifiable philosophically and politically. The large owner gets exactly the same amount of subsidy received by the smaller owner. This justification is augmented by the fact that in many projects the supply of water is limited and the acreage limitation is a rule of rationing exclusive of other considerations.

My proposal would, through the activities of irrigation or other districts, give excess landowners a third choice, provided water was in abundant supply.

Excess lands could receive water without the necessity of the owner agreeing to dispose of them provided such owner was willing to pay a price which had been increased by the amount normally attributed to subsidy. It is as simple as that.

This solution will not satisfy those persons who believe that the present alternates of nondelivery of water or the signing of an agreement to dispose of lands will result in the breaking up of corporation type farms but is almost a complete answer to the complaining taxpayer and protects smaller owners in a situation of short supply. In this connection it should be pointed out that the acreage limitation has been whittled at by administrative ruling and it is not demonstrable that it has had a noticeable effect in breaking up large land holdings in those areas where Federal water is brought in to augment existing supplies for an existing agricultural economy. The rule which permits parceling out of ownerships among members of the same family for the obvious purpose of permitting an actual eligibility of excess lands is a mere subterfuge. The same comment can be made with respect to rulings which authorize waiver of the requirements in the case of lump-sum payments when those payments do not return the total value of the works constructed.

My concern is not with the excess landowners and their economic problems. I am concerned about those aspects of the restriction which create problems for water districts which in the main serve nonexcess holdings and are eager to eliminate those aspects of controversy which endanger water development without abandoning any worthwhile principal. Problems do exist for

such districts and part of the answer to them may lie in a change of the Federal statute.

For example water use is as dependent on water systems as it is on water supply. In many instances the proper delivery of Federal water requires the erection of a distribution system. In those districts wherein parcels eligible under the restriction are scattered by excess parcels the costs of necessary lateral canals can be paid feasibly only if excess lands share in such cost and it is inequitable and possibly illegal to charge those lands for facilities from which they cannot receive water. The proposal contained in my bill would cover some of these situations.

In my opinion sober thought should be given to my proposal and that of Congressman ENGLE as the maximum Federal concession, a concession which would not radically violate the home-stead concept of Federal water availability but would provide an element of flexibility which would be of material value to water districts in administering the Federal law. At the same time districts should be instructed to secure changes in State laws which interfere with their discretion in assessing for the various categories of costs inherent in Federal reclamation programs. The simple fact is that there has been too much rancor and not enough common sense exhibited by persons concerned with this problem in the past.

It is my intention to ask the House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs to investigate this problem by hearings at the grassroots level before the new Congress assembles in January of 1955.

MUTUAL SECURITY ACT OF 1954

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 9678) to promote the security and foreign policy of the United States by furnishing assistance to friendly nations, and for other purposes, with an amendment of the Senate thereto disagree to the Senate amendment and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. VORYS]? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. CHIPERFIELD, VORYS, JUDD, GORDON, and BATTLE.

IMPORT DUTY ON WOOD DOWELS

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 2763) to amend the Tariff Act of 1930, so as to modify the duty on the importation of wood dowels, and for other purposes, with Senate amendments thereto, and concur in the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments, as follows:

Page 2, after line 19, insert:

"Sec. 5. Paragraph 1615 (a) of the Tariff Act of 1930 is amended by inserting before the period at the end thereof a semicolon and the following: 'and articles, previously

imported, with respect to which the duty was paid upon such previous importation, if (1) reimported, without having been advanced in value or improved in condition by any process of manufacture or other means, after having been exported under lease to a foreign manufacturer, and (2) reimported by or for the account of the person who imported them into, and exported them from, the United States'."

Page 2, after line 19, insert:

"Sec. 6. The amendment made by this act shall be effective as to articles entered for consumption or withdrawn from warehouse for consumption on or after the date of enactment of this act."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York [Mr. REED]?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendments were concurred in, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD at this point an explanation of the bill and the amendments.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, the Senate amendment concerns the duty status of articles which are imported into this country, subsequently exported under lease to a foreign manufacturer and then reimported into the United States. The amendment provides for duty-free reimportation in such cases if after their export the articles are not advanced in value or improved in condition by any process of manufacture or other means and if they are reimported by or for the account of the same person who imported them into, and exported them from, the United States.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. GROSS. On what bill were conferees appointed a moment ago?

The SPEAKER. Conferees were appointed on the so-called foreign-aid bill.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I had a motion to instruct the conferees. The request was made, but I do not think anyone knew the request was being made.

The SPEAKER. The Chair knew that the request was being made.

Mr. GROSS. The gentleman from Iowa did not know that the request was being made.

The SPEAKER. The Chair asked very audibly if there was any objection to sending the bill to conference. No one objected, and the Chair appointed the conferees accordingly.

FILING OF CONFERENCE REPORT ON H. R. 9678

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the conferees may have until midnight tonight to file a conference report on the bill H. R. 9678.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio? There was no objection.

AMENDING FOREIGN SERVICE ACT OF 1946

The SPEAKER. The unfinished business is the question on suspending the rules and passing the bill (H. R. 9910) to amend section 413 (b) of the Foreign Service Act of 1946.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. For what purpose does the gentleman from New York rise?

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, may I say that as a result of a conversation with Gen. Walter Bedell Smith, Under Secretary of State, this morning, I have decided to withdraw my objection to this bill and shall vote for it.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

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

The SPEAKER. The Chair will count. [After counting.] One hundred and thirty-six Members are present, not a quorum.

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

A call of the House was ordered.

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

[Roll No. 134]

Bennett, Mich	Gubser	O'Brien, Mich.
Bentley	Hale	Patten
Bentsen	Haley	Patterson
Bolling	Hand	Perkins
Bow	Harrison, Wyo.	Powell
Buckley	Hébert	Priest
Byrd	Hillelson	Prouty
Campbell	Hillings	Radwan
Canfield	Hoffman, Ill.	Rains
Carnahan	Horan	Richards
Chatham	Jones, Mo.	Riehlman
Clardy	Kee	Roosevelt
Cooper	Kilburn	Scherer
Cotton	Landrum	Scrivner
Curtis, Mo.	Lantaff	Secrest
Curtis, Nebr.	Lesinski	Sheehan
Davis, Ga.	Lyle	Shelley
Davis, Tenn.	Machrowicz	Short
Dawson, Ill.	Mailliard	Sutton
Deane	Martin	Taylor
Delaney	Mason	Van Pelt
Dies	Miller, Calif.	Vinson
Dolliver	Miller, N. Y.	Weichel
Donovan	Mollohan	Wheeler
Evins	Morgan	Wigglesworth
Fernandez	Moss	Withrow
Fogarty	Moulder	Wolcott
Frazier	Murray	Yates
Fulton	Nelson	

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall 345 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

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

AMENDING SECTION 413 (B) OF THE FOREIGN SERVICE ACT OF 1946

The SPEAKER. The question is on suspending the rules and passing the bill (H. R. 9910) to amend section 413 (b) of the Foreign Service Act of 1946.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended, and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ELECTION OF MRS. ELIZABETH PRUETT FARRINGTON AS DELEGATE FROM THE TERRITORY OF HAWAII

The SPEAKER. The Chair lays on the desk a communication which the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

WASHINGTON, D. C., August 2, 1954.

HON. JOSEPH W. MARTIN, JR.,

Speaker, House of Representatives:

At special election to fill vacancy in office of Delegate to Congress from Hawaii, Mrs. ELIZABETH PRUETT FARRINGTON was elected by a vote of approximately 43,000 to 19,000 for next highest candidate and 2,500 for remaining candidate. Due to desirability of having Hawaii represented in Congress during closing days of present session, Mrs. FARRINGTON is proceeding to Washington today. It is requested this wire be accepted as notice of her election pending arrival of her official certificate of election.

SAMUEL WILDER KING,

Governor of Hawaii.

HONOLULU, T. H.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that Mrs. ELIZABETH PRUETT FARRINGTON, of Hawaii, may be allowed to take the oath of office at this time. As is indicated by the telegram from the Governor of Hawaii, which was just laid before the House, she has been clearly elected as the Delegate from Hawaii, and there is no contest or opposition, although the certificate of election has not yet arrived.

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

There was no objection.

Mrs. FARRINGTON appeared at the bar of the House and took the oath of office.

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Hawaii.

Mrs. FARRINGTON. Mr. Speaker, I am highly honored to have become a Member of the United States Congress today, and especially honored to have become a Member of this distinguished body, the House of Representatives.

Someday, somehow, I hope that by action and deed I can prove to you how deeply I have appreciated the many expressions of sympathy during the past few weeks. Your official resolution, eulogies from the many colleagues of my husband, masterpieces of literature that belong in the ages, the many individual tributes of flowers, telegrams, and letters have touched me deeply, and especially the large and distinguished escort that accompanied us home.

You knew and I knew and Joe knew that he had friends, but never did I dream that there would be this outpouring of love, this manifestation that has come to me during these days. It has given me the courage and the strength to carry on in the manner that I know Joe would have me do, in the manner that I know the people of Hawaii would have me do.

ATOMIC ENERGY ACT

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the conferees on H. R. 9757, the Atomic Energy Act, may have until midnight tonight to file a conference report.

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

There was no objection.

PRIVATE CALENDAR

The SPEAKER. This is Private Calendar day. The Clerk will call the first bill on the calendar.

CHUAN HUA LOWE AND HIS WIFE

The Clerk called the bill (S. 997) for the relief of Chuan Hua Lowe and his wife.

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

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the immigration and naturalization laws, Chuan Hua Lowe and his wife, Sien-ung Lowe, shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fees. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such aliens as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct the required numbers from the appropriate quota or quotas for the first year that such quota or quotas are available.

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.

DR. VAHRAM ULUHOGLIAN

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2358) for the relief of Dr. Vahram Uluhoglian.

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

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the immigration and naturalization laws, Dr. Vahram Uluhoglian shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee and head tax. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

With the following committee amendments:

Line 3, strike out "Immigration and naturalization laws" and insert "Immigration and Nationality Act."

Line 8, strike out "and head tax."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

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

NICHOLAS JOHN MANTICAS AND OTHERS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2415) for the relief of Nicholas John Manticas, Yvonne Manticas, Mary Manticas, and John Manticas.

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

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Nicholas John Manticas, Yvonne Manticas, Mary Manticas, and John Manticas shall be

held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such aliens as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct four numbers from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 4, after "Manticas", insert "Anne Francis Manticas."

Line 8, after "visa", strike out "fee" and insert "fees."

Page 2, line 1, strike out "four" and insert "five."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

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

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill for the relief of Nicholas John Manticas, Anne Francis Manticas, Yvonne Manticas, Mary Manticas, and John Manticas."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CHARLOTTE MARGARITA SCHMIDT

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2480) for the relief of Charlotte Margarita Schmidt.

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

Be it enacted, etc., That, notwithstanding the provision of section 212 (a) (9) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Charlotte Margarita Schmidt may be admitted to the United States for permanent residence if she is found to be otherwise admissible under the provisions of that act: *Provided*, That this exemption shall apply only to a ground for exclusion of which the Department of State or the Department of Justice have knowledge prior to the enactment of this act.

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert in lieu thereof the following: "That, in the administration of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Charlotte Margarita Schmidt, the fiancée of Maj. David I. Livermore, a citizen of the United States, may be eligible for a visa as a nonimmigrant temporary visitor for a period of 3 months: *Provided*, That the administrative authorities find that the said Charlotte Margarita Schmidt is coming to the United States with a bona fide intention of being married to the said Maj. David I. Livermore, and that she is found otherwise admissible under the immigration laws, except that section 212 (a) (9) of the Immigration and Nationality Act shall not be applicable to the said Charlotte Margarita Schmidt: *Provided further*, That this exemption shall apply only to a ground for exclusion of which the Department of State or the Department of Justice had knowledge prior to the enactment of this act. In the event the marriage between the above-named persons does not occur within 3 months after the entry of the said Charlotte Margarita Schmidt, she shall be required to depart from the United States and upon failure to do so shall be deported in accordance with the provisions of sections 242 and 243 of the Immigration and Nationality Act. In the event that the marriage between the above-named persons shall occur within 3 months after the entry of the said Charlotte Margarita Schmidt, the Attorney

General is authorized and directed to record the lawful admission for permanent residence of the said Charlotte Margarita Schmidt as of the date of the payment by her of the required visa fee."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

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

GIACOMO BARTOLO VANADIA

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2483) for the relief of Giacomo Bartolo Vanadia.

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

Be it enacted, etc., That, notwithstanding the 11th category of section 3 of the Immigration Act of 1917, as amended, Giacomo Bartolo Vanadia may be admitted to the United States for permanent residence if he is found otherwise admissible under the provisions of the immigration laws.

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert in lieu thereof the following: "That, notwithstanding the provision of section 212 (a) (9) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Giacomo Bartolo Vanadia may be admitted to the United States for permanent residence if he is found to be otherwise admissible under the provisions of that act: *Provided*, That this exemption shall apply only to a ground for exclusion of which the Department of State or the Department of Justice had knowledge prior to the enactment of this act."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

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

ANGELITA HABERER

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2647) for the relief of Angelita Haberer.

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

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of sections 4 (a) and 9 of the Immigration Act of 1924, as amended, the minor child, Angelita Haberer shall be held and considered to be the natural-born alien child of E. J. Haberer, a United States citizen.

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert in lieu thereof the following: "That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Angelita Haberer shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

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

DR. PAUL KEUK CHANG

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2674) for the relief of Dr. Paul Keuk Chang.

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

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the immigration and naturalization laws Dr. Paul Keuk Chang shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee and head tax. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

With the following committee amendments:

On page 1, lines 3 and 4, strike out "Immigration and naturalization laws" and substitute "Immigration and Nationality Act."

On page 1, line 7, strike out the words "and head tax."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

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

MRS. CLAIRE GODREAU DAIGLE

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2794) for the relief of Mrs. Claire Godreau Daigle.

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

Be it enacted, etc., That, notwithstanding the provision of section 212 (a) (9) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Mrs. Claire Godreau Daigle may be admitted to the United States for permanent residence if she is found to be otherwise admissible under the provisions of that act: *Provided*, That this exemption shall apply only to a ground for exclusion of which the Department of State or the Department of Justice have knowledge prior to the enactment of this act.

With the following committee amendment:

On page 1, line 9, strike out the word "have" and substitute "had."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

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

GERTRUD BABETTE KRAEUTTER

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2799) for the relief of Gertrud Babette Kraeutler.

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

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the immigration and naturalization laws, Gertrud Babette Kraeutler shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee and head tax. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

With the following committee amendments:

On page 1, lines 3 and 4, strike out "immigration and naturalization laws" and substitute "Immigration and Nationality Act."

On page 1, lines 7 and 8, strike out the words "and head tax."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

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

HILARIO CAMINO MONCADO

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2887) for the relief of Hilario Camino Moncado.

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

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

There was no objection.

TOKUKO KOBAYASHI AND HER MINOR SON

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2901) for the relief of Tokuko Kobayashi, and her minor son.

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

Be it enacted, etc., That, in the administration of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Tokuko Kobayashi, the fiancée of Ernest C. Fehlhaber, a citizen of the United States, and her minor son shall be eligible for visas as nonimmigrant temporary visitors for the period of 3 months: *Provided*, That the administrative authorities find that the said Tokuko Kobayashi is coming to the United States with a bona fide intention of being married to the said Ernest C. Fehlhaber and that she is found otherwise admissible under the immigration laws. In the event the marriage between the above-named persons does not occur within 3 months after the entry of the said Tokuko Kobayashi and her minor son, she and her minor son shall be required to depart from the United States and upon failure to do so shall be deported in accordance with the provisions of sections 241 and 242 of the Immigration and Nationality Act. In the event that the marriage between the above-named persons shall occur within 3 months after the entry of the said Tokuko Kobayashi and her minor son, the Attorney General is authorized and directed to record the lawful admission for permanent residence of the said Tokuko Kobayashi and her minor son as of the date of the payment by her of the required visa fees.

With the following committee amendment:

On page 2, line 6, strike out "241 and 242" and substitute "242 and 243."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

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

SERGIO EMERIC

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3024) for the relief of Sergio Emeric.

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

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the immigration and naturalization laws, Sergio Emeric shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee and head tax. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

With the following committee amendments:

On page 1, lines 3 and 4, strike out "immigration and naturalization laws" and substitute "Immigration and Nationality Act."

On page 1, line 7, strike out the words "and head tax."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

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

ELIAS Y. RICHAS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3144) for the relief of Elias Y. Richas.

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

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Elias Y. Richas shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

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

LOUIE ELLA ATTAWAY

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3388) for the relief of Louie Ella Attaway.

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

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of sections 101 (a) (27) (A) and 205 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, the minor child, Louie Ella Attaway, shall be held and considered to be the natural-born alien child of William R. Attaway, a citizen of the United States.

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

MARIA PACCIONE PICA

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3447) for the relief of Maria Paccione Pica.

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

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of sections 101 (a) (27) (A) and 205 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, the minor

child, Maria Paccione Pica, shall be held and considered to be the natural-born child of Mr. and Mrs. Vincent M. Pica, citizens of the United States.

With the following committee amendment:

On page 1, line 6, after the word "natural-born", insert the word "alien."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

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

MRS. ERNA ROSITA PONT

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3520) for the relief of Mrs. Erna Rosita Pont (formerly Erna Rosita Michel).

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

Be it enacted, etc., That, notwithstanding the provision of section 212 (a) (9) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Mrs. Erna Rosita Pont (formerly Erna Rosita Michel), the German wife of S. Sgt. Kenneth H. Pont, a citizen of the United States serving in the Armed Forces, may be admitted to the United States for permanent residence if she is found to be otherwise admissible under such act.

With the following committee amendment:

On page 1, line 9, after the word "act", change the period to a colon and add the following: "*Provided*, That this exemption shall apply only to a ground for exclusion of which the Department of State or the Department of Justice had knowledge prior to the enactment of this act."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

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

PIMEN MAXIMOVITCH SOFRONOV

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3566) for the relief of Pimen Maximovitch Sofronov.

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

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the immigration and naturalization laws, Pimen Maximovitch Sofronov shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee and head tax. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

With the following committee amendments:

On page 1, lines 3 and 4, strike out "immigration and naturalization laws" and substitute "Immigration and Nationality Act."

On page 1, line 7, strike out the word "and."

On page 1, line 8, strike out the words "head tax."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

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

INGE BECKMANN

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3750) for the relief of Inge Beckmann.

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

Be it enacted, etc., That, notwithstanding the provision of section 212 (a) (9) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Inge Beckmann may be admitted to the United States for permanent residence if he is found to be otherwise admissible under the provisions of that act: *Provided*, That this exemption shall apply only to a ground for exclusion of which the Department of State or the Department of Justice have knowledge prior to the enactment of this act.

With the following committee amendments:

On page 1, line 6, strike out the word "he" and substitute "she."

On page 1, line 9, strike out the word "have" and substitute "had."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

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

ROBERTO JOHNSON

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3874) for the relief of Roberto Johnson.

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

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the immigration and naturalization laws, Roberto Johnson shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee and head tax. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

With the following committee amendments:

On page 1, lines 3 and 4, strike out "immigration and naturalization laws" and substitute "Immigration and Nationality Act."

On page 1, line 7, strike out the words "and head tax."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

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

JORGE SOLE MASSANA

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 4054) for the relief of Jorge Sole Massana.

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

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the immigration and naturalization laws, Jorge Sole Massana, shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee and head

tax. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the quota for Spain for the first year that said quota is available.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 3, strike out "Immigration and naturalization laws" and insert "Immigration and Nationality Act."

Page 1, line 5, insert "and Montserrat Thomas-Sanchez Massana."

Page 1, line 8, strike out "fee and head tax" and insert "fees."

Page 1, line 10, strike out "alien" and insert "aliens."

Page 2, line 1, strike out "one number" and insert "two numbers."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

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

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill for the relief of Jorge Sole Massana and Montserrat Thomas-Sanchez Massana."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

LOUISE RANK

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 4437) for the relief of Louise Rank.

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

Be it enacted, etc., That, in the administration of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Louise Rank, the fiancée of Alvin W. Pierce, a citizen of the United States, shall be eligible for a visa as a nonimmigrant, temporary visitor for a period of 3 months: *Provided*, That the administrative authorities find that the said Louise Rank is coming to the United States with a bona fide intention of being married to the said Alvin W. Pierce and that she is found otherwise admissible under the immigration laws, other than the provision of section 212 (a) (9) of the Immigration and Nationality Act: *Provided*, That this exemption shall apply only to a ground for exclusion of which the Department of State or the Department of Justice have knowledge prior to the enactment of this act. In the event the marriage between the above-named persons does not occur within 3 months after the entry of the said Louise Rank, she shall be required to depart from the United States and upon failure to do so shall be deported in accordance with the provisions of sections 241 and 242 of the Immigration and Nationality Act. In the event that the marriage between the above-named persons shall occur within 3 months after the entry of the said Louise Rank, the Attorney General is authorized and directed to record the lawful admission for permanent residence of the said Louise Rank as of the date of the payment by her of the required visa fee.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 2, line 4, strike out "have" and insert "had."

Page 2, line 4, strike out "241 and 242" and insert "242 and 243."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

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

AUGUSTA OPPACHER BIALEK

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 5119) for the relief of Augusta Oppacher Bialek.

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

Be it enacted, etc., That, notwithstanding the provisions of section 212 (a) (9) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Augusta Oppacher Bialek, also known as Augusta O. Bialek, may be admitted to the United States for permanent residence if she is found to be otherwise admissible under the provisions of that act: *Provided*, That this exemption shall apply only to a ground for exclusion of which the Department of State or the Department of Justice have knowledge prior to the enactment of this act.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 10, strike out "have" and insert "had."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

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

JALAL ELAHI AND BATOOL ELAHI

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 5193) for the relief of Dr. Jalal Elahi and Batool Elahi.

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

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Dr. Jalal Elahi and Batool Elahi shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fees. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such aliens as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota officer to deduct two numbers from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 4, strike out "and Batool Elahi."

Page 1, line 7, strike out "fees" and insert "fee."

Page 1, line 9, strike out "aliens" and insert "alien."

Page 1, line 10, strike out "two numbers" and insert "one number."

The amendments were agreed to.

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

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill for the relief of Dr. Jalal Elahi."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PAULINE KATZMANN

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 5194) for the relief of Pauline Katzmann.

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

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Pauline Katzmann shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such

alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

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

HENRY SCHOR ET AL.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 5319) for the relief of Henry (also known as Heinrich) Schor, Sally (also known as Sali) Schor, and Gita (also known as Gitta Aviva) Schor.

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

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Henry (also known as Heinrich) Schor, Sally (also known as Sali) Schor, and Gita (also known as Gitta Aviva) Schor shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fees. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such aliens as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct three numbers from the appropriate quota for the first year such quota is available.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 9, insert "": *Provided*, That in the case of Gita (also known as Gitta Aviva) Schor, a suitable and proper bond or undertaking, approved by the Attorney General, be deposited as prescribed by section 213 of the said act."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

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

BOB KAN

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 5344) for the relief of Bob Kan.

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

Be it enacted, etc., That, in the administration of the immigration and naturalization laws, the alien, Bob Kan, shall be considered to have lawfully entered the United States for permanent residence on March 16, 1948, the date of his actual entry into the United States, upon payment by him of visa fees and head tax.

SEC. 2. Upon the enactment of this act the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the Chinese racial quota for the first year that such quota is available.

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert "That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Bob Kan and Fourere Kan shall be held and considered to have been admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fees. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such aliens as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota officer to deduct two numbers from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

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

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment to the title.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. GRAHAM: "Amend the title so as to read: 'For the relief of Bob Kan and Fourere Kan'."

The amendment was agreed to, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

TAKEKO ISHIKI

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 5459) for the relief of Takeko Ishiki.

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

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of sections 101 (a) (27) (A) and 205 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, the minor child, Takeko Ishiki, shall be held and considered to be the natural-born alien child of T. Sgt. Fred Wyatt, a citizen of the United States.

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

MARIA TERESA LUBIATO

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 5749) for the relief of Maria Teresa Lubiato.

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

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of sections 101 (a) (27) (A) and 205 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, the minor child, Maria Teresa Lubiato, shall be held and considered to be the natural-born alien child of Mr. and Mrs. Erminio Lubiato, citizens of the United States.

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

SUREN PELENGHIAN

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 5762) for the relief of Suren Pelenghian.

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

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Suren Pelenghian shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

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

BORIS IVANOVITCH OBLESOW

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 5841) for the relief of Boris Ivanovitch Oblesow.

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

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Boris Ivanovitch Oblesow shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

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

FRANK ROBERT GAGE

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 6266) for the relief of Frank Robert Gage.

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

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of sections 101 (a) (27) (A) and 205 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, the minor child, Frank Robert Gage (Franz Fihn), shall be held and considered to be the natural-born alien child of Guy Glen Gage and Mrs. Elizabeth Lackron Gage, citizens of the United States.

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

ORLANDO LUCARINI

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 6324) for the relief of Orlando Lucarini.

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

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Orlando Lucarini shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

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

ELENA SCARPETTI SAVELLI

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 6355) for the relief of Elena Scarpetti Savelli.

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

Be it enacted, etc., That, notwithstanding the provision of section 212 (a) (9) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Elena Scarpetti Savelli may be admitted to the United States for permanent residence if she is found to be otherwise admissible under the provisions of that act: *Provided*, That this exemption shall apply only to a ground for exclusion of which the Department of State or the Department of Justice had knowledge prior to the enactment of this act.

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

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

NOBU NOGAWA NITTA

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 6367) for the relief of Nobu Nogawa Nitta.

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

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the immigration and naturalization laws, Nobu Nogawa Nitta, mother of 4 American-born children, shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee and head tax. Upon granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 3, strike out "immigration and naturalization laws" and insert "Immigration and Nationality Act."

Page 1, line 8, strike out "and head tax."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

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

TAMIKO FUJIWARA

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 6442) for the relief of Tamiko Fujiwara.

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

Be it enacted, etc., That, in the administration of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Tamiko Fujiwara, the fiancé of William E. LaBore, a citizen of the United States, shall be eligible for a visa as a nonimmigrant temporary visitor for a period of 3 months: *Provided,* That the administrative authorities find that the said Tamiko Fujiwara is coming to the United States with a bona fide intention of being married to the said William E. LaBore and that she is found otherwise admissible under the immigration laws. In the event the marriage between the above-named persons does not occur within 3 months after the entry of the said Tamiko Fujiwara, she shall be required to depart from the United States and upon failure to do so shall be deported in accordance with the provisions of sections 241 and 242 of the Immigration and Nationality Act. In the event that the marriage between the above-named persons shall occur within 3 months after the entry of the said Tamiko Fujiwara, the Attorney General is authorized and directed to record the lawful admission for permanent residence of the said Tamiko Fujiwara as of the date of the payment by her of the required visa fee.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 2, line 5, strike out "241 and 242" and insert "242 and 243."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

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

C—836

ELFRIEDE LINA ROSER

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 6498) for the relief of Elfriede Lina Roser.

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

Be it enacted, etc., That, notwithstanding the provision of section 212 (a) (9) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Elfriede Lina Roser, may be admitted to the United States for permanent residence if she is found to be otherwise admissible under the provisions of that act: *Provided,* That this exemption shall apply only to a ground for exclusion of which the Department of State or the Department of Justice have knowledge prior to the enactment of this act.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 5, strike out "Roser" and insert "Avable, nee Roser."

Page 1, line 10, strike out "have" and insert "had."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

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

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill for the relief of Elfriede Lina Avable, nee Roser."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MRS. EFTHEMIA SOTALIS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 6858) for the relief of Mrs. Eftemia Sotalis.

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

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Mrs. Eftemia Sotalis shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

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

MRS. ANNA J. WEIGLE

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 7033) for the relief of Mrs. Anna J. Weigle.

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

Be it enacted, etc., That, notwithstanding the provision of section 212 (a) (9) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Mrs. Anna J. Weigle may be admitted to the United States for permanent residence if she is found to be otherwise admissible under the provisions of that act: *Provided,* That this exemption shall apply only to a ground for exclusion of which the Department of State or the Department of Justice has knowledge prior to the enactment of this act.

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

MAZAL KOLMAN

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 7151) for the relief of Mazal Kolman.

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

Be it enacted, etc., That for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Mazal Kolman shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 7, after the words "visa fee," strike out the remainder of the bill.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

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

ASTOR VERGATA

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 7217) for the relief of Astor Vergata.

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

Be it enacted, etc., That Astor Vergata, who lost United States citizenship under the provisions of section 401 (e) of the Nationality Act of 1940, may be naturalized by taking prior to 1 year after the effective date of this act, before any court referred to in subsection (a) of section 3100 of the Immigration and Nationality Act or before any diplomatic or consular officer of the United States abroad, the oaths prescribed by section 337 of the said act. From and after naturalization under this act, the said Astor Vergata shall have the same citizen status as that which existed immediately prior to its loss.

With the following committee amendment:

On page 1, line 10, strike out the period after the word "act" and insert the following: "": *Provided,* That he shall first take an oath that he has done nothing to promote the cause of communism."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

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

CHRISTINE SUSAN CAIADO

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 7228) for the relief of Christine Susan Caiado.

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

Be it enacted, etc., That, notwithstanding the provision of section 212 (a) (4) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Christine Susan Caiado may be admitted to the United States for permanent residence if she is found to be otherwise admissible under the provisions of that act: *Provided,* That a suitable and proper bond or undertaking, approved by the Attorney General, be deposited as prescribed by section 213 of the said act.

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

MISS MARTHA KANTELBERG

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 7245) for the relief of Miss Martha Kantelberg.

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

Be it enacted, etc., That, notwithstanding the provision of section 212 (a) (9) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Martha Kantelberg may be admitted to the United States for permanent residence if she is found to be otherwise admissible under the provisions of that act: *Provided*, That this exemption shall apply only to a ground for exclusion of which the Department of State or the Department of Justice has knowledge prior to the enactment of this act.

With the following committee amendment:

On page 1, at the end of line 10, change the period to a colon and add the following: "*Provided further*, That her marriage to her United States citizen fiancé, Sgt. Arthur S. Ferreira, takes place within 6 months after the enactment of this act."

The committee amendment was agreed to:

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

MRS. ELFRIEDE MAJKA GRIFASI

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 7246) for the relief of Mrs. Elfriede Majka Grifasi.

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

Be it enacted, etc., That, notwithstanding the provision of section 212 (a) (9) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Mrs. Elfriede Majka Grifasi may be admitted to the United States for permanent residence if she is found to be otherwise admissible under the provisions of that act.

With the following committee amendment:

On page 1, at the end of line 7, change the period to a colon and add the following: "*Provided*, That this exemption shall apply only to a ground for exclusion of which the Department of State or the Department of Justice had knowledge prior to the enactment of this act."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

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

ROSA MARIA VOLLMER

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 7262) for the relief of Rosa Maria Vollmer.

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

Be it enacted, etc., That, notwithstanding the provision of section 212 (a) (12) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Rosa Maria Vollmer may be admitted to the United States for permanent residence if she is found to be otherwise admissible under the provisions of that act: *Provided*, That this exemption shall apply only to a ground for exclusion of which the Depart-

ment of State or the Department of Justice have knowledge prior to the enactment of this act.

With the following committee amendments:

On page 1, line 3, strike out the word "provision" and substitute "provisions."

On page 1, line 3, after the citation "section 212 (a)" insert "(9) and."

On page 1, line 4, strike out the name "Vollmer" and substitute "Phillips, nee Vollmer."

On page 1, line 9, strike out the word "have" and substitute "had."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

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

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill for the relief of Rosa Maria Phillips, nee Vollmer."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

HILDEGART LISELOTTE BUDESHEIM AND HER MINOR CHILD

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 7343) for the relief of Hildegart Liselotte Budesheim and her minor child.

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

Be it enacted, etc., That in the administration of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Hildegart Liselotte Budesheim, the German fiancé of Sgt. Lawrence E. Cooke, a citizen of the United States serving in the Armed Forces, and her minor child Lawrence Hans Joachim Hahn, shall be eligible for visas as nonimmigrant temporary visitors for a period of 3 months: *Provided*, That the administrative authorities find that the said Hildegart Liselotte Budesheim is coming to the United States with a bona fide intention of being married to the said Sgt. Lawrence E. Cooke and that she and such child are otherwise admissible under the immigration laws. In the event that the marriage between the above-named parties does not occur within 3 months after the entry of the said Hildegart Liselotte Budesheim and such child, they shall be required to depart from the United States and upon failure to do so shall be deported in accordance with the provisions of sections 241 and 242 of the Immigration and Nationality Act. In the event that the marriage between the above-named parties shall occur within 3 months after the entry of the said Hildegart Liselotte Budesheim and such child, the Attorney General is authorized and directed to record their lawful admission for permanent residence as of the date of the payment by them of the required visa fees.

With the following committee amendment:

On page 2, line 8, strike out "241 and 242" and substitute "242 and 243."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

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

MRS. SONJA RIES KOCK

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 7352) for the relief of Mrs. Sonja Ries Kock.

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

Be it enacted, etc., That, notwithstanding the provision of section 212 (a) (9) of the

Immigration and Nationality Act, Mrs. Sonja Ries Kock may be admitted to the United States for permanent residence if she is found to be otherwise admissible under the provisions of that act: *Provided*, That this exemption shall apply only to a ground for exclusion of which the Department of State or the Department of Justice had knowledge prior to the enactment of this act.

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

MRS. ANITA SCAVONE

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 7579) for the relief of Mrs. Anita Scavone.

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

Be it enacted, etc., That, notwithstanding the provision of section 212 (a) (9) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Mrs. Anita Scavone may be admitted to the United States for permanent residence if she is found to be otherwise admissible under the provisions of that act: *Provided*, That this exemption shall apply only to a ground for exclusion of which the Department of State or the Department of Justice had knowledge prior to the enactment of this act.

With the following committee amendment:

On page 1, line 9, strike out the word "have" and substitute "had."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

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

GAETANO CONTI

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 7581) for the relief of Gaetano Conti.

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

Be it enacted, etc., That, notwithstanding the provision of section 212 (a) (9) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Gaetano Conti may be admitted to the United States for permanent residence if he is found to be otherwise admissible under the provisions of that act.

With the following committee amendment:

On page 1, line 7, after the word "act", change the period to a colon and add the following: "*Provided*, That this exemption shall apply only to a ground for exclusion of which the Department of State or the Department of Justice had knowledge prior to the enactment of this act."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

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

MARIANA GEORGE LOIZOS KELLIS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 7828) for the relief of Mariana George Loizos Kellis.

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

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Mariana George Loizos Kellis shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent

residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

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

SHIMASOI MICHIKO

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 7829) for the relief of Shimasoi Michiko.

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

Be it enacted, etc., That, in the administration of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Shimasoi Michiko, the fiancée of Joseph Lynn Fakes, a citizen of the United States, shall be eligible for a visa as a nonimmigrant temporary visitor for a period of three months: *Provided,* That the administrative authorities find that the said Shimasoi Michiko is coming to the United States with a bona fide intention of being married to the said Joseph Lynn Fakes and that she is found otherwise admissible under the immigration laws. In the event the marriage between the above-named persons does not occur within three months after the entry of the said Shimasoi Michiko, she shall be required to depart from the United States and upon failure to do so shall be deported in accordance with the provisions of sections 242 and 243 of the Immigration and Nationality Act. In the event that the marriage between the above-named persons shall occur within three months after the entry of the said Shimasoi Michiko, the Attorney General is authorized and directed to record the lawful admission for permanent residence of the said Shimasoi Michiko as of the date of the payment by her of the required visa fee.

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

ERIKA SCHNEIDER BUONASERA

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 7834) for the relief of Erika Schneider Buonasera.

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

Be it enacted, etc., That, notwithstanding the provision of section 212 (a) (9) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Erika Schneider Buonasera may be admitted to the United States for permanent residence if she is found to be otherwise admissible under the provisions of that act: *Provided,* That this exemption shall apply only to a ground for exclusion of which the Department of State or the Department of Justice have knowledge prior to the enactment of this act.

With the following committee amendment:

On page 1, line 9, strike out the word "have" and substitute "had."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

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

SOHAN SINGH RAI AND JOGINDAR KAUR RAI

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 7885) for the relief of Sohan Singh Rai and Jogindar Kaur Rai.

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

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Sohan Singh Rai and Jogindar Kaur Rai shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fees. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such aliens as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct two numbers from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

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

MISS MARTHA HEUSCHELE

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 7983) for the relief of Miss Martha Heuschele.

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

Be it enacted, etc., That, notwithstanding the provision of section 212 (a) (9) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Martha Heuschele may be admitted to the United States for permanent residence if she is found to be otherwise admissible under the provisions of that act: *Provided,* That this exemption shall apply only to a ground for exclusion of which the Department of State or the Department of Justice has knowledge prior to the enactment of this act.

With the following committee amendment:

On page 1, line 10, after the word "act", change the period to a colon and add the following: "*Provided further,* That her marriage to her United States citizen fiancé, Sgt. Manuel J. Fonseca, Jr., takes place within 6 months after the enactment of this act."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

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

MRS. GERTRUD ECKERL STRICKLAND

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 8066) for the relief of Mrs. Gertrud Eckerl Strickland.

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

Be it enacted, etc., That, notwithstanding the provision of section 212 (a) (6) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Mrs. Gertrud Eckerl Strickland may be admitted to the United States for permanent residence if she is found to be otherwise admissible under the provisions of that act: *Provided,* That a suitable and proper bond or undertaking, approved by the Attorney General, be deposited as prescribed by section 213 of the said act.

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

ELFRIEDE IDA GEISSLER

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 8183) for the relief of Elfriede Ida Geissler.

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

Be it enacted, etc., That, in the administration of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Elfriede Ida Geissler, the fiancée of Sfc. Herman I. Price, a citizen of the United States, shall be eligible for a visa as a nonimmigrant temporary visitor for a period of 3 months: *Provided,* That the administrative authorities find that the said Elfriede Ida Geissler is coming to the United States with a bona fide intention of being married to the said Sfc. Herman I. Price and that she is found admissible under all provisions of the Immigration and Nationality Act, other than section 212 (a) (9): *Provided further,* That this exemption shall apply only to a ground for exclusion of which the Department of State or the Department of Justice had knowledge prior to the enactment of this act.

In the event the marriage between the above-named persons does not occur within 3 months after the entry of the said Elfriede Ida Geissler, she shall be required to depart from the United States and upon failure to do so shall be deported in accordance with the provisions of sections 242 and 243 of the Immigration and Nationality Act. In the event that the marriage between the above-named persons shall occur within 3 months after the entry of the said Elfriede Ida Geissler, the Attorney General is authorized and directed to record the lawful admission for permanent residence of the said Elfriede Ida Geissler as of the date of the payment by her of the required visa fee.

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

ILSE RADLER HUGHES

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 8375) for the relief of Ilse Radler Hughes.

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

Be it enacted, etc., That, notwithstanding the provision of section 212 (a) (9) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Ilse Radler Hughes may be admitted to the United States for permanent residence if she is found to be otherwise admissible under the provisions of that act: *Provided,* That this exemption shall apply only to a ground for exclusion of which the Department of State or the Department of Justice have knowledge prior to the enactment of this act.

With the following committee amendment:

On page 1, line 9, after the word "Justice", strike out "have" and substitute "had."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

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

SIGRID BRINKHOFF

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 8413) for the relief of Sigrid Brinkhoff.

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

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Sigrid Brinkhoff shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of

the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

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

MRS. ELSE JOHNSON

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 8424) for the relief of Mrs. Else Johnson.

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

Be it enacted, etc., That, notwithstanding the provision of section 212 (a) (9) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Mrs. Else Johnson may be admitted to the United States for permanent residence if she is found to be otherwise admissible under the provisions of that act: *Provided*, That this exemption shall apply only to a ground for exclusion of which the Department of State or the Department of Justice have knowledge prior to the enactment of this act.

With the following committee amendment:

On page 1, line 9, after the word "Justice", strike out "have" and substitute "had."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

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

ROSE MARY KESER

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 9103) for the relief of Rose Mary Keser.

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

Be it enacted, etc., That, notwithstanding the provision of section 212 (a) (9) Rose Mary Keser may be admitted to the United States for permanent residence if she is found to be otherwise admissible under the provisions of that act: *Provided*, That this exemption shall apply only to a ground for exclusion of which the Department of State or the Department of Justice had knowledge prior to the enactment of this act.

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. GRAHAM: Page 1, at the end of line 3, insert "of the Immigration and Nationality Act."

The amendment was agreed to.

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

SALE OF CERTAIN LAND IN ALASKA TO LLOYD H. TURNER, OF WARDS COVE, ALASKA

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2015) to authorize the sale of certain land in Alaska to Lloyd H. Turner, of Wards Cove, Alaska.

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

Be it enacted, etc., That Lloyd H. Turner, of Wards Cove, Alaska, is hereby authorized for a period of 1 year from and after the

effective date of this act to apply for the purchase of, and the Secretary of the Interior is hereby authorized and directed to convey to said Lloyd H. Turner, for use as a trade and manufacturing site, the following-described land situated in Alaska: Triangular tract beginning at corner numbered 4 of United States Survey Numbered 2632; thence north forty-three degrees no minutes west two and seventy-two one-hundredths chains; thence south seventy-nine degrees ten minutes east one chain; thence south twenty-five degrees fifty-one minutes east one and ninety-nine one-hundredths chains back to the point of beginning in Tongass National Forest and adjacent to United States Survey Numbered 2632, containing eight one-hundredths acre.

Sec. 2. That the conveyance shall be made upon the payment by said Lloyd H. Turner for the land at its reasonable appraised price of not less than \$1.25 per acre, to be fixed by the Secretary of the Interior: *Provided*, That the conveyance hereby authorized shall not include any land covered by a valid existing right initiated under the public land laws: *Provided further*, That the coal and other mineral deposits in the land shall be reserved to the United States, together with the right to prospect for, mine, and remove the same under applicable laws and regulations to be prescribed by the Secretary of the Interior.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 2, line 7, strike out all of section 2 and insert the following:

"Sec. 2. The lands shall be sold to the said Lloyd H. Turner at the reasonable appraised price to be fixed by the Secretary of the Interior, plus the cost of survey. The conveyance shall be made only if the said Lloyd H. Turner makes the total payment due within 5 years after notification by the Secretary of the amount due: *Provided*, That the conveyance hereby authorized shall not include any land covered by a valid existing right initiated under the public land laws and shall be subject to the rights of owners of existing improvements located on the lands described in section 1 hereof under special use permits of the Forest Service to maintain such improvements thereon in accordance with the terms of such use permits."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

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

CONVEYANCE TO T. M. PRATT AND ANNITA C. PRATT OF CERTAIN REAL PROPERTY IN STEVENS COUNTY, WASH.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 7229) to provide for the conveyance to T. M. Pratt and Annita C. Pratt of certain real property in Stevens County, Wash.

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

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior is authorized and directed to donate and convey to T. M. Pratt and his wife, Annita C. Pratt, Kettle Falls, Wash., all of the right, title, and interest of the United States in and to certain real property situated in Stevens County, Wash. Such property, which by error was conveyed to the United States in 1938 pursuant to land purchase contract 1367-910 and which has since been purchased from the former owners in good faith by the said T. M. Pratt and Annita C. Pratt, is more particularly described as follows:

Commencing at the southeast corner of the northeast quarter of the southwest quar-

ter of section 2, township 35 north, of range 37, East Willamette meridian; running thence north five hundred sixty-two and four-tenths feet; thence west one thousand four hundred sixty-six and five-tenths feet to the true point of beginning; from said point of beginning, running thence east five hundred twenty-eight and eight-tenths feet; thence north sixty-four degrees twenty-two minutes west five hundred forty-five and eight-tenths feet; thence south seven degrees two minutes west two hundred fifty-one and six-tenths feet to the point of beginning, being a triangular strip containing one and five-tenths acres.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 2, strike out line 2 and lines 3 to 15, inclusive and insert the following: "the following-described tract of land lying easterly of the easterly right-of-way line of Relocated Primary State Highway No. 22:

"Commencing at the southeast corner of the northeast quarter of the southwest quarter of section 2, township 35 north, range 37 east, Willamette meridian; running thence north five hundred sixty-two and four-tenths feet; thence west one thousand four hundred sixty-six and five-tenths feet to the true point of beginning; from said point of beginning, running thence east five hundred twenty-eight and eight-tenths feet; thence north sixty-four degrees twenty-two minutes west five hundred forty-five and eight-tenths feet; thence south seven degrees two minutes west two hundred fifty-one and six-tenths feet to the point of beginning, containing one and five hundred fifteen one-thousandths acres."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

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

E. S. BERNEY

The Clerk called the bill (S. 46) for the relief of E. S. Berney.

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

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to E. S. Berney, of Fallon, Nev., the sum of \$12,000, in full satisfaction of his claim against the United States for damages sustained by him as a result of representations made to him, on or about August 1943, by responsible officers of the Department of the Navy to the effect that the Navy would take over his ranches to be used as part of a bombing range on or before October 1, 1943, with the result that he moved or sold his cattle and other property at a loss, when, in fact, the Navy did not enter on such ranches until April 10, 1944, and for which losses he has never been compensated since the ranches were considered abandoned property in fixing compensation in the condemnation proceedings which followed: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 6, strike out "\$12,000" and insert "\$4,750."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

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

PAUL E. ROCKE

The Clerk called the bill (S. 1165) for the relief of Paul E. Rocke.

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

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Paul E. Rocke, Warren, Ohio, the sum of \$373. The payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims of the said Paul E. Rocke against the United States for property damage sustained on May 3, 1946, when an Army reconnaissance car, driven by a soldier who was using such car without authority, ran into the automobile of the said Paul E. Rocke which was properly parked on Market Street, Warren, Ohio: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated by this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

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

ALTON BRAMER

The Clerk called the bill (S. 1634) for the relief of Alton Bramer.

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

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Alton Bramer, Grand Portage, Minn., a forest guard in the employ of the Bureau of Indian Affairs, Consolidated Chippewa Agency, Cass Lake, Minn., the sum of \$2,768.90. Such sum represents the value of certain personal property owned by the said Alton Bramer and lost on February 5, 1947, when the Grand Portage ranger cottage and office, Grand Portage, Minn., occupied by the said Alton Bramer was destroyed by fire originating from an undetermined cause: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

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

HERBERT ROSCOE MARTIN

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1157) for the relief of Herbert Roscoe Martin.

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

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to

pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Herbert Roscoe Martin, of Los Angeles, Calif., the sum of \$7,167.15. The payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims of the said Herbert Roscoe Martin against the United States arising out of injuries sustained by him in a cable car wreck at Schofield Barracks, Hawaii, on July 1, 1940, while he was engaged in working on the post rock crusher: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 6, strike out "\$7,167.15" and insert "\$560.64."

Page 1, line 8, strike out "arising out of injuries sustained by him in a cable car wreck at Schofield Barracks, Hawaii, on July 1, 1940, while he was engaged in working on the post rock crusher," and insert "as reimbursement of hospital and medical expenses paid by him as a result of an accident, while engaged in working on the post rock crusher at Schofield Barracks, Hawaii, on July 1, 1940: *Provided*."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

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

EWING CHOAT

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1701) for the relief of Ewing Choat.

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

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Ewing Choat, Guntersville, Ala., the sum of \$5,000. The payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims of the said Ewing Choat against the United States on account of personal injuries (resulting in permanent partial disability) sustained by him on October 27, 1945, while he was working on an honor prison farm as an inmate of the United States Penitentiary, Atlanta, Ga.: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

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

PAUL NELSON

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3237) for the relief of Paul Nelson.

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

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to

pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Paul Nelson, Worcester, Mass., the sum of \$15,000. The payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims of the said Paul Nelson against the United States arising out of personal injuries sustained by him in Worcester on September 21, 1948, when he was assaulted by an enlisted man of the Army; such soldier was not acting within the scope of his employment: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 6, strike out "\$15,000" and insert "\$5,000."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

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

JOHN G. ZEROS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 4185) for the relief of John G. Zeros.

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

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of \$500 to John G. Zeros, of 1435 Harrod Avenue, Bronx, N. Y., in full settlement of all claims against the United States as reimbursement for bond posted for his brother-in-law Michael P. Costopoulos, in February 1948: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

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

MARY ROSE

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 5807) for the relief of Mary Rose.

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

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Mary Rose, McAlester, Okla., the sum of \$10,000. The payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims of the said Mary Rose against the United States for payment of the proceeds of the United States Government insurance (K-662766) issued to her brother, the late Donald Little Rose (Veterans' Administration claim No. XC-880119): *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any

contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 6, strike out "\$10,000" and insert "\$4,000, and to pay the sum of \$6,000 to Mrs. Alcie Rose Spittler, of San Bernardino, Calif."

Page 1, line 8, strike out the words "of the said Mary Rose."

Page 1, line 11, strike out the words "her brother."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

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

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill for the relief of Mary Rose and Mrs. Alcie Rose Spittler."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

RODERICK D. STRAWN

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 5870) conferring jurisdiction upon the United States District Court for the Eastern District of South Carolina, to hear, determine, and render judgment upon certain claims of Roderick D. Strawn.

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

Be it enacted, etc., That jurisdiction is hereby conferred upon the United States District Court for the Eastern District of South Carolina to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of Roderick D. Strawn, Ocean Drive Beach, S. C., against the United States arising when he is alleged to have been kicked by a chief petty officer of the United States Navy while assigned to duty at the United States Navy Training Center, San Diego, Calif., during the month of August 1952.

SEC. 2. Suit upon such claim may be instituted at any time within 1 year after the date of the enactment of this act, notwithstanding any lapse of time or any statute of limitations; and proceedings for the determination of such claims shall be in the same manner as in the case of actions regularly filed under the provisions of section 1346 (b) of title 28 of the United States Code, except that the provisions of section 2680 (h) of title 28 of the United States Code shall not be applicable.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 2, line 12, insert "The enactment of this act is not an inference of liability on the part of the United States."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

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

MR. AND MRS. DONALD D. PARRISH

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 6526) conferring jurisdiction upon the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Michigan to hear, determine, and render judgment upon certain claims of Mr. and Mrs. Donald D. Parrish.

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

Be it enacted, etc., That jurisdiction is hereby conferred upon the United States Dis-

trict Court for the Eastern District of Michigan to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claims of Mr. and Mrs. Donald D. Parrish against the United States arising out of injuries sustained by Mrs. Donald D. Parrish on April 1, 1952, when she was a passenger in a United States Air Force staff car which was involved in an accident with a commercial bus near Florence, Italy.

SEC. 2. In the determination of such claims, the United States shall be liable to the same extent as if the United States were a private person, and as if such accident had occurred in the State of Michigan.

SEC. 3. Suit upon such claims may be instituted at any time within 1 year after the date of enactment of this act, notwithstanding the lapse of time or any statute of limitations. Proceedings for the determination of such claims shall be in the same manner as in the case of actions regularly filed under the provisions of section 1346 (b) of title 28 of the United States Code.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 2, line 14, insert "The enactment of this act is not an inference of liability on the part of the United States."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

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

J. B. PHIPPS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 6697) for the relief of J. B. Phipps.

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

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of \$10,000, to J. B. Phipps, of Columbia, S. C., in full settlement of all claims against the United States for personal injuries, together with all expenses incident thereto sustained as a result of an accident involving a United States Air Force plane at Woodward Field, Camden, S. C., on February 18, 1944: *Provided,* That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

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

H. W. ROBINSON & CO., INC.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 7093) for the relief of H. W. Robinson & Co.

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

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to H. W. Robinson & Co., Inc., of New York, N. Y., the sum of \$823.13. The payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims of such company against the United States for reimbursement of excessive duties (representing estimated duties deposited with the Collector of Customs on or about July 14, 1949, in

connection with New York customs entry No. 703501) paid by such company as a result of a clerical error in failing to note that certain woven fabrics imported by such company had been immediately exported: *Provided,* That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

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

S. H. PRATHER

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 9357) for the relief of S. H. Prather.

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

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is hereby authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to S. H. Prather, Americus, Georgia, the sum of \$10,000. The payment of such sum shall be in settlement of all the claims of said S. H. Prather against the United States for property damage and personal injury damages sustained by S. H. Prather, together with all hospital and medical bills incurred by said S. H. Prather arising out of a collision which occurred on August 6, 1935, when an automobile in which the said S. H. Prather, his wife, his minor daughter, Florence Prather, and his minor son, S. H. Prather, Jr., were lawfully traveling in a lawful manner upon and over a certain public street and highway in the city of Quitman, Ga., was struck by an automobile driven upon, and into said public street and highway, by one Howard Hart at the rate of at least 60 miles per hour, the said Howard Hart being at the time pursued by an officer of the Bureau of Internal Revenue for the purpose of overtaking Howard Hart and making a search of the automobile driven by Howard Hart for illegal liquors, and thereby demolishing the automobile of S. H. Prather and inflicting personal injuries to S. H. Prather consisting of a fractured collar bone, body contusions, and a brain concussion; severe shock and body contusions upon the wife of S. H. Prather; body contusions, a sprained back and broken rib being thereby sustained by S. H. Prather, Jr., and the said daughter, Florence Prather, thereby sustaining a broken shoulder and a fractured skull: *Provided,* That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of service rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 6, strike out "\$10,000" and insert in lieu thereof the following: "\$5,000; to pay Mrs. Florence Prather Penman the sum of \$2,000, and to pay S. H. Prather, Jr., the sum of \$1,000."

Page 1, line 6, after the word "such", change the word "sum" to "sums."

Page 1, line 7, after the word "claims", strike out "of said S. H. Prather."

Page 1, line 9, strike out "S. H. Prather" and insert in lieu thereof "them."

Page 1, line 10, strike out "S. H. Prather" and insert in lieu thereof "them."

Page 2, line 2, after the comma following the word "wife", strike out "his minor."

Page 2, line 2, after the comma following the name "Prather", insert "(now Mrs. Arthur Penman)."

Page 2, line 2, at the end of the line strike out the word "minor."

Page 2, line 18, after the comma following the name "Prather", insert "(now Mrs. Arthur Penman)."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

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

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill for the relief of S. H. Prather, Mrs. Florence Prather Penman, S. H. Prather, Jr."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

JENO CSEPLO

The Clerk called the bill (S. 233) for the relief of Jenő Cseplo.

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

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Jenő Cseplo shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

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.

JOSEPH DI PASQUALE

The Clerk called the bill (S. 431) for the relief of Joseph Di Pasquale.

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

Be it enacted, etc., That, notwithstanding the provisions of section 212 (a) 9 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Joseph Di Pasquale may be admitted to the United States for permanent residence if he is found to be otherwise admissible under the provisions of such act: *Provided*, That this exemption shall apply only to a ground for exclusion of which the Department of State or the Department of Justice have knowledge prior to the enactment of this act.

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.

JOHN DOYLE MOCLAIR

The Clerk called the bill (S. 670) for the relief of John Doyle Moclair.

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

Be it enacted, etc., That, notwithstanding the provisions of section 212 (a) (9) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, John Doyle Moclair may be admitted to the United States for permanent residence if he is found to be otherwise admissible under the provisions of

such act: *Provided*, That this exemption shall apply only to a ground for exclusion of which the Department of State or the Department of Justice have knowledge prior to the enactment of this act.

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.

MONA LISBET KOFOED NICOLAISEN ET AL.

The Clerk called the bill (S. 946) for the relief of Mona Lisbet Kofoed Nicolaisen, Leif Martin Borglum Nicolaisen, and Ian Alan Kofoed Nicolaisen.

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

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Mona Lisbet Kofoed Nicolaisen, Leif Martin Borglum Nicolaisen, and Ian Alan Kofoed Nicolaisen shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fees. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such aliens as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct three numbers from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

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.

MARK VAINER

The Clerk called the bill (S. 914) for the relief of Mark Vainer.

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

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Mark Vainer shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee: *Provided*, That a suitable and proper bond or undertaking, approved by the Attorney General, be deposited as prescribed by section 213 of the said act.

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.

APOSTOLOS SAVVAS VASSILIADIS

The Clerk called the bill (S. 992) for the relief of Apostolos Savvas Vassiliadis.

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

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Apostolos Savvas Vassiliadis shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

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.

STAYKA PETROVICH (STAJKA PETROVIC)

The Clerk called the bill (S. 1158) for the relief of Stayka Petrovich (Stajka Petrovic).

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

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Stayka Petrovich (Stajka Petrovic) shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

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.

MICHAJLO DZIECZKO

The Clerk called the bill (S. 1321) for the relief of Michajlo Dzieczko.

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

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Michajlo Dzieczko shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon the payment of the required visa fee.

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.

ANDRE STYKA

The Clerk called the bill (S. 1520) for the relief of Andre Styka.

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

Be it enacted, etc., That for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Andre Styka shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

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.

MRS. ROBERT LEE SLAUGHTER, NEE ELISA ORTIZ ORAT

The Clerk called the bill (S. 1609) for the relief of Mrs. Robert Lee Slaughter, nee Elisa Ortiz Orat.

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

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Mrs. Robert Lee Slaughter, nee Elisa Ortiz Orat, shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the

enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee.

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.

SISTER ANTONELLA MARIE GUTTERRES (THEREZA MARIA GUTTERRES)

The Clerk called the bill (S. 1858) for the relief of Sister Antonella Marie Gutterres (Thereza Maria Gutterres).

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

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Sister Antonella Marie Gutterres (Thereza Maria Gutterres) shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

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.

DR. TAKEO TAKANO

The Clerk called the bill (S. 1883) for the relief of Dr. Takeo Takano.

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

Be it enacted, etc., That Dr. Takeo Takano, who lost United States citizenship under the provisions of section 401 (d) of the Nationality Act of 1940, may be naturalized by taking, prior to 1 year after the date of enactment of this act, before any court referred to in subsection (a) of section 310 of the Immigration and Nationality Act or before any diplomatic or consular officer of the United States abroad, an oath as prescribed by section 337 of such act. From and after naturalization under this act, the said Dr. Takeo Takano shall have the same citizenship status as that which existed immediately prior to its loss.

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.

MARGOT GOLDSCHMIDT

The Clerk called the bill (S. 1889) for the relief of Margot Goldschmidt.

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

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Margot Goldschmidt shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available: *Provided,* That a suitable and proper bond or undertaking, approved by the Attorney General, be deposited as prescribed by section 213 of the said act.

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.

THERESA ELIZABETH LEVENTER

The Clerk called the bill (S. 1902) for the relief of Theresa Elizabeth Leventer.

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

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Theresa Elizabeth Leventer shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

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.

ANTHONY BENITO ESTELLA, NATIVIDAD ESTELLA, ANTONIO JUAN ESTELLA, AND VIRGINIA ARACELI ESTELLA

The Clerk called the bill (S. 2067) for the relief of Anthony Benito Estella, Natividad Estella, Antonio Juan Estella, and Virginia Araceli Estella.

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

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Anthony Benito Estella, Natividad Estella, Antonio Juan Estella, and Virginia Araceli Estella shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act upon payment of the required visa fees. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such aliens as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct the required numbers from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

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.

LUCIA MEZILGOLOU

The Clerk called the bill (S. 2222) for the relief of Lucia Mezilgoglou.

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

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Lucia Mezilgoglou shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

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.

GEORGE SCHEER, MAGDA SCHEER, MARIE SCHEER, THOMAS SCHEER, AND JUDITH SCHEER

The Clerk called the bill (S. 2287) for the relief of George Scheer, Magda Scheer, Marie Scheer, Thomas Scheer, and Judith Scheer.

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

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, George Scheer, Magda Scheer, Marie Scheer, Thomas Scheer, and Judith Scheer shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fees. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such aliens as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct the required numbers from the appropriate quota or quotas for the first year that such quota or quotas are available.

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.

ANDREJA GLUSIC

The Clerk called the bill (S. 3433) for the relief of Andreja Glusic.

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

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of sections 203 (a) (3) and 205 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Andreja Glusic shall be held and considered to be the minor child of her parents Andrej Glusic and Marica Penca Glusic.

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.

GEORGE S. RIDNER

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 4863) for the relief of George S. Ridner.

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

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury shall pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to George S. Ridner, of Newark, N. J., the sum of \$10,000, in full settlement of all claims against the United States for his erroneous arrest in February 1921, and his subsequent conviction and loss of employment, including the failure of the Treasury Department to comply with Executive Order No. 6872, dated October 12, 1934, directing it to employ him in investigative duties in connection with the internal-revenue laws relating to liquor.

Sec. 2. No part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 6, strike out "\$10,000" and insert "\$5,000."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

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

GILBERT ELKANAH RICHARDS ET AL.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3869) for the relief of Gilbert Elkanah Richards, Adelaide Gertrude Richards, and Anthony Gilbert Richards.

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

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the immigration and naturalization laws, Gilbert Elkanah Richards, Adelaide Gertrude Richards, and Anthony Gilbert Richards shall be considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fees and head tax. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such aliens as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct three numbers from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 3, strike out "immigration and naturalization laws" and insert "immigration and Nationality Act."

Page 1, line 9, strike out "and head tax."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

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

MRS. IRMGARD (CHRAPKO) BROUGHMAN

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 6762) for the relief of Mrs. Irmgard (Chrapko) Broughman.

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

Be it enacted, etc., That, notwithstanding the provision of section 212 (a) (12) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Mrs. Irmgard (Chrapko) Broughman, may be admitted to the United States for permanent residence if she is found to be otherwise admissible under the provisions of that act: *Provided*, That this exemption shall apply only to a ground for exclusion of which the Department of State or the Department of Justice have knowledge prior to the enactment of this act.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 3, strike out "provision" and insert "provisions."

Page 1, line 4, after "(9)", insert "and."

Page 1, line 10, strike out "have" and insert "had."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

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

MRS. FA-CHI LING WANG AND EILEEN WANG

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 9671) for the relief of Mrs. Fa-chi Ling Wang and Eileen Wang.

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

Be it enacted, etc., That, notwithstanding the quota limitations of the Immigration and Nationality Act, upon application hereafter filed, immigration visas may be issued, and admission for permanent residence granted to Mrs. Fa-chi Ling Wang and Eileen Wang, if they are otherwise admissible under the Immigration and Nationality Act. Upon the issuance of such visas, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota control officer to deduct the required numbers from the appropriate quota or quotas for the first year that such quota or quotas are available.

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert "That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Dr. Liang Nun Wang shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available."

Sec. 2. In the administration of the Refugee Relief Act of 1953, Fa-chi Ling Wang and her child, Eileen Wang, shall be held to be classifiable as refugees in accordance with the provisions of section 4 (a) (12) of that act, and shall be exempt from the requirements of section 7 (d) thereof."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

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

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill for the relief of Dr. Liang Nun Wang and his wife and child, Fa-chi Ling Wang and Eileen Wang."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CHARLES W. GALLAGHER

The Clerk called the bill (S. 555) for the relief of Charles W. Gallagher.

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

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Charles W. Gallagher, the sum of \$430, in full satisfaction of his claim against the United States as compensation for a piano which he had loaned to the March Field Service Club, March Field, Calif., in 1942 for the use and entertainment of Army personnel, and which was lost by the Army: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 11, after "Act", insert "in excess of 10 percent thereof."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

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

CARLOS M. COCHRAN

The Clerk called the bill (S. 820) for the relief of the estate of Carlos M. Cochran.

Mr. BONIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill may be passed over without prejudice.

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

There was no objection.

JOHN L. DE MONTIGNY

The Clerk called the bill (S. 1183) for the relief of John L. de Montigny.

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

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to John L. de Montigny, sergeant, United States Army (US 55057148), Grand Forks, N. Dak., the sum of \$384.75, in full settlement of all claims of the said John L. de Montigny against the United States for reimbursement of amounts collected from him by the United States as a result of certain overpayments which were made by the United States pursuant to a class Q allotment: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 2, line 1, after "act" insert "in excess of 10 percent thereof."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

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

EMILIA PAVAN

The Clerk called the bill (S. 1702) for the relief of Emilia Pavan.

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

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of \$879.77 to Emilia Pavan, of Villa Viera di Caorle (Province of Venice), Italy, in full satisfaction of all claims of the said Emilia Pavan against the United States for compensation for personal injuries, and reimbursement of medical and hospital expenses, incurred as a result of having been struck by a United States Government vehicle operated by the American

Battle Monuments Commission near San Stino de Livenza, Italy, on December 15, 1951: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 2, line 3, after "act" insert "in excess of 10 percent thereof."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

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

AMERICAN SURETY COMPANY OF NEW YORK AND OTHER SURETY COMPANIES

The Clerk called the bill (S. 3062) for the relief of the American Surety Company of New York and certain other surety companies.

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

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to make payment, out of the appropriation for the payment of interest on the public debt, to the American Surety Company of New York and other surety companies, severally, as their interests may appear, as assignees of the Chase National Bank of New York, of 10 interest coupons in amount of \$11,250 each, covering interest due June 15, 1949, on ten \$1 million bonds of the June 1, 1945, issue of 2½ percent United States Treasury bonds of 1959-62, Nos. 995E, 996F, 997H, 1001A, 1002B, 1003C, 1004D, 1005E, 1006F, and 1027H. Such payment shall be made only upon receipt of satisfactory proof of the ownership and irretrievable loss of such coupons by the Chase National Bank of New York, assignments by the Chase National Bank of all its right, title, and interest in such coupons to the American Surety Co. of New York and the other surety companies which reimbursed the Chase National Bank of New York on account of the loss of such coupons, and an agreement to indemnify the United States, executed by the American Surety Co. of New York and the other surety companies in such form and amount and as the Secretary of the Treasury may require: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

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

ESTATE OF MARY BEATON DENNINGER, DECEASED

The Clerk called the bill (S. 3064) for the relief of the estate of Mary Beaton Denninger, deceased.

Mr. BONIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

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

There was no objection.

EDWIN K. STANTON

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 703) for the relief of Edwin K. Stanton.

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

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Edwin K. Stanton, Atlanta, Ga., the sum of \$254. The payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims of the said Edwin K. Stanton against the United States arising out of losses he sustained while employed by the Fish and Wildlife Service, Department of the Interior, when his personal property was destroyed by a fire which destroyed the camp of the Fish and Wildlife Service at the Klakas Lake stream weir in Alaska on September 21, 1948: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

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

JACKSONVILLE GARMENT CO.

The Clerk called the resolution (H. Res. 638).

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

Resolved, That the bill (H. R. 5813) entitled "A bill for the relief of the Jacksonville Garment Co.," together with all accompanying papers, is hereby referred to the United States Court of Claims pursuant to sections 1492 and 2509 of title 28, United States Code; and said court shall proceed expeditiously with the same in accordance with the provisions of said sections and report to the House, at the earliest practicable date, giving such findings of fact and conclusions thereon as shall be sufficient to inform the Congress of the nature and character of the demand, as a claim legal or equitable, against the United States, and the amount, if any, legally or equitably due from the United States to the claimant.

The resolution was agreed to, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

WEST COAST MEAT CO., OF HAYWARD, CALIF.

The Clerk called the resolution (H. Res. 637).

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

Resolved, That the bill (H. R. 6242) entitled "A bill for the relief of the West Coast Meat Co., of Hayward, Calif.," together with all accompanying papers, is hereby referred to the United States Court of Claims pursuant to sections 1492 and 2509 of title 28,

United States Code; and said court shall proceed expeditiously with the same in accordance with the provisions of said sections and report to the House, at the earliest practicable date, giving such findings of fact and conclusions thereof as shall be sufficient to inform the Congress of the nature and character of the demand, as a claim legal or equitable, against the United States, and the amount, if any, legally or equitably due from the United States to the claimant.

The resolution was agreed to, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DR. ALFRED L. SMITH

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3014) for the relief of Dr. Alfred L. Smith.

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

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Dr. Alfred L. Smith (captain, Medical Corps, U. S. Navy, retired), Richmond, Va., the sum of \$1,778. The payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims of the said Dr. Alfred L. Smith against the United States for reimbursement of fees which he received as a civilian physician employed by the Department of the Army during the period beginning April 1, 1943, and ending August 31, 1948, but which he was subsequently required to refund to the United States: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

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

EUGENE SPITZER

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 7099) for the relief of Eugene Spitzer.

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

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Eugene Spitzer, of Lake Placid, N. Y., the sum of \$1,000 in full settlement of all claims against the United States for reimbursement of bond declared breached August 13, 1940, because of his failure to depart from the United States on or before December 11, 1939.

With the following committee amendment:

At the end of bill add "*Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

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

ROY M. BUTCHER

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 7497) for the relief of Roy M. Butcher.

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

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Roy M. Butcher, of 510 West San Fernando Street, San Jose, Calif., the sum of \$1,953.53. The payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims under Navy Department Contract NOy 26278 which claims are based upon additional costs incurred under terms of said contract: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

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

WILLIAM B. RICE

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 8281) for the relief of the estate of William B. Rice.

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

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of \$4,000 to the estate of William B. Rice, RA-12296456 (George Rice, Jr.), deceased, of Rockaway Beach, New York, in full settlement of all claims against the United States sustained as the result of the failure of the Department of the Army, Class E Allotment Section, to forward premiums to the Pioneer American Insurance Co., Houston, Tex., prior to the last day of grace as authorized to do so under the law.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 4, strike out the figures and insert in lieu thereof "\$2,000."

At the end of the bill add: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

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

CLEMENT E. SPROUSE

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 9261) for the relief of Clement E. Sprouse.

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

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Clement E. Sprouse of Cabin John, Md., the sum of \$244.31. The payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims of the said Clement E. Sprouse against the United States on account of damage to his car on February 4, 1954, as a result of its being struck at Massachusetts Avenue and Westmoreland Circle in the District of Columbia by a motorcycle operated by a member of the Metropolitan Police Department of the District of Columbia: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 4, after the word "to" strike out "any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated", and insert in lieu thereof "funds of the District of Columbia."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

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

CONVEYANCE OF CERTAIN LANDS BY SOUTHERN PACIFIC RAILROAD CO.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 7881) to validate a conveyance of certain lands by Southern Pacific Railroad Co., and its lessee, Southern Pacific Co., to Morgan Hopkins, Inc.

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

Be it enacted, etc., That the conveyance hereinafter particularly described and heretofore executed by Southern Pacific Railroad Co., a corporation, and its lessee, Southern Pacific Co., a corporation, involving certain lands or interests therein, in the county of Los Angeles, State of California, and forming a part of the right-of-way of said Southern Pacific Railroad Co., granted by the Government of the United States of America by section 23 of the act of March 3, 1871 (16 Stat. 573), is hereby legalized, validated, and confirmed, as far as the interest of the United States is concerned, with the same force and effect as if the land involved therein had been held at the time of such conveyance by the corporations making the same under absolute fee-simple title.

The conveyance, recorded in the office of the county recorder of Los Angeles County, Calif., in book of official records, which is hereby legalized, validated, and confirmed, is as follows: Dated May 13, 1953; recorded June 14, 1953; volume 41897, page 48, to Morgan Hopkins, Inc.: *Provided*, That such legalization, validation, and confirmation shall not in any instance diminish said right-of-way to a width less than 50 feet on either side of the center of the main track or tracks

of said Southern Pacific Railroad Co. as now established and maintained: *Provided further*, That nothing herein contained is intended or shall be construed to legalize, validate, or confirm any rights, titles, or interests based upon or arising out of adverse possession, prescription, or abandonment, and not confirmed by conveyance heretofore made by Southern Pacific Railroad Co. and its lessee, Southern Pacific Co.: *And provided further*, That there shall be reserved to the United States all oil, coal, or other minerals in the land, and the right to prospect for, mine, and remove the same under such rules and regulations as the Secretary of the Interior may prescribe.

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

GRANTING TO BASIC MANAGEMENT, INC., CERTAIN PUBLIC LANDS

The Clerk called the bill (S. 3303) granting to Basic Management, Inc., a private corporation organized under the laws of the State of Nevada, certain public lands of the United States in the State of Nevada.

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

Be it enacted, etc., That there is hereby granted to Basic Management, Inc., a private corporation organized under the laws of the State of Nevada, all lands belonging to the United States situated in Clark County, State of Nevada, which may be necessary, as found by the Secretary of the Interior, for the construction, operation, and maintenance of facilities heretofore or hereafter constructed for the development, production, pumping, storage, transmission, and distribution of water, including any or all of the following purposes:

Rights-of-way; buildings and structures; construction and maintenance camps; dumping grounds, flowage, diverting, or storage dams; pumping plants, canals, ditches, pipes, pipelines, flumes, tunnels, and conduits for conveying water for domestic, irrigation, household, stock, municipal, mining, milling, industrial, and other useful purposes; poles, towers, underground conduits, lines, and equipment, for the conveyance and distribution of electrical energy; poles, underground conduits, and lines for telephone and telegraph purposes; roads, trails, bridges, tramways, railroads, and other means of locomotion, transmission, or communication; for obtaining stone, earth, gravel, and other materials of like character, together with the right to take for its own use, from any public lands, within such limits as the Secretary of the Interior may determine, stone, earth, gravel, sand, and other materials of like character necessary or useful in the construction, operation, and maintenance of aqueducts, reservoirs, dams, pumping plants, electric transmission, telephone, and telegraph lines, roads, trails, bridges, tramways, railroads, and other means of locomotion, transmission, and communication.

That there is hereby excepted and reserved unto the United States, from said grant, minerals, other than sand, stone, earth, gravel, and other materials of like character: *Provided, however*, That such minerals so excepted and reserved shall be prospected for, mined, and removed only in accordance with regulations to be prescribed by the Secretary of the Interior.

This grant shall be effective upon (1) the filing by said grantee at any time after the passage of this act, with the manager of the United States local land office in the district

where said lands are situated, of a map or maps showing the boundaries, locations, and extent of said lands and of said rights-of-way for the purposes hereinabove set forth; (2) the approval of such map or maps by the Secretary of the Interior with such reservations or modifications as he may deem appropriate; (3) the payment of a price representing the fair market value for said rights-of-way and other lands, and also for stone, earth, sand, gravel, and other materials of like character, to be fixed by the Secretary of the Interior through appraisal, exclusive of any increased value resulting from the development or improvement of the lands by the grantee or its predecessors, or a reasonable rental, as the case may be: *Provided*, That said lands for rights-of-way shall be along such location and of such width, not to exceed 250 feet, as in the judgment of the Secretary of the Interior may be required for the purposes of this act.

SEC. 2. Whenever the lands or the rights-of-way are the same as are designated on any map heretofore filed by said Basic Management, Inc., or by any of its predecessors in interest, including Defense Plant Corporation, Reconstruction Finance Corporation, the State of Nevada, or the Colorado River Commission of Nevada, in connection with any application for a right-of-way under any statute of the United States, which application is still pending, or has been granted, and is unrevoked and has been transferred to and is now owned by said Basic Management, Inc., then, upon the approval of the Secretary of the Interior of any such later map with such modifications and under such conditions as he may deem appropriate, the rights hereby granted, shall as to such lands or rights-of-way become effective as of the date of the filing of said earlier map or maps with the manager or register of the United States local land office.

SEC. 3. Said grants are to be made subject to rights-of-way, easements, and permits heretofore granted or allowed to any person or corporation in accordance with any act or acts of Congress and subject to the rights of all claimants or persons who shall have filed or made valid claims, locations, or entries on or to said lands, or any part thereof prior to the effective date of any conflicting grant hereunder, unless prior to such effective date proper relinquishments or quitclaims have been procured and caused to be filed in the proper land office.

SEC. 4. That, whenever the land granted herein shall cease to be used for the purposes for which it is granted, the estate of the grantee or of its assigns shall terminate and revert in the United States.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 2, line 3, strike the word "purposes:" and insert in lieu thereof the words "purposes only to the extent required for such development, production, storage, transmission and distribution of water."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

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

WILLIAM H. BARNEY

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1156) for the relief of William H. Barney.

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

Be it enacted, etc., That William H. Barney, of Los Angeles, Calif., is hereby relieved of all liability to the United States arising out of his failure to perform Navy Contract No. NOy-22897 (Spec. 25380; Structural Al-

terations, Building No. 2-69 and Vault, Building No. 2-68, United States Naval Construction Battalion Center, Port Hueneme, Calif.). The said William H. Barney submitted his bid on October 24, 1950, and accepted notice to proceed on November 6, 1950, but he did not sign the contract, or enter upon its performance, on account of certain previously unforeseen costs of performance which would have caused him irretrievable financial loss.

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

HERMAN E. MOSLEY

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1785) for the relief of Herman E. Mosley.

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

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Herman E. Mosley, Anniston, Ala., the sum of \$5,579.25. The payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims of the said Herman E. Mosley against the United States arising out of the death of his son, Herman E. Mosley, Jr., and the injuries sustained by his son, Willard E. Mosley, on November 25, 1945, as a result of the explosion of a mortar shell on the Fort McClellan Military Reservation, Ala. The Department of War disapproved the claims of the said Herman E. Mosley on the ground that the incident was not caused by negligence of Army personnel. No part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 5, after the word "to", insert "Mr. and Mrs."

Page 1, line 5, after the word "Mosley", insert "as the natural parents of Herman E. Mosley, Jr."

Page 1, line 7, after the word "claims", strike out "of the said Herman E. Mosley."

Page 1, line 9, change the word "his", to "their."

Page 1, line 9, after the word "Junior", strike out, "and the injuries sustained by his son, Willard E. Mosley."

Page 2, line 1, at the end of the line strike out "The Department of War disapproved the claims of the said Herman E. Mosley on the ground that the incident was not caused by negligence of Army personnel."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

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

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Herman E. Mosley, as natural parents of Herman E. Mosley, Jr."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ESTATE OF MATEO ORTIZ VAZQUEZ

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 5125) for the relief of the children of the late Mateo Ortiz Vazquez.

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

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Maria Ortiz Serrano, Joaquin Ortiz Serrano, Camilo Ortiz Serrano, Agripino Ortiz Serrano, Clementina Ortiz Serrano, Antonio Ortiz Serrano, and Leonor Ortiz Serrano, the children of the late Mateo Ortiz Vazquez, in equal shares, the sum of \$35,000, in full settlement of all their claims against the United States arising out of the death of the said Mateo Ortiz Vazquez, which occurred on September 8, 1944, when he was struck by a United States Army truck in Guayama, Puerto Rico. No part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause, and substitute in lieu thereof the following: "That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to the estate of Mateo Ortiz Vazquez, deceased, the sum of \$5,060, in full settlement of all claims against the United States arising out of the death of the said Mateo Ortiz Vazquez, who died on September 8, 1944, as the result of personal injuries sustained by him on that date when he was struck by a United States Army truck near Cayey, Puerto Rico: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by an agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not to exceeding \$1,000."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

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

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill for the relief of the estate of Mateo Ortiz Vazquez, deceased."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

YIN MOW MOY

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 7594) for the relief of Yin Mow Moy.

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

Be it enacted, etc., That in the administration of the Refugee Relief Act of 1953, the provisions of section 7 (d) (2) of such act shall not apply with respect to Yin Mow Moy.

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

CONSTANTINE NITSAS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 5586) for the relief of Constantine Nitsas.

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

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of \$500 to Constantine Nitsas, 1121 Fifth Street, Northeast, Canton, Ohio, in full settlement of all claims against the United States as reimbursement for bond posted for Anastasia Korinis (nee Xanthaki), in November or December 1947: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

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

MRS. LORENZA O'MALLEY (DE AMUSATEGUI)

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 6978) for the relief of Mrs. Lorenza O'Malley (de Amusategui).

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

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any amount in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of \$33,395 to Mrs. Lorenza O'Malley (de Amusategui) of Fort George G. Meade, Md., in full settlement of all claims against the United States for money and supplies furnished and distributed by her to American prisoners of war in the Philippines during World War II: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause, and insert in lieu thereof "That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any amount in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Mrs. Lorenza O'Malley (de Amusategui) the sum of \$20,000, to Jose Maria Gerardo de Amusategui the sum of \$5,000, and to the legal guardian of Ramon de Amusategui the sum of \$5,000 all of Ft. George G. Meade, Md. Such sums shall be in full settlement of all claims against the United States for money and supplies furnished and distributed by Mrs. O'Malley and her former husband, Ramon de Amusategui (now deceased), to American prisoners of war in the Philippines during World War II: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this

claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

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

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill for the relief of Mrs. Lorenza O'Malley (de Amusategui), Jose Maria de Amusategui, and the legal guardian of Ramon de Amusategui."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

IRVING I. ERDHEIM

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 7073) for the relief of Irving I. Erdheim.

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

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Irving I. Erdheim of 1950 Andrews Avenue, Bronx, N. Y., the sum of \$2,000. The payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims of the said Irving I. Erdheim against the United States for refund of the amount which he posted as bond in the case of Floravante Antonio Magistrale, an alien, file No. 0300-370104 App. B) who was deported: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 5, strike out "Irving I. Erdheim of 1950 Andrews Avenue, Bronx, New York", and insert "Vito Magistrale."

Page 1, line 8, strike out "Irving I. Erdheim", and insert "Vito Magistrale."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

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

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill for the relief of Vito Magistrale."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

KERMIT R. LAY, SR.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 7750) for the relief of Kermit R. Lay, Sr.

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

Be it enacted, etc., That Kermit R. Lay, Sr., Concord, Calif., is hereby relieved of all liability to refund to the United States any amounts which have been received by him from the United States as compensation or retired pay during the period beginning May 1, 1951, and ending on the date of the enactment of this act, and which constitute dual compensation in excess of the combined annual rate permitted by law. In the audit and settlement of the accounts of any certifying or disbursing officer of the United States, full credit shall be given for any

amounts for which liability is relieved by this section.

Sec. 2. The Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to the said Kermit R. Lay, Sr., an amount equal to the sum of all amounts which he has repaid to the United States, or which have been withheld by the United States from amounts otherwise due him, by reason of the liability of which he is relieved by the first section of this act: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by an agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 7, strike out "May 1, 1951" and insert in lieu thereof "June 1, 1953."

Page 1, line 7, strike out "on the date of the enactment of this act" and insert in lieu thereof "November 11, 1953, while employed by the Army and the Post Office Department."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

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

VIRGINIA HELL

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 8307) for the relief of Virginia Hell.

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

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of \$2,495.36, to Virginia Hell, of 2055 38th Street SE, Washington, D. C. Such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims of said Virginia Hell against the United States for necessary expenses incurred in returning to the United States from London, England, after serving in Europe as a civilian employee of the American Government for 2 years and 7 months (May 4, 1948, to December 8, 1950): *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 2, line 2, after the parenthesis insert "and for property damage sustained as the result of household furnishings being left out in weather at New Orleans, La., by the United States customs officials."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

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

NEIL C. HEMMER AND MILDRED HEMMER

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 8606) for the relief of Neil C. Hemmer and Mildred Hemmer.

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

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of \$2,469.42, in full settlement of all claims against the United States for personal injuries, medical and hospital expenses, and property damage sustained as a result of an accident involving a United States Army vehicle bearing United States Government license number 188262, near Albert Lea, Minn., on March 16, 1952. This claim is not cognizable under the Federal Tort Claims Act: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 5, strike out "\$2,469.42" and insert "\$1,650."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

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

WILLIAM MARTIN

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 8810) for the relief of William Martin, of Tok Junction, Alaska.

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

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is hereby authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to William Martin, of Tok Junction, Alaska, the sum of \$1,135, in full settlement of all claims against the Government of the United States, as reimbursement for personal effects destroyed as the result of a fire which occurred on September 29, 1953, at the Alaska Road Commission's Liberty construction camp on the Taylor Highway, Alaska.

Sec. 2. No part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

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

HENRIETTE MATTER

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 717) for the relief of Henriette Matter.

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

Be it enacted, etc., That the provisions of section 319 (b) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, insofar as they relate to residence within the United States for naturalization purposes, shall be held to be applicable to Mrs. Henriette Matter, the mother of a United States citizen and an employee of the United States.

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert the following: "Notwithstanding the provisions of section 310 (d) and 316 (b) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Mrs. Henriette Matter shall be held to meet the residential requirements set forth in section 316 (a) of that act, and if otherwise eligible, shall be permitted to file petition for naturalization in accordance with the provisions of section 334 of that act."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

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

APOSTOLOS VASIL PERCAS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 785) for the relief of Apostolos Vasil Percas.

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

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Apostolos Vasil Percas shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

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

SISTER GIUSEPPINA GIACCONE

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 822) for the relief of Sister Giuseppina Giaccone.

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

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Sister Giuseppina Giaccone, known also as Sister Luisa, shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

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

ZBIGNIEW WOLYNSKI

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 826) for the relief of Zbigniew Wolynski.

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

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Zbigniew Wolynski shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

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

KATHARINE BALSAMO

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 832) for the relief of Katharine Balsamo.

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

Be it enacted, etc., That notwithstanding the provision of section 212 (a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Katharine Balsamo may be admitted to the United States for permanent residence if she is found to be otherwise admissible under the provisions of that act: *Provided*, That this exemption shall apply only to a ground for exclusion of which the Department of State or the Department of Justice have knowledge prior to the enactment of this act.

With the following committee amendments:

Line 3, after "(a)" insert "(9)."

Line 9, strike out "have" and insert "has."

The committee amendments were agreed to:

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

SISTER MARY GERTRUDE (MARY GERTRUDE KELLY)

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 839) for the relief of Sister Mary Gertrude (Mary Gertrude Kelly).

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

Be it enacted, etc., That Sister Mary Gertrude (Mary Gertrude Kelly), who lost United States citizenship under the provisions of section 404 (c) of the Nationality Act of 1940, may be naturalized by taking, prior to 1 year after the date of enactment of this act, before any court referred to in subsection (a) of section 310 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, or before any diplomatic or consular officer of the United States abroad, the appropriate oath prescribed by section 337 of the Immigration and Nationality Act. From and after naturalization under this act, the said Sister Mary Gertrude (Mary Gertrude Kelly) shall have the same citizenship status as that which existed immediately prior to its loss.

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

NASSER ESPHAHANIAN

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 877) for the relief of Nasser Esphahanian.

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

Be it enacted, etc., That for the purposes of the immigration and naturalization laws, Nasser Esphahanian shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee and head tax. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

With the following committee amendments:

Line 3, strike out "Immigration and naturalization laws" and insert "Immigration and Nationality Act."

Line 8, strike out "and head tax."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

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

AUGUSTIN MONDREAL

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1622) for the relief of Augustin Mondreal.

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

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the immigration and naturalization laws, Augustin Mondreal shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee and head tax. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 3, strike out "immigration and naturalization laws" and insert "Immigration and Nationality Act."

Line 4, strike out "Augustin" and insert "Agustin."

Line 8, strike out "and head tax."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

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

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill for the relief of Agustin Mondreal."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

JOHANN GROBEN

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1627) for the relief of Johann Groben.

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

Be it enacted, etc., That, notwithstanding the provision of section 212 (a) (9) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Johann Groben may be admitted to the United States for permanent residence if he is found to be otherwise admissible under the provisions of that act: *Provided*, That his exemption shall apply only to a ground for exclusion of which the Department of State or the Department of Justice have knowledge prior to the enactment of this act.

With the following committee amendment:

Line 9, strike out "have" and insert "has."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

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

BROTHER EUGENE CUMERLATO

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2393) for the relief of Brother Eugene Cumerlato.

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

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Brother Eugene Cumerlato shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

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

SPYRIDON SAINTOUFIS AND MRS. EFROSSINI SAINTOUFIS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3013) for the relief of Spyridon Saintoufis and Mrs. Efrossini Saintoufis.

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

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Spyridon Saintoufis and Mrs. Efrossini Saintoufis shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fees. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such aliens as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct two numbers from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

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

MILOS HAMZA AND MRS. JIRINA HAMZA

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3330) for the relief of Milos Hamza and Mrs. Jirina Hamza.

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

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the immigration laws the aliens Milos Hamza and Mrs. Jirina Hamza shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of enactment of this Act, upon payment of the required visa fees and head taxes. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such aliens as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct two numbers from the appropriate

quota for the first year that such quota is available.

With the following committee amendments:

Line 3, strike out "Immigration laws" and insert "Immigration and Nationality Act."

Line 8, strike out "and head taxes."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

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

MAJ. ELIAS M. TSOUGRANIS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3507) for the relief of Maj. Elias M. Tsougranis.

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

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Maj. Elias M. Tsougranis shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien, as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

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

JOSEF, PAULA, AND KURT FRIEDBERG

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 4051) for the relief of Josef, Paula, and Kurt Friedberg.

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

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Josef, Paula, and Kurt Friedberg shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fees. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such aliens as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct 3 numbers from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

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

ALBERTO D'AGLIANO

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 4103) for the relief of Alberto D'Agliano.

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

Be it enacted, etc., That, notwithstanding the provision of paragraph (9) of section 212 (a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Alberto D'Agliano may be admitted to the United States for permanent residence if he is found to be otherwise admissible under the provisions of that act.

With the following committee amendment:

At the end of the bill insert: "*Provided*, That this exemption shall apply only to a

ground for exclusion of which the Department of State or the Department of Justice had knowledge prior to the enactment of this act."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

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

ANDREA PAULETTE QUATREHOMME

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 4426) for the relief of Andrea Paulette Quatrehomme.

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

Be it enacted, etc., That, notwithstanding the provision of section 212 (a) (9) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Andrea Paulette Quatrehomme may be admitted to the United States for permanent residence if she is found to be otherwise admissible under the provisions of that act: *Provided*, That this exemption shall apply only to a ground for exclusion of which the Department of State or the Department of Justice have knowledge prior to the enactment of this act.

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert in lieu thereof the following: "That, in the administration of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Andrea Paulette Quatrehomme, the fiancée of James F. Birmingham, a citizen of the United States, and her child, shall be eligible for visas as nonimmigrant temporary visitors for a period of 3 months: *Provided*, That the administrative authorities find that the said Andrea Paulette Quatrehomme is coming to the United States with a bona fide intention of being married to the said James F. Birmingham and that she is found otherwise admissible under the immigration laws, except that the provision of section 212 (a) (9) of the Immigration and Nationality Act shall not be applicable to the said Andrea Paulette Quatrehomme: *Provided further*, That this exemption shall apply only to a ground for exclusion of which the Department of State or the Department of Justice had knowledge prior to the enactment of this act. In the event the marriage between the above-named persons does not occur within 3 months after the entry of the said Andrea Paulette Quatrehomme and her child, they shall be required to depart from the United States and upon failure to do so shall be deported in accordance with the provisions of sections 242 and 243 of the Immigration and Nationality Act. In the event the marriage between the above-named persons shall occur within 3 months after the entry of the said Andrea Paulette Quatrehomme and her child, the Attorney General is authorized and directed to record the lawful admission for permanent residence of the said Andrea Paulette Quatrehomme and her child as of the date of the payment by them of the required visa fees."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

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

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill for the relief of Andrea Paulette Quatrehomme and her child."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MRS. HELENA PIASECKA

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 4427) for the relief of Mrs. Helena Piasecka.

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

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Mrs. Helena Piasecka shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

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

SOLOMON JOSEPH SADAKNE

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 4581) to legalize the entry of Solomon Joseph Sadakne, a native of Syria.

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

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the immigration and naturalization laws, Solomon Joseph Sadakne, a native of Syria, shall be considered to be a permanent resident of the United States from the date of his entry on July 15, 1943. Upon the enactment of this act, the Secretary of State shall deduct one number from the Syrian quota in the current quota year or the first year in which the quota is available.

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert in lieu thereof the following: "That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Solomon Joseph Sadakne shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

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

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill for the relief of Solomon Joseph Sadakne."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ALEXANDER PETSCHKE

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 4815) for the relief of Alexander Petschke.

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

Be it enacted, etc., That, notwithstanding the provision of section 212 (a) (9) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Alexander Petschke may be admitted to the United States for permanent residence if he is found to be otherwise admissible under the provisions of that act: *Provided*, That this exemption shall apply only to a ground for exclusion of which the Department of State or the De-

partment of Justice had knowledge prior to the enactment of this act.

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

PIETRO PETRALIA

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 4903) for the relief of Pietro Petralia.

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

Be it enacted, etc., That, notwithstanding the provision of section 212 (a) (9) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Pietro Petralia may be admitted to the United States for permanent residence if he is found to be otherwise admissible under the provisions of that act: *Provided*, That this exemption shall apply only to a ground for exclusion of which the Department of State or the Department of Justice had knowledge prior to the enactment of this act.

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

BASILIOS XARHOULACOS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 4969) for the relief of Basilios Xarhoulacos.

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

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Basilios Xarhoulacos shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

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

DR. LU JEN-LUNG

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 5553) for the relief of Dr. Lu Jen-lung.

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

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Dr. Lu Jen-lung shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

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

CHUNG FOOK YEE CHUNG

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 5978) for the relief of Chung Fook Yee Chung.

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

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Chung Fook Yee Chung shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

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

RODOIFO NAVARRO

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 6492) for the relief of Rodolfo Navarro.

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

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Rodolfo Navarro shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

With the following committee amendment:

On page 1, line 7, after the words "visa fee", strike out the remainder of the bill.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

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

MRS. MARIA GIUSEPPA DE LISA QUAGLIANO

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 6752) for the relief of Mrs. Maria Giuseppa De Lisa Quagliano.

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

Be it enacted, etc., That, notwithstanding the provision of section 212 (a) (9) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Mrs. Maria Giuseppa De Lisa Quagliano may be admitted to the United States for permanent residence if she is found to be otherwise admissible under the provisions of that act.

With the following committee amendment:

On page 1, line 7, strike out the period after the word "act" and add the following: "Provided, That this exemption shall apply only to a ground for exclusion of which the Department of State or the Department of Justice had knowledge prior to the enactment of this act."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

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

MARY GEORGE SOLOMON

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 7051) for the relief of Mary George Solomon.

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

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Mary George Solomon shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

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

ELISABETH STIEGLER LEWIS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 7053) for the relief of Elisabeth Stiegler Lewis.

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

Be it enacted, etc., That, notwithstanding the provisions of section 212 (a) (9) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Elisabeth Stiegler Lewis may be admitted to the United States for permanent residence if she is found to be otherwise admissible under the provisions of that act: *Provided,* That this exemption shall apply only to a ground for exclusion of which the Department of State or the Department of Justice had knowledge prior to the enactment of this act.

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

BARTOLOMEO MONTALTO

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 7080) for the relief of Bartolomeo Montalto.

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

Be it enacted, etc., That, notwithstanding the provision of section 212 (a) (9) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Bartolomeo Montalto may be admitted to the United States for permanent residence if he is found to be otherwise admissible under the provisions of that act: *Provided,* That this exemption shall apply only to a ground for exclusion of which the Department of State or the Department of Justice had knowledge prior to the enactment of this act.

With the following committee amendment:

On page 1, line 9, strike out the word "have" and substitute "had."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

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

NAMIKO NITOH ET AL.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 7243) for the relief of Namiko Nitoh and her child, George F. X. Nitoh.

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

Be it enacted, etc., That, in the administration of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Namiko Nitoh, the fiancée of Edward S. Phelan, a citizen of the United States, and her child, George F. X. Nitoh, shall be eligible for visas as nonimmigrant temporary visitors for a period of 3 months: *Provided,* That the administrative authorities find that the said Namiko Nitoh is coming to the United States with a bona fide intention of being married to the said Edward S. Phelan and that she is found otherwise admissible under the immigration laws. In the event the marriage between the above-named persons does not occur within 3 months after the entry of the said Namiko Nitoh and her child, they shall be required to depart from the United States and upon failure to do so shall be deported in accordance with the provisions of sections 242 and 243 of the Immigration and Nationality Act. In the event that the marriage between the above-named persons shall occur within 3 months after the entry of the said Namiko Nitoh and her child, the Attorney General is authorized and directed to record the lawful admission for permanent residence of the said Namiko Nitoh and her child as of the date of the payment by them of the required visa fees.

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

GLICERIO M. EBUNA

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 7252) for the relief of Glicerio M. Ebuna.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. Speaker, the bill (S. 2542) for the relief of Glicerio M. Ebuna is identical to the House bill introduced by the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. ROGERS]. I, therefore, ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the Senate bill.

The Clerk read the title of the Senate bill.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the Senate bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Glicerio M. Ebuna shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee.

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.

House bill 7252 was laid on the table.

JANIS ARVIDS REINFELDS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 7406) for the relief of Janis Arvids Reinfelds.

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

Be it enacted, etc., That, notwithstanding the provisions of sections 212 (a) (1) and 212 (a) (4) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Janis Arvids Reinfelds may be admitted to the United States for permanent

residence if he is found to be otherwise admissible under the provisions of that act: *Provided*, That a suitable and proper bond or undertaking approved by the Attorney General be given as prescribed by section 213 of that act.

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

THEODORA SAMMARTINO

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 7463) for the relief of Theodora Sammartino. There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of sections 101 (a) 27 (A) and 205 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, the minor child, Theodora Sammartino, shall be held and considered to be the natural-born alien child of Vincent and Theodora Sammartino, citizens of the United States.

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

DAVID MANUEL PORTER

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 7493) for the relief of David Manuel Porter.

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

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of sections 101 (a) (27) (A) and 205 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, the minor child, David Manuel Porter (Manuel Pacheco), shall be held and considered to be the natural-born alien child of Warren R. Porter and Mrs. Betty O'Brian Porter, citizens of the United States.

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

CHARLES CHAN

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 7499) for the relief of Charles Chan.

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

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Charles Chan shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this Act, upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this Act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

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

MRS. MARJORIE FLIGOR

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 7572) for the relief of Mrs. Marjorie Fligor (nee Sproul).

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

Be it enacted, etc., That, notwithstanding the provision of section 212 (a) (9) of the

Immigration and Nationality Act, Mrs. Marjorie Fligor (nee Sproul) may be admitted to the United States for permanent residence if she is found to be otherwise admissible under the provisions of that act: *Provided*, That this exemption shall apply only to a ground for exclusion of which the Department of State or the Department of Justice have knowledge prior to the enactment of this act.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 10, strike out "have" and insert "had."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

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

MRS. ERIKA (HOHENLEITNER) STAPLETON

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 7947) for the relief of Mrs. Erika (Hohenleitner) Stapleton.

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

Be it enacted, etc., That, notwithstanding the provision of section 212 (a) (9) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Mrs. Erika (Hohenleitner) Stapleton may be admitted to the United States for permanent residence if she is found to be otherwise admissible under the provisions of that act.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 7, after the word "act", insert "": *Provided*, That this exemption shall apply only to a ground for exclusion of which the Department of State or the Department of Justice had knowledge prior to the enactment of this act."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

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

CARLOS FRANCISCO VER ET AL.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 8065) for the relief of Carlos Francisco, Manriqueta Mina, and Roberto Mina Ver.

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

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Carlos Francisco Ver, Manriqueta Mina Ver, and Roberto Mina Ver shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fees. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such aliens as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct three numbers from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

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

TANNOUS ESTEPHAN

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 8115) for the relief of Tannous Estephan.

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

Be it enacted, etc., That, notwithstanding the provision of section 212 (a) (9) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Tannous Estephan may be admitted to the United States for permanent residence if he is found to be otherwise admissible under the provisions of that act: *Provided*, That this exemption shall apply only to a ground for exclusion of which the Department of State or the Department of Justice had knowledge prior to the enactment of this act.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 3, strike out all after the enacting clause and insert: "That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Tannous Estephan shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

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

MRS. DOROTHY NELL WOOLGAR ALLEN

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 8244) for the relief of Mrs. Dorothy Nell Woolgar Allen.

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

Be it enacted, etc., That, notwithstanding the provision of section 212 (a) (9) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Mrs. Dorothy Nell Woolgar Allen may be admitted to the United States for permanent residence if she is found to be otherwise admissible under the provisions of that act.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 7, after the word "act", insert "": *Provided*, That this exemption shall apply only to a ground for exclusion of which the Department of State or the Department of Justice had knowledge prior to the enactment of this act.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

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

MARIA M. KHOE

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 8554) for the relief of Maria M. Khoe.

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

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Maria M. Khoe shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

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

EZIO BERTONI

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 8557) for the relief of Ezio Bertoni.

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

Be it enacted, etc., That, notwithstanding the provision of section 212 (a) (3) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Ezio Bertoni may be admitted to the United States for permanent residence if he is found to be otherwise admissible under the provisions of that act: *Provided*, That a suitable and proper bond or undertaking, approved by the Attorney General, be deposited as prescribed by section 213 of the said act.

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

DANA EVANOVICH

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 8936) for the relief of Dana Evanovich.

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

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of sections 101 (a) (27) (A) and 205 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Dana Evanovich shall be held and considered to be the minor child of Jim D. Evans, a citizen of the United States.

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

MARIANNE GEYMEIER

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 9336) for the relief of Marianne Geymeier.

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

Be it enacted, etc., That, notwithstanding the provision of section 212 (a) (9) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Marianne Geymeier may be admitted to the United States for permanent residence if she is found to be otherwise admissible under the provisions of that act: *Provided*, That her marriage to her United States citizen fiancé, Sgt. George L. Kraft, shall occur not later than 6 months following the date of the enactment of this act: *Provided further*, That this exemption shall apply only to a ground for exclusion of which the Department of State or the Department of Justice had knowledge prior to the enactment of this act.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 9, strike out "six months" and insert "one year."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

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

MRS. FRANZISKA (HAN) RIGAU

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 9512) for the relief of Mrs. Franziska (Han) Rigau.

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

Be it enacted, etc., That, notwithstanding the provision of section 212 (a) (9) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Mrs. Franziska (Han) Rigau may be admitted to the

United States for permanent residence if she is found to be otherwise admissible under the provisions of that act: *Provided*, That this exemption shall apply only to a ground for exclusion of which the Department of State or the Department of Justice have knowledge prior to the enactment of this act.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 10, strike out "have" and insert "had."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

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

GABRIELLA SARDO

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 9844) for the relief of Gabriella Sardo.

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

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of sections 101 (a) (27) (A) and 205 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, the minor child, Gabriella Sardo, shall be held and considered to be the natural-born alien child of William Sardo, a citizen of the United States.

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

MR. FU-HO CHAN AND MRS. FU-HO CHAN

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 9953) for the relief of Mr. Fu-Ho Chan and Mrs. Fu-Ho Chan.

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

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Mr. Fu-Ho Chan and Mrs. Fu-Ho Chan shall be held to be natives of Canada, the country of their present residence.

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. Speaker, I offer certain amendments which are at the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. GRAHAM: On page 1, line 4, after the word "Act", insert: "and notwithstanding the provision of section 202 (b) of the said act."

Page 1, line 4, after name "Mrs. Fu-Ho Chan", insert "and their child Richard Chan." Amend the title so as to read: "A bill for the relief of Mr. Fu-Ho Chan, Mrs. Fu-Ho Chan, and their child Richard Chan."

The amendments were agreed to.

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

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill for the relief of Mr. Fu-Ho Chan, Mrs. Fu-Ho Chan, and their child Richard Chan."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

HUGO KERN

The Clerk called the bill (S. 232) for the relief of Hugo Kern.

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

Mr. BONIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

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

There was no objection.

INGER LARSSON

The Clerk called the bill (S. 354) for the relief of Inger Larsson.

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

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the immigration and naturalization laws, Inger Larsson shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

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.

VASILIKI TOUNTAS

The Clerk called the bill (S. 447) for the relief of Vasiliki Tountas (nee Vasiliki Georgion Karoumbali).

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

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of sections 101 (a) (27) (A) and 205 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, the minor child, Vasiliki Tountas (nee Vasiliki Georgion Karoumbali), shall be held and considered to be the natural-born alien child of Mr. and Mrs. Louis Tountas, citizens of the United States.

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.

JAN E. TOMCZYCKI

The Clerk called the bill (S. 810) for the relief of Jan E. Tomczyk.

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

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Jan E. Tomczyk shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

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.

CERTAIN CHINESE CHILDREN

The Clerk called the bill (S. 974) for the relief of certain Chinese children.

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

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of sections 101 (a) (27) (A) and 205 of the

Immigration and Nationality Act, the minor children, Chee-on Wong, Chee-leong Wong, Qew-Yuen Wong, and Mee-Yuen Wong, shall be held and considered to be the natural-born alien children of William Wong Foon Kew, a citizen of the United States.

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.

CHARLES PEROULAS

The Clerk called the bill (S. 1798) for the relief of Charles Peroulas.

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

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Charles Peroulas shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

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.

MICHELA AURUCCI

The Clerk called the bill (S. 1940) for the relief of Michela Aurucci.

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

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Michela Aurucci shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

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.

FERNANDO A. RUBIO, JR.

The Clerk called the bill (S. 2135) for the relief of Fernando A. Rubio, Jr.

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

Be it enacted, etc., That, notwithstanding the provisions of section 315 of title III of the Immigration and Nationality Act, or any other provision of law making ineligible to become a citizen of the United States any alien who has applied for exemption or discharge from training or service in the Armed Forces or in the National Security Training Corps of the United States on the ground that he is an alien, Dr. Fernando A. Rubio, Jr., who is now serving as a captain in the United States Army, may be naturalized upon compliance with all other provisions of title III of such act.

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.

RELIEF OF PETER JAMES COPSES ET AL.

The Clerk called the bill (S. 2214) for the relief of Peter James Copses, Beatrice Copses, Victoria Copses, and James Peter Copses.

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

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Peter James Copses, Beatrice Copses, Victoria Copses, and James Peter Copses shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fees. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such aliens as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct the required numbers from the appropriate quota or quotas for the first year that such quota or quotas are available.

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.

DR. MIEN FA TCHOU AND HIS WIFE, LI HOEI MING TCHOU

The Clerk called the bill (S. 2363) for the relief of Dr. Mien Fa Tchou and his wife, Li Hoei Ming Tchou.

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

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Dr. Mien Fa Tchou and his wife, Li Hoei Ming Tchou, shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fees. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such aliens as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct two numbers from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

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.

RUTH BERNDT

The Clerk called the bill (S. 2411) for the relief of Ruth Berndt.

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

Be it enacted, etc., That, notwithstanding the provisions of section 212 (a) (9) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Ruth Berndt may be admitted to the United States for permanent residence if she is found to be otherwise admissible under the provisions of that act: *Provided,* That this exemption shall apply only to a ground for exclusion of which the Department of State or the Department of Justice have knowledge prior to the enactment of this act.

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.

MARTIN GENUTH

The Clerk called the bill (S. 2456) for the relief of Martin Genuth.

Mr. BONIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill may be passed over without prejudice.

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

There was no objection.

PAUL LEWERENZ AND MARGARETA EHRHARD LEWERENZ

The Clerk called the bill (S. 2510) for the relief of Paul Lewerenz and Margareta Ehrhard Lewerenz.

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

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Paul Lewerenz and his wife, Margareta Ehrhard Lewerenz, shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such aliens as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct two numbers from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

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.

RELIEF OF PAOLINO BERCHIELLI, HIS WIFE LEDA, AND DAUGHTER ALBA

The Clerk called the bill (S. 2594) for the relief of Paolino Berchielli, his wife Leda, and daughter Alba.

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

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Paolino Berchielli, his wife Leda, and daughter Alba, shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fees. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such aliens as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct three numbers from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

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.

FAUSTINO ACHAVAL ALDECOA AND HIS WIFE CARMEN ACHAVAL (NEE CORTABITARTE)

The Clerk called the bill (S. 2607) for the relief of Faustino Achaval Aldecoa and his wife, Carmen Achaval (nee Cortabitarte).

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

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Faustino Achaval Aldecoa and his wife, Carmen Achaval (nee Cortabitarte), shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fees. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such aliens as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct the required numbers from the ap-

propriate quota or quotas for the first year that such quota or quotas are available.

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.

NADEEM TANNOUS AND MRS. JAMILE TANNOUS

The Clerk called the bill (S. 2635) for the relief of Nadeem Tannous and Mrs. Jamile Tannous.

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

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Nadeem Tannous and Mrs. Jamile Tannous shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fees. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such aliens as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct the required numbers from the appropriate quota or quotas for the first year that such quota or quotas are available.

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.

WALTRAUT CLAASSEN

The Clerk called the bill (S. 3126) for the relief of Waltraut Claassen.

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

Be it enacted, etc., That, notwithstanding the provision of section 212 (a) (9) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Waltraut Claassen may be admitted to the United States for permanent residence if she is found to be otherwise admissible under the provisions of that act: *Provided*, That this exemption shall apply only to a ground for exclusion of which the Department of State or the Department of Justice has knowledge prior to the enactment of this act: *And provided further*, That her marriage to her United States citizen fiancé, Sgt. Allen G. Stark, shall occur not later than 6 months following the date of the enactment of this act.

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.

SUSPENSION OF DEPORTATION OF CERTAIN ALIENS

The Clerk called the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 83) favoring the suspension of deportation in the case of certain aliens.

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

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring) That the Congress favors the suspension of deportation in the case of each alien hereinafter named, in which case the Attorney General has suspended deportation for more than 6 months:

A-7049480, Acuna-Ruiz, Jesus.
A-7194255, Adams, Melsaldis Vanita.
A-7049736, Aguirre, Amparo Perez De.
A-7092581, Aguirre, Antonio Martinez.
A-6732153, Aguirre-Reyes, Guadalupe.
A-7367925, Alfaro-Hernandez, Alfredo.

A-7145096, Allen, Whitley Benjamin.
A-7083963, Alvarado, Juan.
A-7092831, Alvarado, Gertrudis De.
A-7056302, Alvarado, Nemesio.
A-6924791, Alvarado, Maria De La Luz.
A-7044190, Alvarez, Acencion.
A-7044191, Alvarez, Anastacio.
A-7070395, Alvarez-Garcia, Roberto.
A-7354297, Alvarez, Rodriguez, Alberto.
A-5949118, Amaro-Moreno, Refugio.
A-7117577, Amaro, Basilisa Corpus De.
A-7225226, Amozurrutia-Lugo, Salvador.
A-7222539, Almaraz, Juana.
A-7463661, Anda, Celia Luna De.
A-7383364, Anda-Munoz, Jose Trinidad De.
A-7463664, Andrade-Vargas, Socorro.
A-7469341, Angel-Zarate, Ramon.
A-7240160, Angulo, Ercilia Galindo De.
A-7322737, Angulo-Medina, Pedro.
A-7379676, Aponte, Rosario Estevez Frias de.

A-7903287, Aranda, Maria Vasquez De.
A-7903288, Aranda-Vasquez, Romelia.
A-7903289, Aranda-Vasquez, Rogelio.
A-7903290, Aranda-Vasquez, Reynaldo.
A-7203308, Arias-Morales, Isaac.
A-7483202, Arizmendi-Rodriguez, Camilo.
A-7050091, Armendariz, Antonio B.
A-7358658, Armendariz-Rodriguez, Alberto.
A-7890506, Aspeitia-Salmeron, Ines.
A-7070731, Avitia, Francisco.
A-6079368, Ayala, Marcos Garcia.
A-7203384, Balderrama-Tapia, Faustino Humberto.
A-7203385, Balderrama-Lopez, Virginia.
A-7050479, Banuelos, Javier.
A-7050478, Banuelos, Vicente.
A-7070872, Bargas-Pulido, Salvador.
A-7985416, Barclay, Hazel Grace.
A-7886491, Barnes, Izolia Ophelia.
A-7178631, Barragan, Maria Rodriguez De.
A-6844549, Bejarano, Luis Robles.
A-7957133, Beltran, Maria De La Luz Aguero De.

A-6855837, Beltran, Samuel.
A-7117989, Benitez, Raul Vasquez.
A-7945420, Berkley, Eva Euphemia.
A-5966233, Berkley, Richard James.
A-7830642, Bernal-Mata, David.
A-7890505, Blyden, Emanuel.
A-6101335, Borraro-Rodriguez, Manuel.
A-6004182, Branche, Mavis Irene.
A-7189471, Brown, Uriah.
A-7375921, Bueno, Juan.
A-7375923, Bueno, Juan, Jr.
A-7375922, Bueno, Guadalupe.
A-6143848, Caballero, Sara Torres-Ruiz de.
A-7130758, Cadena, Pablo.
A-8057399, Cajuste, Carmen.
A-9605699, Callwood, Samuel Israel.
A-8017504, Campa-Orozco, Francisco.
A-7137134, Campbell, Odilia Marcela Orane.
A-5882748, Candonzo-Leza, David.
A-6719053, Canton, Milled Idonia.
A-7189167, Cantu, Clara Garcia De.
A-7189253, Cantu-Hinojosa, Francisco.
A-7962138, Cardoso, Petra Caridad.
A-7387463, Cardozo-Perez, Rafael.
A-7058994, Carey, Delroy Samuel.
A-6874893, Carrasco, Americo.
A-6978022, Carrillo, Manuel B.
A-6965018, Campa, Mario Carrillo De.
A-7483469, Cartaya-Martinez, Aleidia Leopoldina.

A-7224976, Carter, Dorothy Maud Johnson.
A-7188904, Casillas, Alberto.
A-6811076, Casillas, Enedina Santana De.
A-6929905, Casillas-Alcala, Ramon.
A-6802760, Casillas-Ochoa, Roberto.
A-6988887, Castellanos-Martinez, Pedro.
A-7070740, Castillo, Jose.
A-7874314, Castillo-Castillo, Aurelio.
A-7982039, Castillo-Reyes, Simon.
A-6948174, Castillo, Zenona Martinez de.
A-7112576, Castro, Emma.
A-7886492, Castro, Rafael Aguilar.
A-7127206, Castro-Esquivel, Salvador.
A-7264781T, Cepeda, Margarita Aguirre.
A-6622157, Cera-Ramirez, Jose.
A-7251641, Cerda, Tereso.
A-7476867, Cervera, Gertrudis Beltran.

A-7249825, Cervera-Villafana, Francisco.
A-7365937, Chambers, Alfred Anthy.
A-6373500, Chaparro, Roberto.
A-7049688, Chaparro, Roberto.
A-7049687, Chaparro, Lillia.
A-7049686, Chaparro, Hector.
A-3297406, Chavarria, Genaro.
A-7298510, Chavez, Sigifredo.
A-7873872, Chavez-Calderson, Jose.
A-6755436, Chavez-Marquez, Luis.
A-7050946, Chavez, Roberto.
A-7389923, Chavez-Ortiz, Jose.
A-6509457, Chen, Hubert.
A-5740575, Chinnery, Alton, Edwardo.
A-5963583, Chinnery, Isabelita.
A-7983211, Chisholm, Ruth Allen.
A-6046841, Clarke, Cassandra.
A-7439859, Contreras, Felipa Dominguez De.

A-6851182, Contreras-Pais, Jesus.
A-6774270, Cordoba, Maria Ines.
A-5998725, Corral-Lopez, Lorenzo.
A-7241651, Cortez-Ruiz, Gonzalo.
A-7372071, Cosio, Maria Torres De.
A-7240606, Covarrubias-Salgado, Jose.
A-6592052, Craciun, Carmen Rosa.
A-6857769, Crisostomo-Martinez, Francisco.
A-7083971, Cruz, Jose Francisco.
A-7457369, Cruz, Juan De La.
A-7457371, Cruz, Soledad De La.
A-7457370, Cruz, Berta De La.
A-7457372, Cruz, Joaquin De La.
A-6919362, Cruz, Refugia Fernandez de la.
A-7280289, Cruz-Garcia, Anastacio.
A-6948097, Cruz-Padilla, Ignacio Santa.
A-7457924, Cunningham, Keith Ashley.
A-7178687, Davis, Clarence George.
A-6270412, Dawkins, Kemel Gladstone.
A-7251801, De-Anda, Antonio Lara.
A-7050448, Delapena, Godfrey Howard.
A-6423475, Delgado, Maria Josefa (nee Castro).

A-5943038, Dessuit, Gladys Idalia.
A-6024058, Diaz, Concepcion Gonzalez De.
A-6378888, Diaz, Lazaro Rene.
A-6074448, Diaz-Cano, Gonzalo.
A-6334018, Diaz-Diaz, Jose.
A-7222036, Diaz-Renna, Manuel.
A-7886453, Diaz-Santos, Juan.
A-6920814, Diaz-Veledias, Felipe.
A-7049679, Dominguez, Consuelo.
A-7137812, Dominguez, Della.
A-7137811, Dominguez, Pascual.
A-7137810, Dominguez, Manuel.
A-7137809, Dominguez, Teresa.
A-7130202, Dominguez, Raul.
A-7985523, Dominguez, Rosa Emilia Gutierrez y.

A-5974895, Donovan, Keturah Delcina.
A-6363361, Dosamantes-Perez, Jesus.
A-6978207, Duncan, Cleveland.
A-7390793, Duran, Angela Reyes de.
A-6078640, Duran-Tapia, Romulo.
A-7274247, Elizald, Josefina Solis De.
A-7445524, Escobar, Rosa Olivia Calzonzin.
A-7962471, Espinoza, Otilia Victoria Garcia De.

A-7476174, Esquivel, Marciano.
A-6556350, Esteves, Hermelinda Herrera de.
A-7092825, Estrada, Felipe.
A-6960351, Estrada, Santos.
A-7022965, Fahie, Gwendolyn Imie.
A-6761553, Fahie, Zephaniah.
A-7050950, Falcon, Isidoro.
A-7962043, Farrell-Murga, Argos.
A-7483479, Fernandez, Gildardo.
A-7297200, Fernandez, Ignacio.
A-7297202, Fernandez, Jose Ignacio.
A-7297201, Fernandez, Rosa Emma.
A-8015897, Ferro, Alan Richard Kelso de Montigny Y.
A-8015898, Ferro, Ronald James Kelso de Montigny Y.
A-7178590, Flores, Arturo Ochoa.
A-8001048, Flores, Esther Perez-Kellar De.
A-7130952, Flores, Francisco.
A-7130545, Flores, Marcelina Martinez de.
A-7092826, Flores, Jesus.
A-7295794, Flores-Montion, Jose Jesus.
A-7137772, Flores, Rafael.
A-7137773, Flores, Soledad Rodarto De.

- A-6822853, Fortune, Lillian Winifred.
A-7910734, Foster, Gladstone Theodore.
A-7356563, Foy, Richard Howard.
A-7927392, Fraile-Nunez, Nicolas.
A-5901042, Francis, Iris Feldara.
A-7809250, Franco-Bucio, Francisco.
A-6935601, Frausto, Xavier.
A-7273902, Frausto-Montoya, Xavier.
A-7273901, Frausto-Montoya, Irene.
A-5963738, Fredericks, Era Lucille.
A-3124503, Freeman, Blanche Aima.
A-4747415, Freeman, Joseph Ivan.
A-6120852, Frias-Escoto, Narciso.
A-7415753, Fuentes-Ortega, Feliz.
A-7189220, Furett, Adina Augusta.
A-6985576, Gallegos-Gamez, Valentin.
A-7379784, Galvan, Celedino.
A-8021473, Galvan, Jesus Sandoval.
A-7417024, Galvan-Rodriguez, Daniel.
A-6512380, Galvez, Ochoa, Santos.
A-6858742, Gantong, Carmen Cuenca de.
A-7140277, Garcia, Bella Chavez De.
A-6877286, Garcia, Bruno.
A-7375420, Garcia, Favio or Trinidad Sanchez.
A-7439150, Garcia, Felipa Mareno De.
A-7841526, Garcia, Fortino.
A-6725019, Garcia, Jose Felipe Munoz.
A-6081916, Garcia, Julio.
A-7367917, Garcia, Manuel.
A-7145256, Garcia, Maria De Jesus Alvarez De.
A-7145257, Garcia, Aurelia.
A-8001576, Garcia, Maria Hernandez (nee Loza).
A-7137155, Garcia, Rosalio.
A-6877612, Garcia-Barron, Concepcion.
A-6877613, Garcia-Barron, Leondegaria.
A-6877611, Garcia-Barron, Otilia.
A-6791116, Garcia-Duran, Cirenio.
A-7264196, Garcia-Gonzalez, Guillermo.
A-6053843, Garcia-Mendoza, Martiniano.
A-6838493, Garcia-Negrete, Alberto.
A-6044332, Garcia-Ochoa, Federico.
A-6375102, Garcia-Ortiz, Jose.
A-7284794, Garcia-Ramirez, Jesus.
A-6132965, Garcia-Razo, Pablo.
A-7145046, Garcia, Robles, Maximino.
A-7171741, Gentry, Maria De La Luz Zabalza De.
A-7079833, Gil, Marcos.
A-7264220, Godina-Garcia, Benjamin.
A-7137733, Gonzalez-Valdez, Ramon.
A-7145043, Gonzalez-Aguilar, Gilberto.
A-6489508, Gonzalez-Alejo, Nicolas.
A-7200693, Gonzalez-Gonzalez, Rito.
A-7222076, Gonzalez-Fernandez, Benigno.
A-7358647, Gonzalez, Francisco.
A-7358665, Gonzalez, Guadalupe Perez.
A-7222702, Gonzalez-Mena, Felipe.
A-7394417, Gonzalez-Saldivar, Guadalupe.
A-3674206, Granados, Antonio.
A-6924780, Granados, Olga.
A-6924781, Granados, Ricardo.
A-7070745, Granillo, Jose.
A-7070703, Granillo, Adela Valenzuela de.
A-7140299, Granum, Frances Constantia.
A-6377810, Gray, Winifred Eloise.
A-7841609, Greaux, Joseph Sebastien.
A-6093592, Greaux, Victor Pierre.
A-7189837, Guadian, Lorenzo.
A-7189840, Guadian, Olga.
A-7189839, Guadian, Antonio.
A-7189838, Guadian, Manuel.
A-6288570, Guajardo-Flores, Ruben.
A-7298511, Guerra-Arenas, Salvador.
A-6989089, Guerrero, Esteban.
A-7188291, Guerrero, Cruz.
A-7188292, Gurrola, Margarita.
A-6733866, Guevara-Natividad, Genaro.
A-7203040, Gugman, Felipe.
A-6989470, Gutierrez, Francisco.
A-7112955, Guzman-Aguirre, Antonio.
A-7358645, Garcia, Marina Guzman De.
A-7070294, Hache, Adela Julia Haddad.
A-6920655, Harris, Daniel Charles.
A-2113545, Harris, Sydney Lambert.
A-6221472, Hawley, Aristle Wellington.
A-7139124, Haynes, Joseph Nathaniel.
A-6512351, Heredia-Perez, Jose Baltazar.
A-7140418, Hermosillo-Dabaloz, Jesus.
A-5959492, Hermon, Diana Rebecca.
A-7483228, Hermosillo, Julia Lopez.
A-7390997, Hernandez, Carmen Gomez.
A-7903101, Hernandez, Eugenio, Jr.
A-7050955, Hernandez, Francisco Socorro.
A-6972463, Hernandez, Manuel Flores.
A-7145053, Hernandez, Nicolas.
A-7145713, Hernandez, Domitila Trejo De.
A-7145015, Hernandez-Argomaniz, Vicente.
A-6314181, Hernandez-Gutierrez, Angel.
A-7483462, Hernandez-Illas, Pablo Anselmo.
A-6770300, Hernandez-Perez, Pedro.
A-7117566, Herrera, Carlos.
A-7117567, Herrera, Carlos.
A-7117568, Herrera, Jose Luis.
A-7117569, Herrera, Manuel.
A-7841575, Herrera, Natividad.
A-7828651, Herrera, Maria Eustolia Torres De.
A-7386241, Hibbert, Alfred Alexander.
A-7439655, Hines, Richard Samuel.
A-5917249, Hodge, Maria Ophelia.
A-7910567, Hodge, Pathrenella.
A-5980534, Hodge, Valdrina James.
A-7264096, Hughes, George Benjamin.
A-7983405, Ibarra-Ortega, Antonio.
A-7044362, Irigoyen-Leon, Ramon.
A-7802439, Irvin, Moses Hezekiah.
A-6113357, Jasso, Jose Barbosa.
A-6242791, Javier, Rosenda Lopez de.
A-4377208, Jennings, Ebenezer Alvin.
A-5132781, Jennings, Hilda Idalia.
A-7991790, Jones, Charles Joseph.
A-7991789, Jones, Mary Estella.
A-7962009, Jones, Sidney Oliver.
A-5953872, Joseph, Clementina.
A-5901607, Joseph, Severena.
A-6188585, Knibbs, Allan Henry.
A-7269644, Krelenstein, Maria Lourdes Aguilar.
A-7991495, Lacarda, Marta Antonia Agdamag y.
A-7372156, Lara, Santos.
A-7372157, Lara, Maria Concepcion.
A-7873883, Lazos-Morales, Isauro.
A-7415554, Leos-Lomeli, Mario.
A-7112933, Levien, Gilmore.
A-6572095, Lluberes, Conrado Antonio Alfau.
A-7439901, Loera, Pedro Zuniga.
A-7439900, Zuniga-Gonzalez, Pedro.
A-7873884, Loera, Rodolfo.
A-7083002, Long, Maisie Alphancene Bernard.
A-6870227T, Longoria, Jose.
A-6921015, Lopez, Celia Vargas De.
A-6420663, Lopez, Jorge Abraira.
A-7247920, Lopez, Josefina Mendoza Martinez De.
A-6423543, Lopez, Juan Francisco.
A-8065557, Lopez, Maria Del Refugio.
A-7802184, Lopez, Ramon.
A-7978957T, Lopez-Barragan, Juventino Baltazar.
A-7379785T, Lopez-Castro, Felipe.
A-7375744, Lopez-Figueroa, Abelardo.
A-6989596, Lorenzo, Miguel Emilio Marun.
A-7247943, Losano, Lorenzo Murillo.
A-7983076, Losano, Serbando.
A-7351265, Loza-Gutierrez, Manuel.
A-7140116, Lozano, Alejandro.
A-7140115, Lozano, Isidra.
A-7945128, Lucero-Moreno, Primitivo.
A-7927520, Lucero-Llana, Alejandra.
A-7927519, Lucero-Llanas, Gloria Irma.
A-7927518, Lucero-Llanas, Leopoldo.
A-7927521, Lucero-Llanas, Julietta.
A-7203610, Lujan, Clotilde.
A-7995641, Luna-Carmona, Jose.
A-7379599, Lynch, Charles Thomas.
A-5948752, Lynch, Marie Annie.
A-7115391, Lytton, Ivy May.
A-7178302, Macias-Cordero, Clemente.
A-7203037, Flores, Paula.
A-7267711, Madrid, Andres.
A-7267096, Madrid, Isabel.
A-5934468, Madrid, Blas.
A-7070678, Madrid, Pilar Parra.
A-7070682, Madrid, Andrea Parra.
A-7070681, Madrid, Gerardo.
A-7070680, Madrid, Manuel.
A-7476214T, Madrigal-Madrigal, Silvestre.
A-7130567, Magallanes, Jesus Jose.
A-7083548, Maina, Ana Maria Ramirez de.
A-7203580, Maldonado, Samuel Valdez.
A-6817437, Marcelli, Millicent Louise.
A-6970242, Marmolejo, Amalia Mazon de.
A-6970241, Marmolejo-Hernandez, Pedro.
A-7145585, Marquez, Cruz.
A-7145600, Marquez, Emma Berta.
A-7140732, Marquez, Francisco.
A-7145602, Marquez, Marciala Ester.
A-7145601, Marquez, Maria Telesfora.
A-7145603, Marquez, Ricardo.
A-7297180, Marquez-Gallegos, Manuel.
A-7297179, Marquez, Maria Elena.
A-6165329, Marrero, Augustina.
A-7375897T, Martinez, Albertina Goint De.
A-7910281, Martinez, Antonio.
A-7178573, Martinez, Benito.
A-7054562, Martinez, Carlos Miguel.
A-7054561, Martinez, Guillermo Winston.
A-7050463, Martinez, Jesus.
A-6422181, Martinez, Marcos.
A-7054560, Martinez, Otilia Aurora.
A-6490672, Martinez, Reyna Estela Ramona Marina.
A-7387471, Martinez-Lozano, Guadalupe.
A-3779201, Matthias, Majorita.
A-7445788T, McKenzie, Aubrey Alexander.
A-7130563, Medina, Felicitas.
A-4566750, Medina, Jose Luz.
A-7358671, Medrano, Crispin.
A-7287909, Medrano, Tomas.
A-7387933, Silva Evangelina.
A-6090236, Melendez, Cayetano.
A-6976418, Mendez, Adelina Leonor Moreno Y Garcia De.
A-7050338, Moreno, Sonia Teresa Mendez.
A-7050339, Moreno, Magali Regina Mendez.
A-6882302, Mendez-Hernandez, Jose.
A-6882269, Mendoza, Micaela Pontenciano de.
A-6213719, Mendoza Ramon.
A-7290945, Perez, Adela.
A-7802642, Mendoza-Mondragon, Ubaldo.
A-7809526, Mendoza-Sanchez, Jesus.
A-7809525, Mendoza, Maria Elva.
A-5871666, Millin, Leonora Christine.
A-7841722T, Milliner, Leslie Alquin.
A-7389301, Milton, Norman Edgton.
A-7383365, Miranda-Lopez, Arturo.
A-6948481, Miranda-Salazar, Salvador.
A-7372146, Molina-Hernandez, Genovevo.
A-7457789, Montenegro-Rodriguez, Fernando.
A-6724300, Montero-Castaneda, Manuel.
A-7385583, Montes-Molina, Jose.
A-7388754, Montoya-Melesio, Valentin.
A-6732047, Montoya-Ortega, Rafael.
A-6291190, Monzano-Salazar, Estela Eugenia.
A-6291189, Monzano-Salazar, Margarita Clara.
A-6291191, Monzano-Salazar, Rosa Maria.
A-7070047, Morales, Eduvigis.
A-7189047, Morales, Marcial.
A-7189048, Morales, Abundio.
A-7189049, Morales, Maria Pascuala.
A-7145583, Moreno, Alejandro.
A-7145718, Tiscareno, Isabel.
A-6855855, Moreno, Jose.
A-6089522, Moreno, Maria Guadalupe Desales de.
A-7144641, Moss, Vivian George.
A-7122049, Munoz, Guadalupe.
A-6169103, Muriel, Jose.
A-7371589, Myers, Clifton Vivian.
A-6921234, Najera, Francisca.
A-6921235, Najera, Candelaria.
A-6921236, Najera, Evangelina.
A-6921237, Najera, Armando.
A-6921238, Nejera, Raul.
A-6921239, Nejera, Roberto Gutierrez.
A-6775845, Nava, Carlos L.
A-7127244, Nava, Jose Luis.
A-7910523, Nieves, Cristobal.
A-7910522, Nieves, Guadalupe Renteria De.
A-5911583, Niles, Elita Virnah.
A-5935855, Ochoa, Fidel.
A-7183547, Olvae, Fernando.
A-6033300, Oliveres, Jose Salome Chapa.

A-7145620, Olivas, Leopoldo.
 A-6208817, Olivas-Alvarez, Catarino.
 A-7423135, Olivas, Paula Rodriguez De.
 A-7292115, Olivas-Lozoya, David.
 A-7392114, Olivas, Guadalupe Morales de.
 A-7137553, Olivera, Pablo.
 A-6956176, Orozco, Rosa Barroso De.
 A-7266111, Ortega, Rafael.
 A-7197850, Ortego-Quintana, Francisco.
 A-7189000, Ortiz, Cecilio.
 A-6476130T, Ortiz, Pedro.
 A-6972306, Oseguera-Arevalo, Aurora.
 A-6972305, Oseguera-Arevalo, Roman.
 A-6971649, Oseguera-Barajas, Honorio.
 A-6165544, Pacheco, Maria Garcia-Lopez De.
 A-6065635, Parrott, Ellouise.
 A-5966201, Parrott, Louis Albreric.
 A-7188729, Patino, Maria Louisa Velasquez De.
 A-6679818, Pelaez, Manuel Armando.
 A-7224071, Pena-Rodriguez, Eloy.
 A-6961717, Perez, Librado.
 A-7264086, Perez, Margarita.
 A-7264087, Perez, Antonia.
 A-6235770, Perez-Barron, Fidel.
 A-7140806, Perez-Garcia, Leon.
 A-7140807, Perez, Marcelino.
 A-7140808, Perez, Leonor.
 A-5958162, Perez-Gomez, Ignacio.
 A-6058862, Petersen, Ruth Glover.
 A-7886874, Phillip, Minerva Olivia.
 A-7137530, Pinder, Washington Howard.
 A-7222455, Pino-Fernandez, Fermin.
 A-7287920, Pinon, David.
 A-6869930, Pizano, Salvador Prado.
 A-7297156, Portillo, Austreberto.
 A-7297162, Flores, Rafaela.
 A-7188264, Potter, Francina.
 A-6124500, Preciado-Soto, Alberto.
 A-6877596, Prieto, Lorenzo.
 A-6916219, Puckerin, Ervin Fitzherbert.
 A-7137172, Puentes, Matias.
 A-7137167, Puentes, Gabina Ramirez de.
 A-5995994, Quinones, Angel.
 A-7358677, Quinones, Guadalupe Cadena De.
 A-6562093, Quinones, Fillmon Navarrete.
 A-6394586, Quintana, Angela Lorenza.
 A-6924327, Quiroz-Martinez, Angel.
 A-4377209, Rabast, Olva Ludvig.
 A-7290943, Ramirez, Gregorio.
 A-7277918, Ramirez, Manuel.
 A-7264812, Ramirez, Maria Gutierrez De.
 A-7921528, Ramirez-Aquirre, Jose Roberto.
 A-7112651T, Ramirez-Contreras, Roberto.
 A-7264811, Ramirez-Ortiz, Jose Aurelio Maximino.
 A-6836307, Ramos, Salvador Garcia.
 A-7188738, Reyes, Manuel.
 A-5977287, Reyes, Maria Concepcion.
 A-7178067, Reyes-Portilla, Felipe.
 A-6848214T, Rice, Ina Maud.
 A-5783566, Richardson, Edward Alexander.
 A-6965422, Rios-Ortiz, Jesus.
 A-7189495, Rios, Carmen Campean De.
 A-6038539, Rivas-Borrojo, Arturo.
 A-7178306, Rivera, Ciriaco.
 A-7178304, Sanchez, Angela.
 A-7802451, Robinson, George Saybert.
 A-7863962, Robles-Diaz, Jose.
 A-7044287, Roca, Tomas.
 A-5958068T, Rocha-Burciaga, Francisco.
 A-6978147T, Rocha, Juan Francisco.
 A-6352535, Rodriguez, Pedro.
 A-7372014, Rodriguez, Ramon.
 A-7863359, Rodriguez, Manuela.
 A-7863360, Rodriguez, Fermina.
 A-7863357, Rodriguez, Mariana.
 A-7140123, Rodriguez, Sebastian.
 A-7420834, Rodriguez-Garcia, Francisca.
 A-7457906, Rodriguez-Gaspar, Manuella.
 A-7841677, Rodriguez-Gonzalez, Trinidad.
 A-6106212, Rodriguez-Lares, Manuel.
 A-8065802, Rodriguez-Lopez, Francisco Javier.
 A-7491011, Rodriguez-Natividad, Gilberto.
 A-6839869, Rodriguez-Salazar, Maria.
 A-7350030, Rodriguez, Jesus.
 A-6077403, Rojas, Dolores Navarro De.
 A-7367084, Rojas-Gutierrez, Francisco.

A-6260321, Rojas-Mendoza, Gonzalo.
 A-6888204, Roman, Maria De Jesus.
 A-7083950, Roman-Arias, Guadalupe.
 A-7476758T, Romero, Olivia Arreola De.
 A-7910926, Romero-Anzaldo, Arturo.
 A-7417222, Romero-Belmonte, Ana Maria.
 A-7417224, Romero-Belmonte, Manuel Antonio.
 A-7417223, Romero-Belmonte, Maria Luisa.
 A-7394262, Romero-Jimenez, Antonio.
 A-7463972, Romero-Jimenez, Gilberto.
 A-7394579, Romo-Ruiz, Anselmo.
 A-7591593, Ros, Alberto.
 A-7059614, Rosales, Manuel.
 A-7070677, Rosales, Juan Manuel.
 A-7980285, Rosales-Davila, Jose.
 A-6878354, Rose, George Leahong.
 A-7297154, Rubio, Jose Antonio.
 A-7863949, Rueda-Calderon, Rafael.
 A-7391995, Ruiz-Avalos, Rafael.
 A-7903426, Ruiz-Ruiz, Alfonso.
 A-7057051T, Russell, Howard George.
 A-7849993, Rymer, Audrey Kate.
 A-7858181, Rymer, Norbert.
 A-6844306T, Salazar, Juan Maldonado.
 A-7388952, Salazar-Diaz, Pedro.
 A-7070690, Salcido, Ascencion.
 A-7070689, Salcido, Magdalena.
 A-7070688, Salcido, Hector.
 A-7070687, Salcido, Guadalupe.
 A-7463000, T. Sanchez, Alfredo Tapia.
 A-6050230, Sanchez-Sandoval, Eustacio.
 A-7982041, Sandoval, Juana Castellanos De.
 A-7203089, Sandoval, Maria Rufina de Jesus Rico de.
 A-7991575, Sandoval-Alapisco, Raustino.
 A-7921571, Santana, Jose Trinidad.
 A-7178311, Sarinana, Irene.
 A-6976524, Sarriz-Orozco, Manuel.
 A-6786973, Scatliffe, Leonaldo.
 A-7367040, Segoviano-Rocha, Gonzalo.
 A-7983420, Serrano-Torres, Juan.
 A-7983418, Serrano-Torres, Luz.
 A-7983419, Serrano-Torres, Margarita.
 A-6816110, Silva-Gonzalez, Guadalupe.
 A-9623189, Smith, John.
 A-7978841, Solis, Maria Petra Garcia de.
 A-7927785, Sosa, Alma Cecilia Pena De.
 A-6749266, Sosa-Medina, Juan.
 A-7222989, Sotelo, Margarita Pompa De.
 A-6428750, Stafford, Amy Dorothy.
 A-7502274T, Subia, Maria De Los Angeles Vargas De.
 A-7264385, Tapia-Millan, Victor Samuel.
 A-7145717, Tarin, Enrique.
 A-6840186, Taylor, Joseph Snape.
 A-6970260, Tejelo-Ramos, Evelio.
 A-7251944, Tena-Munoz, Jesus.
 A-6151707, Thoma-Bautista, Arturo.
 A-3479228, Tittley, Viola.
 A-7915505, Todman, Ettie Thelyn.
 A-7910928, Toro, Pablo Ramirez-del.
 A-7044378, Torres, Eduardo.
 A-7049589, Torres, Benjamin Castro De.
 A-7050975, Torres, Juan.
 A-7178378, Torres-Arellano, Luis.
 A-7081458, Trejo-Delgado, Raul.
 A-7387477, Trejo-Hernandez, Epigmenio.
 A-7137176, Treviso, Natividad.
 A-7056869, Ugaide-Sanchez, Miguel.
 A-7982226, Urigen, Luis.
 A-6995960, Urteaga, Oscar.
 A-7145334, Valdes, Andres.
 A-7145743, Valdez, Lamberto.
 A-6954117, Valencia-Murataya, Jose.
 A-6344033, Valenzuela, Jesus.
 A-7178891, Valenzuela, Ynes.
 A-7178890, Valenzuela, Nicolasa Graciela.
 A-7178889, Valenzuela, Maria De Jesus.
 A-7178888, Valenzuela, Guadalupe.
 A-7137254, Valodolid-Campos, Ramon.
 A-7240143, Vargas-Guzman, Epifanio.
 A-7267605, Vargas-Pena, Jose.
 A-7140836, Vasquez, Lucio Rodriguez.
 A-5912952, Vasquez, Meliton.
 A-8057760, Vasquez-Guzman, Jose.
 A-7145210, Vasquez-Vasquez, Trinidad.
 A-7375456, Velarde, Antonio Coronado De.
 A-6936170, Velasquez, Enrique.
 A-7049205, Enrique, Consuelo.
 A-6949203, Velasquez, Pascual.

A-7264090, Veloz, Alejandro.
 A-7083807, Venegas, Tomas.
 A-7203652, Venturo, Austreberto Quezada.
 A-7203941, Quezada, Berta Rodriguez de.
 A-7863082, Vera-Sierra, Vicente.
 A-6683032, Villa, Simon.
 A-7081463, Villalobos, Jose.
 A-6989990, Villanueva-Aguayo, Jose.
 A-7197920, Villarreal-Astorga, Albino.
 A-7178303, Villegas, Esteban.
 A-7982031, Vital-Perez, Benjamin.
 A-5968234, Webster, Samuel Arthur.
 A-7132835, Wiggan, William Alexander.
 A-7915588, Williams, Hubert George.
 A-7647826, Williams, Joseph Samuel.
 A-5929790, Williams, Mathilda Augustine.
 A-7469934, Willoughby, Leonard Anthony.
 A-1164563, Wilson, William James.
 A-7222288, Yanez-Garcia, Victor.
 A-6146645, Yang, Cynthia Norma Poon.
 A-7222325, Ybarra, Maria Reyes De.
 A-7439001, Zapata, Heriberto Mireles.
 A-7983498, Zubeldia, Federico Hill.
 A-7450257, Albin, Winsome King.
 A-7450751, Brotherton, Rupert.
 A-7222366, Cantua-Bracamonte, Jesus.
 A-7188531, Gonzalez, Juan De Dios.
 A-5934065, Juarez, Miguel.
 A-7398912, Sifuentes, Exiquilo Lopez.
 A-7985770, Nisbeth, Carol Lloyd.
 A-6402334, Patrice, Lillian Mary.
 A-7083988, Sifuentes, Pedro.
 A-7439585, Smart, Hubert.
 A-6919721, Barreto-Larios, Natividad.
 A-7083972, Contreras, Jose Luis.

The Senate concurrent resolution was concurred in.

SUSPENSION OF DEPORTATION OF CERTAIN ALIENS

The Clerk called the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 92) favoring the suspension of deportation in the case of certain aliens.

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

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the Congress favors the suspension of deportation in the case of each alien hereinafter named, in which case the Attorney General has suspended deportation for more than 6 months:

E-41708, Bravo, Juan Jose or John Bravo.
 A-6848427, Chen, Neng Kuan.
 A-7828736, Chen, Ming Li Pei.
 A-4918479, Choi, Cheng Yin or Chin Yin Toy.
 A-6949355, Chu, Grace.
 A-1139169, D'Arco, Vincenzo.
 A-5459000, Ezaki, Matsuhiko or Yuzo Kamiji.
 A-3965686, Golding, Arthur Samuel.
 A-1662032, Gomes, Pedro Fernandes.
 A-5960653, Gronberg, Richard.
 A-6836829, Herrera, Camila Montes De.
 E-5523, Hine, Louie or Louie Him or Hong or Gin or Louis Hine or Him.
 A-3690663, Hum, Tom Peter or Tom Hum.
 A-3927082, Kamimura, Chiyozo.
 0300/408451, Martins, Luis Antonio.
 A-6420723, Martins, Palmira de Conceicao nee Palmira da Conceicao Silva.
 A-7050096, Moreno, Maria Luisa Hernandez de.
 A-7050274, Moreno, Andres.
 1511/101, Natividad, Dominga Verdosa de.
 A-4598015, Perez, Jose Aurelio or Jose Aurelio Baeza Y Perez or Andrew Perez.
 E-9453, Shen, Yui Chien or Po Kang or Nelson Shen or Shen Yui Chien.
 E-9454, Shen, Alice Shi-Fang or Shih Shien (nee Shih Shien Liu or Alice Liu or Liu Shi Fang).
 A-2459840, Spadavecchia, Cosmo or Cosimo.

A-1526760, Troyanos, Nicolaos or Nicolaos John Troyanos.
 A-4422113, Aguirre-Bermudez, Vicente or Vicente Bermudez-Aguirre or Vicente Bermudez-Medrano.
 A-3982995, Aguirre, Maria De Jesus Martinez De or Maria De Jesus Martinez.
 A-6087758, Aldana, Carlos.
 A-4166099, Alexa, Joseph or Jozsep Olexov.
 A-7179099, Allen, Eugenia Kokoris.
 A-6612846, Baglaneas, Theodore Elias.
 A-3876966, Banfield, Fitzherbert or Fitzgerald Herbert.
 A-3230496, Beglita, Simon or Jack Landis.
 A-4332186, Chiappara, Francesco Paolo.
 A-1810873, Chin, Tin.
 A-6868702, Chumbris, Kyriacoula Loucoupoulou.
 E-094466, Cohen, Abraham.
 E-094472, Cohen, Lyba (nee Bell).
 A-6384625, Diaz, Juan Manuel Sola Y or Juan Manuel Sola-Diaz or Manuel Sola.
 A-1164488, Evora, Pedro Alcantara.
 A-6292555, Hilderbrandt, Hana Kanaya.
 A-9730811, Johnsen, Trygve.
 E-33273, Lara-Lastra, Alberto or Gilberto Lara-Lastra.
 0300-417576, Long, Shew Chen or Shew Chen Lang.
 A-2374221, Matsukuma, Kiyoshi.
 A-6743863, Mora-Arias, Panfilo.
 A-7125036, Ramajo, Lydia (nee Lydia Almazar).
 E-124899, Rodriguez, Natalia Galvez De.
 A-3478987, Rothwell, John Jurice.
 A-3647767, Salinas-Sigala, Alfonso.
 A-6805995, Udvarnoki, Bela.
 A-7379126, Wizenfeld, Dora.
 0300-329649, Wu, Hsia.
 A-3849604, Yow, Wong or You Wong.
 A-5876961, Zarrillo, Costanzo.
 A-3544573, Zarrillo, Maria Donata Zizza.
 A-7036297, Angelo, Richard Raymond.
 0300-258155, Black, Anthony James or James Black or Anthony James.
 0300-371226, Brathwaite, Henry Mariton or Henry Holder.
 T-1892701, Chong, Wong.
 A-6255500, Curiel-Ayala, Aristeo.
 0300-58263, Dock, Li or Hui Cheung Shun.
 0300-400090, Ekson, Larry.
 A-7903429, Espinosa, Francisca Hernandez de.
 A-7140767, Fuentes-Nava, Francisco or Francisco Nava-Fuentes or Francisco Fuentes.
 A-7445991, Gomez-Villarreal, Luis.
 A-7450111, Gomez, Teodora Conde De.
 T-2626062, Gomez-Conde, Maria Elena.
 T-2626062, Gomez-Conde, Jorge.
 T-2626062, Gomez-Conde, Jose.
 0300-420450, Gong, Henry or Gong Hen Foon.
 A-6988061, Gonzalez-Rubio, German.
 1300-119611, Howe, Virginia.
 1300-119612, Howe, Margarita.
 A-2771466, Hughes, George Fairfield.
 T-2671872, Ivanov, Charles Bill.
 E-072667, Jacobowitz, Molly formerly Rabinowitz (nee Malka (Molly) Berman).
 0900/40998, Koukiltianos, Charalambos or Haralambos or Coulentinos or Chris Collins.
 A-6139106, Kudo, Rokuichi.
 A-6139105, Kudo, Yoshiko Hasegawa.
 A-6139102, Kudo, Eigo.
 A-6139103, Okamoto, Nami (nee Kudo).
 A-6139104, Kudo, Shiro.
 1409-15290, Lagunas-Rosas, Alejo.
 1409-15291, Lagunas, Margarita Padron de.
 0300-408198, Langdon, Lawrence.
 A-2444431, Lee, Mow.
 E-056276, Lew, Peek or Peep Chung or Jimmy Lew.
 E-9273, Maczynski, Slawomir Peter Tede.
 E-905424, Man, Chang or Chang Man Yung.
 A-4849580, Miklavek, Mario or Joe Marino.
 A-7178566, Morales-Alvarez, Pedro.
 A-6432337, Perez, Maxima Adelaida (nee Henriquez).
 A-1026803, Power, Winston Lionel.

T-2672136, Riemer, Detlef Robert or Robert Launder.
 A-7450836, Rodriguez-Castillo, Ascencion.
 A-1018591, Sanchez, Jose or Jose Sanchez Celis or Nemesio Navarro or Memesio Navarro Gireto.
 A-5624444, Santos, Trifona or Tryphon Santos or Tom Lido.
 A-9689295, Seerat, Salim Bin Haji or Salim Seerat.
 A-3771460, Seretis, Despina.
 A-1770227, Sokolowski, August.
 A-6273964, Talamantez, Benita Prado De.
 0300-285857, Wong, George or Wong Yee.
 T-1892486, Wong, Koa Nel.
 V-591428, Wong, Sio Zea or Sio Zea San.
 A-9575148, Berasategui, Francisco.
 A-7828285, Berman, Laila Liliane (nee Shalom).
 0300/118691, Betancourt, Bernardo Buena-ventura.
 A-5557699, Chong, Jick or Chong Yick or Chong Ten or Jung Ten or Chong Soo Ten.
 0800-95470, Conner, Alma.
 V-1183602, Doo, Vee Sing.
 A-5468256, Goodell, Laura Beatrice or Laura Beatrice Rickley.
 A-5525131, Goodspeed, Marian Bertha.
 A-4855254, Hamilton, Tugela Violet May (nee Jeremy).
 A-2665726, Hernandez, Elena Garcia de or Elena Moya or Elena Moya de Hernandez or Elena Garcia.
 0900-37855, Jager, Marceline Helen (nee Doeseckle).
 A-7980253, Macias-Martinez, Estreberto.
 A-7802062, Mendez, Miguel Mendoza.
 A-9764791, Miha, Ebrahim or Ebrahim Miha.
 A-7898789, Morales, Luz Maria Logrono de.
 A-574834, Pritchitt, Albert Fredrick.
 A-7463609, Santos, Maria Cristina De.
 A-7463610, Santos, Maria Victoria Ramona De.
 A-5967458, Shimabukuro, Takichi.
 A-6161509, Shimabukuro, Matsui.
 A-2473130, Sklavounos, Spyros Dennis or Spyros Gerasimos Sklaveunos.
 A-7056495, Stathakos, Payayotis N.
 A-7068019, Stathakos, Hippolyta.
 A-6019501, Tamez, Reynaldo Rodriguez or Reynaldo Rodriguez.
 A-5476563, Togisala, Simi or Simi Taualli.
 A-5642023, Tsuboi, Iwaichi.
 A-9024705, Ulrich, Anthony or Anton Ulrich or Anton Ulric or Orlic.
 A-5886869, Williams, Moses.
 A-4125218, Wong, Him or Wong Hing.
 0803-6809, Zamudio, Juan Zamaripas.
 A-4664137, Bencivenga, Tambaro or Tammaro Bencivenga.
 A-7500672, Bruyn, Thomas Deynem Matthijs De.
 A-4750806, Dalal, Rustom Hormusji.
 A-7927502, Felix-Escobedo, Alberto or Albert Felix.
 A-9769394, Goni, Abdul.
 A-6640245, Gonzalez-Cisneros, Luis.
 A-5088694, Gonzalez-Irvin, Arturo or Arthur Martinez or Cliff Glen or Harry Gonzalez or Tony J. Camacho.
 A-6261625, Gregoriou, Androniki.
 E-082291, Henderson, George.
 A-4444592, Heyamoto, Toshiro.
 A-7027973, Hsu, Yun Fong or Brenda Mary Hsu.
 A-6319225, Katsouros, Nicholas.
 A-6319226, Katsouros, Emmanuel.
 A-3264569, Kornoff, William Alexander.
 A-6921628, Li, Sing Chung.
 E-079716, Magarian, Antranik.
 A-9128479, Malay, Geminiano.
 A-9625360, Manolakis, George.
 A-5409188, Moninger, Stephen or Stefan Moninger or Earl Wilhelm Moninger.
 A-5967502, Nashiro, Shisho.
 A-5884554, Ornelas, Melquiades.
 A-7469919, Ospina, Arnold.
 A-6168371, Pelayo, Junior, Jose Luis.
 T-1496851, Pelayo, Maria Beatriz.
 T-1496852, Pelayo, Javier M.

A-6535301, Pelayo, Margarita M.
 0900/64624, Pineda, Justino Escobar.
 0300-390645, Power, John William.
 A-6934595, Prescod, Vera Velveteen or Vera Velveteen Fields Haywood or Vera Haywood.
 A-5156312, Provencher, Lucien E.
 A-1281505, Pytel, Pavlo or Paul.
 E-20554, Reame, Antonio.
 E-20000, Reame, Nancy.
 0300-357987, Seng, Quock Bond or Quock Cheung.
 A-4963183, Solis, Dolores Martinez de or Dolores Martinez de Gonzalez.
 0900/60343, Solis-Luna, Jose Santos.
 A-7180027, Sulyi, Andre Janos.
 A-7180028, Sulyi, Emilia Mullner.
 1600-108124, Tamayo-Lopez, Ruben.
 E-905094, Tatanis, Alexandria.
 A-6610922T, Thompson, Hurbir or John Clayton Oliver.
 A-7387955, Yuan, Shao-Yuen.
 A-2636089, Zavala, Paula Arenas Beltran de.
 A-6040375, Afzal, Mir.
 E-33872, Bolshakoff, Victor Grigoriy or Victor Larsen.
 A-4799003, Chiarella, Thomas or Tomas.
 A-6854505, Chin, Chang or Chun Cheng or Cheung Cheng or Chin Chang or Cheng Chun Sang.
 A-6819554, Clark, Vivian (nee Meade).
 0300-279088, Czajkowski, Stefan Josef or Stefan Josef Grzesik.
 A-5450342, Delli, Mario or Dello.
 A-4442876, Dorf, Stella Beatrice (nee Egurin).
 E-087755, Farrell, Helen Frances (nee Mlsener).
 A-6819114, Feiner, Sara or Sara Grunzweig.
 A-4894017, Fekete, Frank or Ferenc Kekete.
 A-4961721, Flores, Elvira Martinez de.
 T-2760497, Gabriel, Rafael Labeza.
 A-6512394, Garcia-Carasco, Martiniano.
 A-6693060, Garcia, Consuelo Lizarraga de.
 A-9767729, Grando, Cornelis Eugene or Cornelius E. Grando or Cornelius Grando or Eddie Grando.
 A-3987793, Higa, Shinzo.
 A-7882765, Hsu, Dickie Ping.
 E-075569, Jew, Wong Lai Ying.
 E-079570, Jew, Mona.
 E-087605, Kan, Lee or Gin Lee.
 A-6510550, Knall, Wilhelmine.
 A-7486946, Kuo, Agnes Kan Ping or Ping Kan.
 A-2828835, Lee, Kum or Gum Lee.
 A-4946369, Louis, Andre or Goung Sam.
 1300-122543, Lourdes-Rivera, Maria de.
 A-6620355, Manuellan, Margaret Florence (nee Bishop).
 0300-253643, Manuellan, Robert or Robert Mihan Manuellan.
 T-2671947, Michel-Preciado, Jose.
 A-6261593, Mohr, Elembre or Siforos Olympia Moore or Olimpia Muratti.
 0900-59324, Moore, Vernon Alfonso.
 E-083528, Osen, Anton or Anton H. J. Osen.
 A-3359890, Pagador, Isabelo Padua.
 A-9569986, Pang, Chu or Gee Hog Pang or Gee Hog Pan.
 T-2760441, Paz-Gomez, Gabriel De La.
 T-2760438, Paz, Maria De Jesus Lopez De La.
 T-282078, Piazza, Lois Anita or Anita Ethel Ellis or Anita Rosalie Murch or Lois Elaine James.
 A-3552213, Pong, Tung.
 A-9742097T, Rasmussen, Erik Johannes.
 0900/58314, Rodriguez-Martinez, Ramon.
 A-7841500T, Sankovich, Miro.
 E-086535, Scoufopoulos, Dora Constantine or Dorothea C. Scoufopoulos (nee Doufeti).
 E-086536, Scoufopoulos, Niki Maria.
 1600-101921, Serrano-Ramirez, Florentino.
 A-4789531, Stampolas, Nicholas.
 A-5977654, Tawara, Mitsutaro.
 A-6162289, Tawara, Kiwa.
 A-6162284, Tawara, Paula Sumiko.
 A-6162285, Tawara, Juan Akio.
 A-6162286, Tawara, Susana Kiyoko.

A-6162288, Tawara, Toshiharu or Toshiharu Adolph Tawara.
 A-6162287, Tawara, Victor Toshimitsu.
 A-7984782, Valdez, Maria Luisa Garibay-Arzate de.
 E-48172, Valle-Veytia, Rosa Luz.
 A-7222282, Velasco-Esqueda, Carlos.
 T-302969, Villalobos-Alvillar, Santiago.
 A-7228784, Wust, Klaus German.
 A-7289028, Wust, Marlene (nee Haumann).
 0300-413932, Yzaguirra, Anselmo.
 E-33938, Aloise, Francesco or Frank.
 A-4135951, Alvarez, Jose Perez or Jose Perez or Jose Peda.
 T-1496830, Amaya-Varela, Ramon.
 0300-363553, Awad, Abou Bakr.
 V-150975, Azrak, Adele (nee Kralem).
 E-6939, Chun, Vung-Kwan or Victor Chun.
 A-7264793, Dacosta, Alfred George or Cullio Del Valle.
 A-7821401, Delaney, August or Gus De Leones or Kostos Teleones.
 T-1506077, Ferreira, Ramon or Ramon Ferreira Hermida.
 0900-65223, Fiordiroso, Dominick or Vincenzo Fiordiroso.
 A-7978692, Garcia-Dena, Paulin.
 0900-64707, Guzman, Juan Eleucadio de San Antonio Martinez or Antonio Martinez Guzman or Alfredo Martinez.
 A-7198814, Kim, Sook Chong.
 A-6965059, Leon, Ernestina Garza de.
 A-8022384, Medina-Amador, Jose.
 A-4594891, Mitsuya, Akira.
 A-1184641, Park, Maria or Maria Lin-Pack or Kyong Ock or Oak.
 0900-63931, Saldana, Augustin Perez.
 T-303859, Sezen, Vecihi Sermet.
 1407-2425, Silva-Gonzalez, Martin.
 A-6704301, Agraz-Ochoa, Alfonso Enrique or Alfredo Agraz.
 A-4055563, Feinberg, Sarah.
 A-6504425, Gaduang, Senena Evaristo.
 1409-9991, Gonzalez-Salinas, Benito.
 1409-9992, Gonzalez, Hipolita Lugo de.
 A-7381350, Harrigan, Leonora or Lee Leonara Harrigan.
 E-084964, Hausan, Kanian or Kanian.
 1049-14463, Jimenez, Guadalupe Trevino de.
 T-2671878, Kong, Rose Joe or Mrs. Chan Look.
 E-36302, Larsen, Luba.
 A-7961348, Leifer, Beresl.
 0300-403512, Leifer, Serena.
 A-7886271, Levenbook, Alessandra Lucia.
 E-086791, Perez, Angel Pedro Pascual.
 E-082996, Rigos, Spiros Sotiri or Spiros S. Rigos or Sam Tigos.
 A-9505901, Santos, John Ricardo Dos or John Andria or John Hendrick.
 A-6096240, Tavsani, Hulul.
 A-8008810, Valencia-Avila, Gildardo or Gildardo Avila-Valencia.
 A-6747848, Wilson, Angelina.
 0300-405015, Cominos, Spyros or Spyros.
 V-321499, Fernandez, Maria Francisca Babio-Suarez De nee Maria Francisca Babio-Suarez.
 V-884966, Hsu, Kee Ming or Ming Kee Hsu or Thomas Hsu.
 A-7991810, Hsu, Mrs. Kee Ming nee Lai Mai Chou or Chu Lei Mai or Chou Lai Mai or Daisey Hsu or Chow Lai Mai.
 A-6379694, Lee, Laura or Wan Ho Chao Lee.
 A-6149070, Lee, Shu-Ching.
 A-7450671, Szaja, Mordka.
 A-7910983, Szaja, Toni.
 V-693113, Singer, Josef.
 V-379740, Singer, Vera (nee Verona Stein).
 A-6757009, Skarzynski, Alexis Edouard De.
 A-7184237, Arra, Esa Qultimo.
 E-6999, Arra, Kettu Serafina.
 0300-415564, Beecher, Henry Ward or George McLean or Leslie Bell.
 A-6899540, Beinhauer, Karel Vladimir.
 A-6699541, Beinhauer, Maria Alexandra nee Neumann.
 A-6912306, Papadakos, Stavroula or Stella.

With the following committee amendment:

On page 6, strike out all of line 20.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The Senate concurrent resolution was concurred in.

OTMAR SPRAH

The Clerk called the bill (S. 231) for the relief of Otmar Sprah.

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

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Otmar Sprah shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon the payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

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.

LAND PATENT TO CERTAIN LANDS IN COUNTY OF KAUAI, T. H., FOR SCHOOL PURPOSES

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 8736) to authorize the issuance of a land patent to certain public lands, situate in the county of Kauai, T. H., for school purposes.

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

Be it enacted, etc., That the commissioner of public lands of the Territory of Hawaii be authorized to issue a land patent to the Roman Catholic bishop of Honolulu, a corporation sole, covering the following described lands:

Lot 40, Kapaa house lots, Kapaa, district of Puna (which includes the Kawaihau District) county of Kauai, T. H.; said land to be used for school purposes.

With the following committee amendment:

Strike all of lines 3 to 6, inclusive, and insert in lieu thereof "That with the consent of the Governor of the Territory of Hawaii the commissioner of public lands of said Territory is authorized to issue a land patent to the Roman Catholic bishop of Honolulu, a corporation sole, covering the following described lands."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

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

CONVEYANCE OF CERTAIN REAL PROPERTY IN BOX ELDER COUNTY, UTAH

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 6451) to provide for the conveyance to Robert Ward Morgan and others of certain real property in Box Elder County, Utah.

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

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior is authorized and directed to

convey to Robert Ward Morgan, Willard, Utah, upon payment of an amount equal to \$2.50 an acre, all of the right, title, and interest of the United States in and to two tracts of real property situated in Box Elder County, Utah. Such tracts of real property contain a total of approximately thirty-one and fifty-six one-hundredths acres and are more particularly described as follows:

(1) Tract No. 57A in section 21, township 8 north, range 2 west, Salt Lake meridian, Box Elder County, Utah; and

(2) Tract No. 57B in section 22, township 8 north, range 2 west, Salt Lake meridian, Box Elder County, Utah.

Sec. 2. The Secretary of the Interior is authorized and directed to convey to Robert Ward Morgan, Willard, Utah, upon payment of an amount equal to \$2.50 an acre, all of the right, title, and interest of the United States in and to a tract of real property situated in Box Elder County, Utah. Such tract of real property contains approximately three and thirty-one one-hundredths acres and is more particularly described as follows: Tract No. 52A in section 22, township 8 north, range 2 west, Salt Lake meridian, Box Elder County, Utah.

With the following committee amendment:

Strike all after the enacting clause and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"That subject to the requirements of this act, the Secretary of the Interior shall issue patents to the occupants of the public lands in sections 9, 10, 15, 16, 21, 22, 27 and 28, T. 8 N., R. 2 W., Salt Lake Meridian, Utah, upon payment of the appraised value of the lands at the date of the appraisal, exclusive of any increased value resulting from the development or improvement of the lands by the occupants or their predecessors in interest. In such appraisal, the Secretary of the Interior shall consider and give full effect to the equities of the occupants."

"Sec. 2. The Secretary of the Interior shall issue a patent for such land to any occupant only if the occupant (1) files an application to purchase the lands within one year after the enactment of this act; (2) makes a showing satisfactory to the Secretary that he or his predecessors in interest were bona fide occupants of the tract and had adverse possession for 7 years prior to the approval of the plat survey of the lands; and (3) pays the price of the lands, as required by the Secretary."

"Sec. 3. Nothing in this act shall be construed as affecting adversely valid existing rights to public lands."

"Sec. 4. Any money paid by the occupants shall be covered into the reclamation fund for credit against the construction costs of the Weber Basin project, Utah. If any of these lands are needed by the United States for the said project, the Secretary may declare the lands forfeited and return to the United States upon tender of payment for such lands of the amount paid by the occupant to the United States under this act plus the reasonable value of the improvements in place at the time the land is patented. Such tender and payment shall be made from the reclamation fund."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

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

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill to provide for the conveyance of certain public lands in Utah to the occupants of the land."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

RELIEF OF WALTER W. FLORA AND MILDRED L. FLORA

The Clerk called the resolution (H. Res. 659) providing for sending to the United States Court of Claims the bill (H. R. 9334) for the relief of Walter W. Flora and Mildred L. Flora, doing business as Flora Engineering Co.

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

Resolved, That the bill (H. R. 9334) entitled "A bill for the relief of Walter W. Flora and Mildred L. Flora, doing business as Flora Engineering Co.," together with all accompanying papers, is hereby referred to the United States Court of Claims pursuant to sections 1492 and 2509 of title 28, United States Code; and said court shall proceed expeditiously with the same in accordance with the provisions of said sections and report to the House, at the earliest practicable date, giving such findings of fact and conclusions thereon as shall be sufficient to inform the Congress of the nature and character of the demand, as a claim legal or equitable, against the United States, and the amount, if any, legally or equitably due from the United States to the claimant.

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

MARKO RIBIC

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3665) for the relief of Marko Ribic.

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

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of sections 101 (a) (27) (A) and 205 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, the minor child Marko Ribic, shall be held and considered to be the natural-born alien child of George Ignac Yarnevic and Cecelia Magdalene Yarnevic, citizens of the United States.

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

EKEA JAHNS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 6149) for the relief of Ekea Jahns.

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

Be it enacted, etc., That, in the administration of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Ekea Jahns, the fiancée of Max G. Fidler, a citizen of the United States, shall be eligible for a visa as a nonimmigrant temporary visitor for a period of 3 months: *Provided*, That the administrative authorities find that the said Ekea Jahns is coming to the United States with a bona fide intention of being married to the said Max G. Fidler and that she is found admissible under the Immigration and Nationality Act other than the provisions of section 212 (a) (9) of that act: *Provided*, That this exemption shall apply only to a ground for exclusion of which the Department of State or the Department of Justice have knowledge prior to the enactment of this act.

In the event the marriage between the above-named persons does not occur within 3 months after the entry of the said Ekea Jahns, she shall be required to depart from the United States and upon failure to do so shall be deported in accordance with the provisions of sections 242 and 243 of the Immigration and Nationality Act. In the event that the marriage between the above-named persons shall occur within 3 months after

the entry of the said Ekea Jahns, the Attorney General is authorized and directed to record the lawful admission for permanent residence of the said Ekea Jahns as of the date of the payment by her of the required visa fee.

With the following committee amendments:

On page 1, line 11, insert a period after the word "act" and strike out the remainder of line 11.

On page 2, strike out lines 1, 2, 3, and 4.

The committee amendments were agreed to.

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

ROGER FEGHALI

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 7987) for the relief of Roger Feghali.

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

Be it enacted, etc., That for the purposes of section 5 (a) of the Refugee Relief Act of 1953, Roger Feghali shall be held and considered to be under 10 years of age.

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

MRS. DIANA P. KITTRELL

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 8371) for the relief of Mrs. Diana P. Kittrell.

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

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of \$500 to Mrs. Diana P. Kittrell of 1434 Wieland Avenue, Chicago, Ill., in full settlement of all claims against the United States as reimbursement for bond posted for her natural niece and adopted daughter, Denesse Jennifer Brown: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

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

SUZANNE L'HEUREUX

The Clerk read the bill (H. R. 8694) for the relief of Suzanne L'Heureux.

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

Be it enacted, etc., That, notwithstanding the provision of section 212 (a) (9) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Suzanne L'Heureux may be admitted to the United States for permanent residence if she is found to be otherwise admissible under the provisions of that act: *Provided*, That she marries her United States citizen fiancée, Sgt. James E. Jones, not later than 6 months after the date of enactment of this act: *Provided further*, That this exemption shall apply only

to a ground for exclusion of which the Department of State or the Department of Justice had knowledge prior to the enactment of this act.

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

ROBERT FRANCIS SYMONS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 8812) for the relief of Robert Francis Symons.

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

Be it enacted, etc., That Robert Francis Symons, of Bishop, Calif., is hereby relieved of all liability to pay to the United States any and all amounts which are due from or payable by the said Robert Francis Symons to the United States under a judgment entered against him by the United States District Court for the Southern District of California, Northern Division (United States of America, plaintiff, against Robert Francis Symons, defendant, civil action No. 783 ND).

Such civil action arose out of the conditional sale of a surplus aircraft by the War Assets Administration to the said Robert Francis Symons.

With the following committee amendment:

Line 6 after the word "States" strike out "under a judgment entered against him by the United States District Court for the Southern District of California, Northern Division (United States of America, plaintiff, against Robert Francis Symons, defendant, civil action No. 783-ND). Such civil action arose out of" and insert in lieu thereof the following: "for the unpaid balance due on."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

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

PAUL JAMES PATRIE

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 9029) for the relief of Paul James Patrie.

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

Be it enacted, etc., That, notwithstanding the provision of section 212 (a) (6) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Paul James Patrie may be admitted to the United States for permanent residence if he is found to be otherwise admissible under the provisions of such Act: *Provided*, That a suitable and proper bond or undertaking, approved by the Attorney General, be deposited as prescribed by section 213 of such act.

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

INGEBORG ELIZABETH DAVIS (NEE EISENREIDER)

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 9440) for the relief of Ingeborg Elizabeth Davis (nee Eisenreider).

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

Be it enacted, etc., That, notwithstanding the provision of section 212 (a) (9) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Ingeborg

Elizabeth Davis (nee Eisenreider) may be admitted to the United States for permanent residence if she is found to be otherwise admissible under the provisions of that act: *Provided*, That this exemption shall apply only to a ground for exclusion of which the Department of State or the Department of Justice had knowledge prior to the enactment of this act.

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

ELISABETH HOEFT

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 9496) for the relief of Elisabeth Hoeft.

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

Be it enacted, etc., That, notwithstanding the provisions of section 212 (a) (9) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Elisabeth Hoeft may be admitted to the United States for permanent residence if she is found to be otherwise admissible under the provisions of that act: *Provided*, That this exemption shall apply only to a ground for exclusion of which the Department of State or the Department of Justice had knowledge prior to the enactment of this act.

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

JOSEPH FLURY PALUY

The Clerk called the bill (S. 65) for the relief of Joseph Flury Paluy.

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

Be it enacted, etc., That, notwithstanding the provision of section 212 (a) (9) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Joseph Flury Paluy may be admitted to the United States for permanent residence if he is found to be otherwise admissible under the provisions of that act.

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.

ALICE MASARYK

The Clerk called the bill (S. 1212) for the relief of Alice Masaryk.

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

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Alice Masaryk shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

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.

ESTHER SAPORTA

The Clerk called the bill (S. 1000) for the relief of Esther Saporta.

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

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Esther Saporta shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

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.

MALY BRAUNSTEIN AND AURELIA RAPPAFORT

The Clerk called the bill (S. 2176) for the relief of Maly Braunstein and Aurelia Rappaport.

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

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Maly Braunstein and Aurelia Rappaport shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fees. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such aliens as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct the required numbers from the appropriate quota or quotas for the first year that such quota or quotas are available.

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.

LUIGI CICCHINELLI

The Clerk called the bill (S. 2257) for the relief of Luigi Cicchinelli.

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

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Luigi Cicchinelli shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

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.

IRMA MUELLER KOEHLER COBBAN

The Clerk called the bill (S. 2295) for the relief of Irma Mueller Koehler Cobban.

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

Be it enacted, etc., That, notwithstanding the provisions of section 212 (a) (9) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Irma Mueller Koehler Cobban may be admitted to the United States for permanent residence if she is found to be otherwise admissible under the provisions of such act: *Provided*,

That this exemption shall apply only to a ground for exclusion of which the Department of State or the Department of Justice has knowledge prior to the enactment of this act.

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.

ALPHONSUS DEVLIN

The Clerk called the bill (S. 2340) for the relief of Alphonsus Devlin.

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

Be it enacted, etc., That, notwithstanding the provisions of subsections (9) and (19) of section 212 (a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Alphonsus Devlin may be admitted to the United States for permanent residence if he is found to be otherwise admissible under the provisions of that act: *Provided*, That this exemption shall apply only to a ground for exclusion of which the Department of State or the Department of Justice has knowledge prior to the enactment of this act.

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.

FRANTISEK VYBORNÝ

The Clerk called the bill (S. 2448) for the relief of Frantisek Vyborný.

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

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Frantisek Vyborný shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act: *Provided*, That a suitable bond or undertaking, approved by the Attorney General, be deposited as prescribed by section 213 of the said act.

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.

FRANCISCO VASQUEZ-DOPAZO (FRANK VASQUEZ)

The Clerk called the bill (S. 2469) for the relief of Francisco Vasquez-Dopazo (Frank Vasquez).

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

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Francisco Vasquez-Dopazo (Frank Vasquez) shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act upon payment of the required visa fee.

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.

INGEBORG BOGNER JOHNSON

The Clerk called the bill (S. 2493) for the relief of Ingeborg Bogner Johnson.

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

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act,

Ingeborg Bogner Johnson shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee: *Provided*, That a suitable and proper bond or undertaking, approved by the Attorney General, be deposited as prescribed by section 213 of the said act.

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.

ELISA ALBERTINA CIOCCIO RIGAZZI OR ELISA CIOCCIO

The Clerk called the bill (S. 2504) for the relief of Elisa Albertina Cioccio Rigazzi or Elisa Cioccio.

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

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the immigration and naturalization laws, Elisa Albertina Cioccio Rigazzi or Elisa Cioccio shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provide for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

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.

MRS. OVEIDA MOHRKE AND HER SON, GERARD MOHRKE

The Clerk called the bill (S. 3514) for the relief of Mrs. Oveida Mohrke and her son, Gerard Mohrke.

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

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Mrs. Oveida Mohrke and her son, Gerard Mohrke, shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fees. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such aliens as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct two numbers from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

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.

ALFIO CAPIZZI

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 9814) for the relief of Alfio Capizzi.

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

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Alfio Capizzi shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate

quota for the first year that such quota is available.

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

WILLIAM T. DORMINY

The Clerk called the resolution (H. Res. 684) for the relief of William T. Dorminy.

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

Resolved, That the bill (H. R. 10017) entitled "A bill for the relief of William T. Dorminy," together with all accompanying papers is hereby referred to the United States Court of Claims pursuant to sections 1492 and 2509 of title 28, United States Code; and said court shall proceed expeditiously with the same in accordance with the provisions of said sections and report to the House, at the earliest practicable date, giving such findings of fact and conclusions thereon as shall be sufficient to inform the Congress of the nature and character of the demand, as a claim legal or equitable, against the United States, and the amount, if any, legally or equitably due from the United States to the claimant.

The House resolution was agreed to, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PAULINE H. CORBETT

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 6531) for the relief of Pauline H. Corbett.

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

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Pauline H. Corbett, Charleston, W. Va., the sum of \$30,000. Payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims of the said Pauline H. Corbett against the United States on account of severe personal injuries and disabilities sustained by her as a result of an overdosage of streptomycin which she received while a patient at the Tokyo Army Hospital, Tokyo, Japan, from November 2 to November 28, 1950, as a civilian employee of the General Headquarters, Far East Command, United States Army, engaged in a nonappropriated fund activity. Since the said Pauline H. Corbett was a civilian employee of the General Headquarters, Far East Command, who was paid from nonappropriated funds, she is not eligible for the benefits of the Federal Employees' Compensation Act, as amended. No part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 6, strike out "\$30,000" and insert "\$18,716.97."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

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

ROBERT H. WEBSTER

The Clerk called the bill (S. 384) for the relief of Robert H. Webster.

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

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Robert W. Webster, a money-order clerk in the Moscow, Idaho, post office, the sum of \$100, the amount refunded to the United States by the said Robert H. Webster as a result of a deficiency in his account caused by the loss, on May 22, 1952, of a money order in the amount of \$100: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

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

KARL L. VON SCHLIEDER

The Clerk called the bill (S. 1216) for the relief of Karl L. von Schlieder.

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

Be it enacted, etc., That Karl L. von Schlieder, a librarian at Fitzsimons Army Hospital, Denver, Colo., is hereby relieved of all indebtedness to the United States by reason of the failure, during the period from July 1, 1947, to January 1, 1953, on the part of the Veterans' Administration and the Air Force Finance Center, Denver, Colo., to reduce, pursuant to section 212 of the act of June 30, 1932, as amended (47 Stat. 406) (limiting the amount of retired pay of certain commissioned officers holding positions under the U. S. Government) the amounts payable to the said Karl L. von Schlieder as a retired commissioned officer of the Air Force while he was employed as a librarian at such hospital.

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.

WILLIAM B. BAKER AND DON P. FANKHAUSER

The Clerk called the bill (S. 1434) for the relief of William B. Baker and Don P. Fankhauser.

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

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to William B. Baker, of Seattle, Wash., the sum of \$64.25 and to Don P. Fankhauser, of Alexandria, Va., the sum of \$72 in full satisfaction of all claims of the said claimants against the United States for reimbursement for personal property lost when the boat they were using in the course of their duties as fishery aides for the Fish and Wildlife Service, Department of the Interior, capsized during a storm while tied up off False Point Pybus, Admiralty Island, Alaska, on August 26, 1950, without fault on their part: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act shall be paid or delivered to or received

by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

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

LT. COL. GEORGE P. PRICE

The Clerk called the bill (S. 1615) for the relief of Lt. Col. George P. Price.

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

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to George P. Price, lieutenant colonel, Finance Corps, Army of the United States, the sum of \$401.30 in full satisfaction of his claim against the United States for reimbursement of the amount paid by him in settlement of the charge entered on his account by reason of the erroneous payment of such sum upon a forged voucher on October 13, 1948, at the Army Medical Center, Washington, D. C., while he was finance officer at such medical center: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

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

CLAIR F. BOWMAN

The Clerk called the bill (S. 1757) for the relief of Clair F. Bowman.

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

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Clair F. Bowman (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army Reserve), of Cody, Wyo., the sum of \$535.10, in full satisfaction of his claims against the United States for pay and allowances which he would have received had the effective date of his relief from active duty been properly adjusted to take into account the period from November 26, 1945, to December 22, 1945, during which he was hospitalized while on terminal leave, and for mileage allowance for travel incurred in returning from the hospital to his home in Lincoln, Nebr.: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

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

FRED AND BERNICE EHLERS

The Clerk called the bill (S. 1795) for the relief of Fred and Bernice Ehlers.

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

Be it enacted, etc., That, in the administration of section 322 of the Internal Revenue Code (relating to refunds and credits), the claim for refund of income tax for the taxable year ending December 31, 1948, mailed by Fred and Bernice Ehlers, of Hettinger, N. Dak., on March 15, 1952, and received in the office of the director of internal revenue, Fargo, N. Dak., on March 19, 1952, shall be held and considered to have been filed within the 3-year period referred to in section 322 (b) (1) of the Internal Revenue Code.

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.

LT. COL. CARL E. WELCHNER, UNITED STATES AIR FORCE

The Clerk called the bill (S. 1925) for the relief of Lt. Col. Carl E. Welchner, United States Air Force.

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

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Lt. Col. Carl E. Welchner, United States Air Force, the sum of \$735, in full satisfaction of all claims against the United States for compensation for additional per diem payments, such sum representing the amount the said Lieutenant Colonel Welchner would have received had he been permitted to receive per diem payments for the time in excess of 30 days that he spent on temporary duty in connection with Army Air Force labor relations and manpower requirements with the Boeing Aircraft Co., between February and June 1944: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

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

TERRENCE WALLER

The Clerk called the bill (S. 2147) for the relief of Terrence Waller.

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

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Terrence Waller, captain, United States Marine Corps Reserve (O34032), of Challis, Idaho, the sum of \$340.79 in full satisfaction of his claim against the United States for active-duty pay for, and all allowances incident to, active service rendered by him between June 12, 1952, and July 25, 1952, which pay and allowances have not been paid to him because of the revocation, through administrative error, of his orders for active duty in conformity with a United States Marine Corps communication dated July 15, 1952: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appro-

priated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 2, line 4, after "act", strike out "in excess of 10 percent thereof."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

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

MRS. CARL DOBRATZ

The Clerk called the bill (S. 2240) for the relief of Mrs. Carl Dobratz.

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

Be it enacted, etc., That Mrs. Carl Dobratz, of Redfield, S. Dak., is hereby relieved of all liability to pay to the United States the sum of \$161.17, representing payments erroneously made to her as a class E allottee for the period July 1 to December 31, 1945, incident to the service in the Army of her son, Lloyd Dobratz.

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.

WALTER P. SYLVESTER

The Clerk called the bill (S. 2266) for the relief of Walter P. Sylvester.

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

Be it enacted, etc., That, notwithstanding the limitation upon the time for filing claims under section 20 of the Federal Employees' Compensation Act, Walter P. Sylvester, of Rutland, Mass., may, within 6 months after the date of enactment of this act, file a claim under such section for compensation for disability incurred by him as a result of an injury sustained while he was employed at the Boston Naval Shipyard from June 1943 to January 1945.

Mr. JONAS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. JONAS of Illinois: Page 1, line 8, after "disability", insert "allegedly."

At the end of the bill insert: "*Provided*, That no benefits shall accrue except hospital and medical expenses prior to the enactment of this act."

The amendments were agreed to.

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

MRS. S. EUGENE LAMB

The Clerk called the bill (S. 2455) for the relief of Mrs. S. Eugene Lamb.

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

Be it enacted, etc., That Mrs. S. Eugene Lamb, of Rockland, Maine, is hereby relieved of liability to the United States in the

amount of \$496.75, representing the amount charged her for treatment at the Veterans' Administration Center at Togus, Maine, for an illness which occurred while she was serving as a gray lady at such center: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

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

JOSEPH V. CRIMI

The Clerk called the bill (S. 2553) for the relief of Joseph V. Crimi, father of the minor child, Joseph Crimi.

Mr. BONIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill may be passed over without prejudice.

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

There was no objection.

ROBERT LEE WILLIAMS

The Clerk called the bill (S. 2693) for the relief of Robert Lee Williams.

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

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is directed and authorized to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of \$5,000 to Robert Lee Williams, of Feather Falls, Calif., in full satisfaction of his claim against the United States for permanent injuries sustained by him as a minor while attending the Seneca Indian School in the year 1937: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 10, after "act", strike out "in excess of 10 percent thereof."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

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

JOSEPH H. HEDMARK, JR.

The Clerk called the bill (S. 2823) for the relief of Joseph H. Hedmark, Jr.

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

Be it enacted, etc., That, Joseph H. Hedmark, Jr., of Chicago, Ill., an employee of the Air Force, is relieved of all liability to refund to the United States the sum of \$1,023.73, representing overpayments of salary paid to him during the period from March 1951 through August 1953, as a result of administrative error.

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.

THOMAS F. HARNEY, JR.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 10067) for the relief of Thomas F. Harney, Jr., doing business as the Harney Engineering Co.

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

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Thomas F. Harney, Jr., doing business as the Harney Engineering Co., the sum of \$13,439.84. The payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims of said Thomas F. Harney, Jr., for alleged losses suffered by him as the plumbing and heating subcontractor under two lump-sum contracts between the United States, acting through the Army Quartermaster Corps, and D. A. Sullivan & Sons, Inc., which provided for the construction of building installation including 30 barracks at Fort Devens, Mass., during the fall and winter of 1940-41, the United States Court of Claims (congressional Nos. 17860 and 17861, decided July 13, 1954, pursuant to S. Res. 152 and 165, 81st Cong., 1st sess.) having found that the United States received substantial benefits from the work and efforts of claimant: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

Mr. JONAS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. JONAS of Illinois: Page 2, line 10, strike out "in excess of 10 percent thereof."

The amendment was agreed to.

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

LEWIS ROLAND EDWARDS

The Clerk called the bill (S. 53) for the relief of Lewis Roland Edwards.

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

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Lewis Roland Edwards shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act upon payment of the required visa fee.

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.

ANNI WOLF

The Clerk called the bill (S. 771) for the relief of Anni Wolf and her minor son.

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

Be it enacted, etc., That, in the administration of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Anni Wolf, the fiancée of John A. Vink, a citizen of the United States, and her minor son, Alfred Wolf, shall be eligible for visas as nonimmigrant temporary visitors for a period of 3 months: *Provided*, That the administrative authorities find that the said Anni Wolf is coming to the United States with a bona fide intention of being married to the said John A. Vink and that they are found otherwise admissible under the immigration laws. In the event the marriage between the above-named persons does not occur within 3 months after the entry of the said Anni Wolf and her minor son, they shall be required to depart from the United States and upon failure to do so shall be deported in accordance with the provisions of sections 242 and 243 of the Immigration and Nationality Act. In the event that the marriage between the above persons shall occur within 3 months after the entry of the said Anni Wolf and her minor son, the Attorney General is authorized and directed to record the lawful admission for permanent residence of the said Anni Wolf and her minor son as of the date of the payment by them of the required visa fees.

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.

FRANK (FRANZ) HOMOLKA ET AL.

The Clerk called the bill (S. 2210) for the relief of Frank (Franz) Homolka, Olga Homolka (nee Mandel), Adolf Homolka, Helga Maria Homolka, and Frieda Homolka.

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

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Frank (Franz) Homolka, Olga Homolka (nee Mandel), Adolf Homolka, Helga Maria Homolka, and Frieda Homolka shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act.

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.

JEANNETTE KALKER AND ABRAHAM BENJAMIN KALKER

The Clerk called the bill (S. 2512) for the relief of Jeannette Kalker and Abraham Benjamin Kalker.

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

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of sections 203 (a) (3) and 205 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, the minor children, Jeannette Kalker and Abraham Benjamin Kalker, shall be held and considered to be the natural-born alien children of Mr. Abraham Benjamin Konijn, a lawful permanent resident of the United States, and his wife.

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.

KANG CHAY WON

The Clerk called the bill (S. 3306) for the relief of Kang Chay Won.

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

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of sections 101 (a) (27) (A) and 205 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Kang Chay Won shall be held and considered to be the natural-born alien child of Harry Yam Won, a citizen of the United States.

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.

PETRUS VAN KEER

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 4522) for the relief of Petrus Van Keer.

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

Be it enacted, etc., That, notwithstanding the provision of the ninth category of section V of the Immigration Act of 1917, as amended, Petrus Van Keer may be admitted to the United States for permanent residence if he is found to be otherwise admissible under the provisions of the immigration laws.

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert: "That, notwithstanding the provision of section 212 (a) (4) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Petrus Van Keer may be admitted to the United States for permanent residence if he is found to be otherwise admissible under the provisions of that act: *Provided*, That a suitable and proper bond or undertaking, approved by the Attorney General, be deposited as prescribed by section 213 of the said act."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

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

SUSAN ELLEN HEINEY

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 9996) for the relief of Susan Ellen Heiney.

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

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of sections 101 (a) (27) (A) and 205 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, the minor child, Susan Ellen Heiney, shall be held and considered to be the natural-born alien child of Verda Meranda Heiney, a citizen of the United States.

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

TENDER GRATITUDE OF CONGRESS TO GEN. DOUGLAS MACARTHUR

The Clerk called the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 264) expressing gratitude and appreciation to General of the Army Douglas MacArthur for his unsurpassed service to this Nation and the world.

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

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Speaker, I object.

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

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, I object.

The SPEAKER. Two objections are required.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I object.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. EBERHARTER] and the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER] have objected. The bill will be stricken from the calendar and recommitted to the Committee on Armed Services.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, that completes the bills we have had for consideration on the Private Calendar.

The SPEAKER. This completes the reading of the Private Calendar of those bills eligible for consideration at this time.

GERASIMOS GIANNATOS

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of S. 120, for the relief of Gerasimos Giannatos.

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

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the immigration and naturalization laws, Gerasimos Giannatos shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

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.

COMPENSATION FOR DAMAGES CAUSED BY LAKE OF THE WOODS

Mr. JONAS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report of the bill (H. R. 2098) to provide for the compensation of certain persons whose lands have been flooded and damaged by reason of fluctuations in the water level of the Lake of the Woods, and ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers on the part of the House be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT (REPT. NO. 2273)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 2098) to provide for determining the compensation of certain persons whose lands have been flooded and damaged by reason of fluctuations in the water level of the Lake of the Woods, Minnesota, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to rec-

ommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments and agree to the same.

EDGAR A. JONAS,
USHER L. BURDICK,
THOMAS J. LANE,

Managers on the Part of the House.

PRESCOTT BUSH,
J. GLENN BEALL,
SPESSARD L. HOLLAND,

Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the House to the bill (H. R. 2098) to provide for determining the compensation of certain persons whose lands have been flooded and damaged by reason of fluctuations in the water level of the Lake of the Woods, Minn., submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon by the conferees and recommended in the accompanying conference report:

The bill as passed the House provided that damages should be upon any flooding between elevations 1,064 sea-level datum unaffected by winds. The Senate restored this provision and Hon. HAROLD HAGEN, author of the bill, stated that if this provision remained in the bill that it would not be effective. Therefore, the Senate conferees concurred in the House action.

EDGAR A. JONAS,
USHER L. BURDICK,
THOMAS J. LANE,

Managers on the Part of the House.

Mr. JONAS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the conference report.

The previous question was ordered.

The conference report was agreed to, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. BOYKIN asked and was given permission to address the House for 60 minutes tomorrow, after the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered.

CONVEYING OF REVERSIONARY INTEREST OF UNITED STATES IN LANDS TO CITY OF PAWNEE, OKLA.

Mr. BELCHER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of H. R. 8859, to convey the reversionary interest of the United States in certain lands to the city of Pawnee, Okla.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object—and I shall not object—I want to compliment the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. BELCHER] for taking the microphone in presenting his unanimous-consent request. That was not done earlier today on a very important bill.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior is authorized and directed to

convey by quitclaim deed, to the city of Pawnee, Okla., all of the right, title, and interest of the United States in and to the tract of land in Pawnee County, Okla., known as Mission Park, and more particularly described as follows: Lot 1 of section 32, in township 22 north of range 5 east of the Indian meridian, Oklahoma, containing eighty-eight and forty-three one-hundredths acres, according to the official plat of the survey of the said lands, returned to the General Land Office by the Surveyor General.

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

COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC WORKS

Mr. SCHENCK. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I submit a privileged resolution (H. Res. 695) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That there shall be printed for use of the Committee on Public Works, 1,000 additional copies of House Report No. 1215, 83d Congress, second session, the report relative to the St. Lawrence seaway, made by the above committee.

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

Mr. SCHENCK. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. I want to commend the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. SCHENCK] for taking the microphone in making his request.

Mr. SCHENCK. I thank the gentleman.

The resolution was agreed to, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

JOINT COMMITTEE ON ATOMIC ENERGY

Mr. SCHENCK. Mr. Speaker, I offer a privileged concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 267) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the concurrent resolution, as follows:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That there be printed for the use of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy 15,000 additional copies of the hearings held by the said joint committee during the current Congress, relative to the contribution of atomic energy to medicine.

The concurrent resolution was agreed to, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

STRATEGIC AND CRITICAL MATERIALS

Mr. SCHENCK. Mr. Speaker, I offer a privileged concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 97) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the concurrent resolution, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That there be printed 1,000 additional copies of part 6 of the hearings conducted before a subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs pursuant to Senate Resolution 143, 83d Congress, relative to stockpile

and accessibility of strategic and critical materials to the United States in time of war. Such additional copies shall be for the use of the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

The concurrent resolution was concurred in, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

UNITED STATES CITIZENS EMPLOYED BY THE UNITED NATIONS

Mr. SCHENCK. Mr. Speaker, I offer a privileged concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 98) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the concurrent resolution, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That there be printed for the use of the Senate Committee on the Judiciary an additional 20,000 copies of the second interim report entitled "Activities of United States Citizens Employed by the United Nations," a report of hearings held before a subcommittee of the above committee during the 83d Congress.

The concurrent resolution was concurred in, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SENATE COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Mr. SCHENCK. Mr. Speaker, I offer a privileged concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 99) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the concurrent resolution, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That there be printed for the use of the Senate Committee on the Judiciary not to exceed 25,000 copies of parts 1 to 3 and subsequent parts of the hearings entitled "Strategy and Tactics of World Communism," held before a subcommittee of the above committee during the 83d Congress.

The concurrent resolution was concurred in, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ANTIBOOTLEGGING BILL

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, on Thursday July 29, the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee favorably reported out of committee the antibootlegging bill, H. R. 9769. I respectfully request that this honorable body take this bill from the calendar and ask that each and every Member of the House cast his vote in favor of this most needed legislation.

This bill if enacted into law would permit the automobile manufacturers to reinstate an antibootlegging clause in their selling agreements with retail automobile dealers. Such a permissive clause, when followed through by the manufacturers,

would do much to eliminate the sale of new automobiles by nonauthorized or nonenfranchised or by used-car dealers, many of the "shade tree" variety.

Bootlegging of new cars by the above-named groups is a serious threat to each and every new car dealer in Rhode Island with his large investments in buildings, tools, parts, and equipment. It is true that the used-car dealers, in most instances, do purchase these new cars from new-car dealers, who are overstocked with cars. When these sales by other than enfranchised dealers are reported to the manufacturers they, the manufacturers, tell us they cannot penalize or cancel the enfranchised dealer who sells a car to a "bootlegger," because of existing antitrust laws. How are the purchasers of these cars from other than enfranchised dealers affected? Each new car purchased from an enfranchised dealer carries a new-car warranty, this warranty runs up to 12 months by most factories. Each new-car dealer is required to purchase special tools for the servicing of their respective cars at each model change and purchase an adequate supply of parts. Each new-car dealer is required to send his service manager and mechanics to factory-conducted schools in order that they may know how to service the cars properly. Cars cannot today be properly serviced by independent garages or superservice stations due to many new innovations, such as the automatic transmissions, power steering, power brakes, and so forth; special tools and schooled mechanics are required to make the necessary repairs and adjustments. There have been many instances where a purchaser would purchase a new car from a nonenfranchised dealer and because of improper adjustments and lack of knowledge of the correct type of lubricants used in automatic transmissions costly repairs have had to be made entirely at the purchaser's expense. In view of the foregoing, I therefore submit that H. R. 9769 is most certainly in the interest of most of your and my constituents, the new-car purchasers.

The situation which confronts the retail dealers of America and which is detrimental to the public interest, is, and I refer to bootlegging. Bootlegging is due fundamentally to overproduction by the manufacturers and the indiscriminate shipping of cars to new-car dealers who do not have an outlet for them. Two of the largest manufacturers today are engaged in a race for first place in sales. They are offering and suggesting to their retail dealers various plans, contests, and bonuses for sale of their respective cars. This results in all dealers having to give excessive used-car allowances in order to be competitive. Overproduction is also the reason for a new type of dealer today and that is the so-called volume dealer. This is the dealer that is encouraged by the manufacturer to give long trades, using such methods as "would you takes," free interest and insurance up to 24 months, a free trip, all expenses paid, to some vacation spot or metropolitan center, a new refrigerator, a new television set, and many other unethical baits to get the prospect into their

salesroom. The volume dealers then use all kinds of high pressure tactics to get the prospect's name on the dotted line. I do not claim that this legislation will be a cure-all, but it is a step in the right direction, it places the burden of stamping out bootlegging, where it rightfully belongs, on the manufacturers. When enacted into law, they, the manufacturers, have the necessary tools to work with, to stop this type of merchandising that could and will be the end of the time-honored system of distribution of new cars.

In closing I would also like to state that I am in favor of and will vote for H. R. 9916 and H. R. 9917, the so-called phantom freight rate legislation. These bills were introduced by the gentleman from California [Mr. HINSHAW] and were also reported out of the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee on Thursday, July 29. These three bills are most urgently needed by the buying public and the retail dealers of America alike.

AUTOMOBILE SALES

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H. R. 9769) to amend the Federal Trade Commission Act with respect to certain contracts, agreements, or franchises to enable manufacturers of automobiles and trucks, and their franchise dealers, to protect their good will in the business of manufacturing and distributing automobiles and trucks, made or sold by them, by restricting franchise dealers from reselling to certain unauthorized persons.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

Mr. GROSS. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, and I shall not object, I want to commend the gentleman from California [Mr. YOUNGER] for going to the microphone and asking for this permission so that all the Members of the House may know what is going on. That was not done earlier this morning.

Mr. YOUNGER. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. McCORMACK. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, and I shall not object, I cannot permit this bill to be considered and passed without making a few observations.

I have read with deep interest the large number of letters and telegrams some Member of the House from time to time inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, communications he received from various dealers and sellers of cars. I was very much impressed with the contents of the various communications received by the Member and inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. I was very much impressed with the complaint made by the dealers that large automobile manufacturing companies were forcing them to buy a larger number of cars than they wanted to buy.

That was one of the main complaints, that in order to retain their dealer's agency or their dealer's contractual rela-

tionship with the automobile manufacturing companies, many of them were forced to purchase cars whether there was any demand for them or not. The result was that it put many of them in a very bad financial position as well as putting them in a bad position in other respects. They felt that the large manufacturing companies were forcing them to do something which was unethical and unfair. I realize the purpose of this bill and I am not going to object to its consideration at the present time, but I think something ought to be done with reference to these big automobile manufacturers who engage in practices that are unethical and wrong and unfair to the automobile dealers who might have an agency as a dealer or a contractual relationship where, if they do not purchase the number of cars, that the manufacturing company wants them to purchase, they lose their agency. I simply want to have the RECORD show that there is at least one Member of this body who condemns that practice and who realizes that many dealers have been placed in a very unfortunate position by being compelled to buy cars that they did not want to buy in order to be able to keep their agency with some particular large automobile manufacturing company.

Mr. YOUNGER. I thank the gentleman for his observation.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, with that statement, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I should like to propound 1 or 2 questions to the gentleman. Was this a unanimous report by the committee?

Mr. YOUNGER. Yes, sir.

Mr. CELLER. Has the committee consulted the Federal Trade Commission with reference to the bill itself?

Mr. YOUNGER. Yes, the Federal Trade Commission objected on the grounds that it is an unnecessary exemption from the antitrust laws. The Bureau of the Budget made the same objection.

Mr. CELLER. In other words, the Bureau of the Budget objects to the bill?

Mr. YOUNGER. Yes.

Mr. CELLER. Did the Department of Justice object to the bill?

Mr. YOUNGER. Yes; they objected to it.

Mr. CELLER. Did the Federal Trade Commission object to the bill?

Mr. YOUNGER. Yes.

Mr. CELLER. You said the Bureau of the Budget—or did I misunderstand you?

Mr. YOUNGER. Yes, the Bureau of the Budget.

Mr. CELLER. Then, I ask the gentleman this question: Did the Federal Trade Commission object or approve the bill?

Mr. YOUNGER. Yes, they objected.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, under these circumstances, I object to the consideration of the bill at this time. It is too important to pass in this manner.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman withhold his objection? Might I say to the gentleman that this is a very acute situation in which a tremendous number of people are interest-

ed. I think it is properly a matter for legislative action and completely within the discretion of the Congress of the United States. I sincerely hope that the gentleman will not object.

Mr. CELLER. Does not the gentleman realize that an amendment to the antitrust laws, and this is an amendment to the antitrust laws, should be fully and fairly debated before we come to any conclusion on such a subject as important as this is?

Mr. HALLECK. I think the committee, if I understand correctly, gave the matter very careful consideration and, as the gentleman has just said, it is a unanimous report from the committee. The gentleman from New York understands that in the closing days of the session, circumstances are such, it does seem to me that a sufficient consideration has been given to this matter.

Mr. CELLER. I am informed that the Department of Justice voices objection to the bill. That is a very responsible Agency, I am sure the majority leader will agree. In these closing days of the session, I think we must be most careful.

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

Mr. CELLER. I yield to the distinguished member of my own committee.

Mr. CRUMPACKER. The history of this subject matter is that the franchise contracts between the manufacturers and the dealers for many, many years contained the type of clause that this bill would again permit. Because of the rulings of the Department of Justice in the last 10 years, the industry was forced to withdraw them. This bill is designed to again permit a practice which the Department of Justice since 1948 has held to be contrary to the law. That has been their attitude and it continues to be their attitude. In fact it is this very attitude which makes this legislation necessary. But I think the situation in the industry at the present time, the extremely critical situation that has been partly brought about as a result of this practice of bootlegging new cars certainly justifies this modification of the law.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I respect the gentleman's opinion very much as well as the opinion of the majority leader and the gentleman from California, and while I am opposed to the bill I shall not at this time object.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, we have all received letters and telegrams urging support of the pending bill, H. R. 9769. The dealers seem to think it will help with a problem they face. I would like to point out to the House and to the dealers that the trouble lies much deeper.

This bill would make more unilateral contracts between the automobile manufacturers and retailers, already, perhaps, more unilateral on the side of the manufacturers than any enforceable contract known.

The pending bill will not cure the problem, because the real ill comes from the manufacturers requiring many of their dealers, one way or another, to take more cars than they can handle in line with the manufacturers' fixed retail prices.

I repeat the statement I made here on the floor May 28, 1954:

Mr. Speaker, on May 26, I introduced a bill, H. R. 9354, which is as follows:

"Be it enacted, etc., That Public Law 212, 63d Congress, following section 3, be amended by adding the following subsections:

"Sec. 3. (a) It shall be deemed an unfair trade practice and against the public interest for any person engaged in commerce in connection with the granting of any franchise or distribution right to demand any contract with any retail dealer requiring such dealer to accept goods, wares, merchandise, machinery, supplies, or other commodities not ordered by such retail dealer.

"(b) The withdrawal by any person engaged in commerce of any franchise or distribution rights of any retail dealer because of failure to order or failure to accept without order any goods, wares, machinery, supplies, or other commodities in excess of need as determined by such retail dealer shall be unlawful."

This bill speaks for itself, but I would like to discuss the basis on which I have offered such measure.

In recent months I have noticed that most of the larger automobile companies have made many statements to the effect that 1953 was one of the greatest years automobile manufacturers have had. The total number of cars produced has been stressed in such articles. At the time these releases were made to the press, several months into 1954, I learned that on River Road in this area there were in storage more than 300 new 1953 models of one of the more popular makes of cars. At the same time there were approximately 170 new 1953 model cars in storage in sight of the Capitol, the product of another major manufacturer of automobiles which also makes many other appliances and equipment. As late as March 25 of this year the local dealers carried in Washington papers advertisement of 132 brand new 1953 models of still another popular make of automobile at a discount of \$720 to \$1,980 below list price. These occurrences all happened well into the year 1954, and at a time when these statements were being made to the press by the manufacturers.

I do not know why local retailers had that carryover of new cars. It may be that the local distributors or retail dealers bought the cars at a discount and were pleased with the situation, but it did call to my mind the situation which existed in the 1930's. Not that the present situation is too bad, but I do believe there is enough evidence at present to warrant the Congress to act to prevent what happened in the late 1920's and early thirties.

At that time several of the larger manufacturers of automobiles, when times began to get tight, insisted that their local retail dealers order automobiles many, many months in advance and take many more cars than they wished or needed, or could sell profitably. These advance orders had to include extra heavy units of automobiles, for which there was no market in my area.

One of the major manufacturers of cars broke every one of his dealers, of whom I knew, in my State in that period by loading on such dealers automobiles which the dealer could not sell at reasonable terms; and all the assets of such dealers were pulled into the manufacturing company in Michigan and the retail dealers went into bankruptcy. The manufacturer remained strong financially.

Later I had an opportunity to study the dealer contracts. Under the terms of the contracts, as I recall, the dealer was given a franchise to sell the manufacturer's products in a particular area. But this does not mean an exclusive franchise to sell. The manufacturer only contracted to deliver to no one except the dealer with the franchise in that area. That one little right was all

that kept such contract from being unilateral. Otherwise the contract was one-sided in favor of the manufacturer. As I recall, the company did not guarantee to deliver a single unit, but the dealer had to agree to accept units and to order as much as a year in advance, all for the protection of the manufacturer.

At a time when extra large automobiles had no market at all in my region, dealers had to take heavy units of such automobiles in order to get any cars at all. This had disastrous effects and as I say, in the case of one major make of car, it broke all retail dealers in Mississippi of whom I knew. That situation prevailed generally over the country. It is my understanding such contracts have not been changed in any substantial way since that time.

Since I have been in the Congress I have had occasion to try to help dealers in my district, who were the local distributors for one of the major farm machinery lines, to hold their franchise which the company threatened to cancel. While it was not admitted, from a study of the facts it was apparent that the franchises were being canceled, primarily, because such dealers would not go in debt to put up a prototype or expensive building in a new location as insisted upon by the manufacturer. Doubtless the same situation has existed in various other lines.

Mr. Speaker, I know that no major company sets out to ruin the retailers of its product but judging by the past, should conditions get tight to the point where it becomes a question as to who is going to be pressed financially, under the type of dealer contract which most local distributors have, the man placed in financial straits first is going to be the retail dealer or distributor; and this will be brought about by the manufacturer under present contracts. The dealer's franchise is his means of making a living and under pressure from the manufacturer he will order well in advance even though he is not guaranteed the delivery of a single unit. Then with hope that his condition will improve he will yield to pressure to order well in advance, even when there is no market for such product in his area.

Judging by the past he will accept large units, with little or no markets, in order to get what he thinks he can sell. All of this is a part of a package delivery demanded by the manufacturer.

The illustrations I have used to point out the need for congressional action are the ones I know about. In recent months other complaints at practices in the automotive industry have been pointed up in House Joint Resolution 484 by Congressman CRUMPACKER. Also, as early as 1939, the Federal Trade Commission, in House Document No. 468, 76th Congress, 1st session, after exhaustive hearings made the following recommendations:

"It is recommended that present unfair practices be abated to the end that dealers have (a) less restriction upon the management of their own enterprises; (b) quota requirements and shipments of cars based upon mutual agreement; (c) equitable liquidation in the event of contract termination by the manufacturer; (d) contracts definite as to the mutual rights and obligations of the manufacturers and the dealers, including specific provision that the contract will be continued for a definite term, unless terminated by breach of reasonable conditions recited therein."

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, may I point out that by section 4 of Public Law 212 of the 63d Congress, which my bill would amend, any individual who may be injured or threatened with injury by actions which I would make against the public interest, is authorized to go into the Federal court and obtain an injunction to prevent the action from being taken.

Several States have tried to meet this problem in recent years, notably Rhode

Island, where manufacturers must qualify with a State agency to do business in the State and the State can then cancel the right of such manufacturer to do business in the State if they do the things prohibited under my bill.

I called this statute to the attention of friends in the legislature of my State of Mississippi. In recent weeks the State legislature has passed such a measure. That is one way to meet the issue, of course. However, I hope this Congress will act on a national basis. Now is the time, in advance of trouble.

The bill which I have introduced is not unfair, and it will give some degree of protection to retail dealers and distributors. It will let those in an industry somewhat ride together as against the manufacturer being able to squeeze every dollar out of the distributor so as to maintain the home company in a strong financial condition. I hope the committee will see fit to have early hearings on this measure and that the Congress will pass it.

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I know something about this. We have some very large automobile agencies in South Carolina, members of the National Automobile Dealers' Association, and they have found because of bootlegging and because of the forcing of unreasonable quotas by virtue of the franchise of the dealer, that bootlegging, aided and abetted by the manufacturers, is ruining the industry. I charge that this bootlegging can be directly chargeable to the manufacturers and that is one reason at the present time why the Department of Justice has been doing nothing about it. It is because of the ruling of the Department of Justice in years gone by that this bootlegging has been going on. It is driving these dealer agencies to the wall. This is one piece of legislation that is needed if we are going to save the orderly processes of doing business in this Nation. I hope the committee will bring out the bill to which the gentleman from Massachusetts referred also. That is, the quota bill. This cramming down the throats of the dealers an unreasonable quota of automobiles and trucks is driving those dealers to the wall.

I hope this bill will be passed.

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

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

Be it enacted, etc., That section 5a of the Federal Trade Commission Act, as amended (66 Stat. 631, 632; 15 U. S. C. 45), is further amended by adding at the end of subsection (5) of said section 5a the following subsection:

"(6) Nothing contained in any of the Antitrust Acts shall render unlawful any contract, agreement, or franchise by which any dealer in new motor vehicles who operates as such under a franchise granted by the manufacturer of such vehicles agrees with such manufacturer that such dealer will not resell, either directly or indirectly, any current model motor vehicle made by such manufacturer, to any person, partnership, corporation, or other entity engaged in the business of selling new or used motor vehicles other than a person or entity operating under a franchise or authorized dealer agreement with such manufacturer.

"(7) Nothing contained in any of the Antitrust Acts shall make it unlawful for a manufacturer of motor vehicles to enforce any agreement authorized by paragraph (6)

by refusing to sell to, or canceling the franchise of, any dealer who knowingly sells current model motor vehicles made by such manufacturer to any person, partnership, corporation, or other entity engaged in the business of selling new or used motor vehicles other than a person or entity operating under a franchise or authorized dealer agreement with such manufacturer."

"(8) The Commission is hereby empowered and directed to prevent persons, partnerships, or corporations, except banks, common carriers subject to the act to regulate commerce, air carriers, and foreign air carriers subject to the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, and persons, partnerships, or corporations subject to the Packers and Stockyards Act, 1921, except as provided for in section 406b of said act, from using unfair methods of competition in commerce and unfair or deceptive acts or practices in commerce."

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 3, strike out all of lines 3, 4, 5, and 6, and insert "That section 5 (a) of the Federal Trade Commission Act (15 U. S. C., sec. 45 (a)) is amended (1) by redesignating paragraph (6) thereof as paragraph (8), and (2) by adding immediately after paragraph (5) thereof the following."

Page 3, line 1, strike out all of section 8.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the amendments.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, this amendment would modify the Federal Trade Commission Act. I cannot see why we should have such an important amendment at this late date.

The SPEAKER. There is no reservation of objection. Consent was granted for consideration of the bill.

The question is on the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

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

SIGNS OF DANGER

Mr. PHILBIN. 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 New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, there has been a rather deplorable tendency in some quarters to minimize the strength and scope of the Communist propaganda apparatus. Reference is made time and time again to the relatively small number of active, card-carrying Communists in the United States, thus by implication trying to show that the influence of the Communists within this Nation would be presumably negligible and their progress hardly appreciable. Yet thoughtful, well-informed observers are inevitably led to a quite different conclusion. It is not the number of active, card-carrying Communists that counts; it is the extent to which the Communist movement has penetrated and ramified throughout our entire social structure that gives us such grave concern. Some of the effects of this movement we can discern; others are less noticeable and can only be estimated in a general way.

It is not primarily those bearing the label "Communist" that we must fear—

though we cannot afford to ignore them or to minimize their influence—but it is the more subtle, secretive, underground elements which are doing the real damage. It is these elements which are boring from within, so to speak, just like some sinister termites leaving trails of poisonous propaganda, and unwitting converts among people who do not realize that the ideas they absorb are really Communist ideas.

Only one-fifth of this subversive iceberg is above the surface, the other four-fifths are hidden beneath the waters. That there has been widespread and serious dissemination of Communist ideas, doctrines, and techniques within the United States is unquestioned. The traces appear almost everywhere, though the poison is usually contained in sugar-coated capsules. Many are innocently traduced; others are willing tools.

What is true of our own Nation is true in larger degree of a great many other nations, in fact, of most nations throughout the world. The Western Hemisphere was shocked by the disclosures in Guatemala which culminated in a coup d'etat in the form of a revolution against a pro-Communist government. Whether the liquidation of communism in that country was real or only apparent remains to be seen, but it is common knowledge that communism is thriving in many other South American nations.

As to the rest of the world outside of the Western Hemisphere the situation is even worse. Communism is fanning fires of revolution and insurrection in many lands. It has achieved many conquests. Using imperialism and exploitation as scapegoats, communism has succeeded in penetrating and taking over literally millions of people. Communism has never hesitated to use aggression where necessary as in Korea and Indochina; in fact we can look for more aggression as time progresses in Asia and Africa. When the time comes and communism acquires sufficient strength, we may expect it in Europe. Some of these gains have been secured through diplomatic concessions to which the United States was an unwise party and also by virtue of weakness and appeasement on the part of the free nations. While we stand by in confusion and bewilderment over foreign policy following our quest for peace into the channels of further appeasement demanded by some of our allies, the Communists steadily and inexorably extend the boundaries of their dominion.

According to a recent dispatch from London by the news agency, Reuters, under date of July 3, Communist Party members throughout the world are estimated at about 30 million, according to latest figures published in Moscow. Yet, under Communist sway today are countries totaling more than 900 million persons, exclusive of India, which is following a policy of cordial cooperation with the Kremlin. This huge population includes the 200 million of the U. S. S. R. and the 600 million of China. Actually, well over a billion people are either under direct or indirect control of, or sympathetic toward world communism.

Moscow openly boasts of the fact, according to this dispatch that today there is not a single country in the world without a Communist movement, legal or illegal. This survey claims a membership of 60,000 Communists in the United States which is more than double the number usually asserted by those groups here which are deliberately seeking to minimize Communist strength in this country.

In a book published in Moscow called the Agitator's Notebook issued by the central committee of the Soviet Communist Party the survey gives a country-by-country breakdown of the membership of Communists and Communist-controlled Workers' Party. The book is intended for the guidance of Communist Party propagandists in Russia.

When the last Soviet Communist Party Congress was held in October 1952 the party counted approximately 7 million members in Russia. The Chinese Communist Party has a membership of some 6,500,000.

The survey lists membership figures of 7,400,000 in Communist Parties in the satellite countries of Czechoslovakia, Poland, Hungary, Bulgaria, Albania, East Germany, Korea and Vietnam.

The survey omitted the 700,000 members of the Yugo-Slav League of Communists since this party has declared itself independent of Moscow. It states that the Communist Parties are the most numerous, closely knit, and powerful parties in France and Italy where membership figures given are: France, 800,000; Italy, 2,120,000.

Membership figures for other "capitalist" countries are listed thus:

United States.....	60,000
Britain	35,000
Belgium	100,000
Holland	50,000
Denmark	50,000
Sweden	60,000
Finland	50,000
Japan	100,000
India	60,000

The survey does not quote figures for Norway, Iceland, or West Germany. In the Far East, no membership figures are quoted for Burma, Malaya—where Britain has been battling Communist forces for several years—Siam, the Philippines, Ceylon, or Indonesia.

President Syngman Rhee in his recent speech before the Congress made drastic proposals amounting to demand for a preventive war and analyzed at great length the menacing growth and power of world communism in Asia. The American people seek peace, not war, and I do not believe that, on the whole, they would advocate or be willing to start a war against Russian communism. But one thing is certain and that is that this Nation and the free world cannot afford to delay further while communism completes its nefarious work of militarily and economically outflanking the United States and the democratic nations.

I have urged many times on this floor and elsewhere that we reappraise American foreign policy in the light of ominous developments in the world threatening our safety and security. We cannot

afford to wait while this monstrous well-organized, ruthless conspiracy liquidates democracy in many nations and extends its dominion over millions and millions of helpless people. There are risks in an affirmative policy I admit. But at the same time this Nation must be prepared to assume them unless it is willing to embrace the other alternative of waiting until the Soviet has completed its work of conquering all of Asia, Africa and Europe, successfully implements the atomic and hydrogen bombs, develops the jet-propelled planes able to deliver them over United States territory, and gains possession of other vital secrets of more modern and more destructive weapons of war and then when its timetable permits might decide to launch a crippling attack upon this Nation. We might never recover from such a blow. That is our greatest danger.

I hope that our executive department, our State Department, and our great President will take fresh stock of the grave situation before us and take appropriate action to meet it. Unreasonable fear of atomic and hydrogen weapons or any other weapons or situations, however grave, must never be permitted to possess and obsess the American people or deter our leaders from pursuing that strong, courageous policy characteristic of our Nation which is required now more than ever before in our history to secure the safety of our shores and the integrity of our institutions.

Away with all doctrines of appeasement, away with policies of vacillation and delay. Away with the stultifying Fabian policy of watchful waiting. In this grave hour of decision let us once more put our faith in the Almighty, as we have always in history, and with high courage and faith and resolution let us mobilize our resources and our manpower and our people behind a traditional American policy which will enable us to defend America and all it represents against the ruthless aggression and obnoxious penetration of the world Communist conspiracy.

AMERICAN FALLS RESERVOIR DISTRICT NO. 2, IDAHO

Mr. BUDGE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H. R. 9889) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to execute an amendatory contract with American Falls Reservoir District No. 2, Idaho, and for other purposes, which was on the Consent Calendar.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

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

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior is authorized to execute on behalf of the United States the amendatory contract with American Falls Reservoir District No. 2, Idaho, negotiated pursuant to section 7 of the Reclamation Project Act of 1939 (53 Stat. 1187, 1192; 43 U. S. C., 1946 edition, sec. 485f), and approved by the district's electors on June 29, 1954.

Sec. 2. All beginning with the first "Provided" under the subheading "Minidoka proj-

ect, American Falls Reservoir, Idaho" under the heading "Bureau of Reclamation" of the act of January 12, 1927 (44 Stat. 934, 958), is hereby repealed.

Sec. 3. This act is declared to be a supplement to the Federal Reclamation Laws.

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

JOSEPH V. CRIMI

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to return to Private Calendar No. 1161, which is S. 2553, for the relief of Joseph V. Crimi, father of the minor child, Joseph Crimi, which was passed over without prejudice. A satisfactory explanation has been made.

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

There was no objection.

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

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

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Joseph V. Crimi, father of the minor child, Joseph Crimi, of Boston, Mass., the sum of \$8,500. The payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims of the said Joseph V. Crimi and Joseph Crimi arising out of personal injuries sustained by the said Joseph Crimi in Boston on August 5, 1949, when he was struck by a privately owned automobile being used under contract by the United States Post Office for the delivery of parcel post. Such sum represents the unsatisfied portion of the judgments on such claims obtained in the Superior Court in Boston against the owner and the operator of such automobile, plus interest and cost: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 2, line 6, after the word "act" strike out "in excess of 10 percent thereof."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

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

OFFICE EXPENSES OF CERTAIN UNITED STATES COMMISSIONERS

Mr. JONAS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill (S. 2204) to provide that United States commissioners who are required to devote full time to the duties of the office may be allowed their necessary office expenses.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That (a) the catchline to section 633 of title 28, United States Code, is amended so that such catchline will read as follows:

"§ 633. Fees and expenses."

(b) That section 633 of title 28, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end thereof a new subsection (c), reading as follows:

"(c) United States commissioners who are required to devote full time to the performance of the duties of the office, as determined by the Director of the Administrative Office of the United States Courts under the supervision and direction of the Judicial Conference of the United States and who do not engage in the practice of the law, shall be allowed their actual and necessary office expenses, including the compensation of a necessary clerical assistant. Such office expense shall be determined and paid and such compensation shall be fixed and paid by the Director of the Administrative Office of the United States Courts under the provisions of section 604 of this title."

(c) The analysis of chapter 43 of title 28, United States Code, immediately preceding section 631 of such title, is amended so that item 633 in such analysis will read as follows:

"633. Fees and expenses."

Sec. 2. The amendment made by the first section of this act shall not apply to any United States Commissioner for the District of Columbia, and this act shall not be deemed to modify, supersede, or repeal the provisions of section 403 of the District of Columbia Law Enforcement Act of 1953.

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

A motion to reconsider and a similar House bill (H. R. 5801) were laid on the table.

REQUEST TO RETURN TO PRIVATE CALENDAR

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to return to Private Calendar No. 1103, S. 232.

The SPEAKER. Has the gentleman cleared this with the official objectors?

Mr. KEATING. It has been cleared with the objector who asked that it be passed over without prejudice. I have not spoken to the others.

The SPEAKER. The Chair suggests that the gentleman submit his request after consulting the others.

GRANT OF IMMUNITY TO WITNESSES

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (S. 16) to amend the immunity provision relating to testimony given by witnesses before either House of Congress or their committees, amended to read as follows:

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That title 18, United States Code, section 3486, is amended to read as follows:

"§ 3486. Compelled testimony tending to incriminate witnesses; immunity.

"(a) In the course of any investigation relating to any interference with or endangering of, or any plans or attempts to interfere with or endanger the national security or defense of the United States by treason, sabotage, espionage, sedition, seditious conspiracy or the overthrow of its Government

by force or violence, no witness shall be excused from testifying or from producing books, papers, or other evidence before either House, or before any committee of either House, or before any joint committee of the two Houses of Congress on the ground that the testimony or evidence required of him may tend to incriminate him or subject him to a penalty or forfeiture, when the record shows that—

"(1) in the case of proceedings before one of the Houses of Congress, that a majority of the Members present of that House; or

"(2) in the case of proceedings before a committee, that two-thirds of the members of the full committee shall by affirmative vote have authorized such witness to be granted immunity under this section with respect to the transactions, matters, or things concerning which he is compelled, after having claimed his privilege against self-incrimination to testify or produce evidence by direction of the presiding officer and that an order of the United States district court for the district wherein the inquiry is being carried on has been entered into the record requiring said person to testify or produce evidence. Such an order may be issued by a United States district court judge upon application by a duly authorized representative of the Congress or of the committee concerned. But no such witness shall be prosecuted or subjected to any penalty or forfeiture for or on account of any transaction, matter, or thing concerning which he is so compelled, after having claimed his privilege against self-incrimination, to testify or produce evidence, nor shall testimony so compelled be used as evidence in any criminal proceeding (except prosecutions described in subsection (d) hereof) against him in any court.

"(b) Neither House nor any committee thereof nor any joint committee of the two Houses of Congress shall grant immunity to any witness without first having notified the Attorney General of the United States of such action and thereafter having secured the approval of the United States district court for the district wherein such inquiry is being held. The Attorney General of the United States shall be notified of the time of each proposed application to the United States district court and shall be given the opportunity to be heard with respect thereto prior to the entrance into the record of the order of the district court.

"(c) Whenever in the judgment of a United States attorney the testimony of any witness, or the production of books, papers, or other evidence by any witness, in any case or proceeding before any grand jury or court of the United States involving any interference with or endangering of, or any plans or attempts to interfere with or endanger, the national security or defense of the United States by treason, sabotage, espionage, sedition, seditious conspiracy, violations of chapter 115 of title 18 of the United States Code, violations of the Internal Security Act of 1950 (64 Stat. 987), violations of the Atomic Energy Act of 1946 (60 Stat. 755), as amended, violations of sections 212 (a) (27), (28), (29), or 241 (a) (6), (7), or 313 (a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (66 Stat. 182-186; 204-206; 240-241), and conspiracies involving any of the foregoing, is necessary to the public interest, he, upon the approval of the Attorney General, shall make application to the court that the witness shall be instructed to testify or produce evidence subject to the provisions of this section, and upon order of the court such witness shall not be excused from testifying or from producing books, papers, or other evidence on the ground that the testimony or evidence required of him may tend to incriminate him or subject him to a penalty or forfeiture. But no such witness shall be prosecuted or subjected to any penalty or forfeiture for or on account of any transaction, matter, or thing concerning which he

is compelled, after having claimed his privilege against self-incrimination, to testify or produce evidence, nor shall testimony so compelled be used as evidence in any criminal proceeding (except prosecution described in subsection (d) hereof) against him in any court.

"(d) No witness shall be exempt under the provision of this section from prosecution for perjury or contempt committed while giving testimony or producing evidence under compulsion as provided in this section."

Sec. 2. The analysis of chapter 223 of title 18, United States Code, is amended by striking out

"3486. Testimony before Congress; immunity."

and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

"3486. Compelled testimony tending to incriminate witness; immunity."

Mr. CELLER (interrupting the reading of the bill). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the further reading of the bill may be dispensed with.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. Is a second demanded?

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I demand a second.

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that a second be considered as ordered.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GRAHAM] will be recognized for 20 minutes and the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER] for 20 minutes.

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. KEATING].

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, this bill is a very important piece of legislation to further the struggle against the Communist conspiracy on all fronts, in the activities of investigating committees representing the legislative arm of Government and in the prosecutive functions carried on through the executive branch. It is certainly in our national interest to give our investigating committees and our prosecutors a means of loosening the tongues of important witnesses who resist all inquiries into their activities by taking refuge behind the fifth amendment.

Mr. Speaker, it would be perhaps helpful as anything in the few moments I have at my disposal to explain the history of this legislation. The bill, S. 16, as it passed the other body—without going into detail—gave to the Congress the final say as to whether immunity should be granted. The Attorney General was to be given notice if a congressional committee desired to grant immunity and he would have a right to object, but even if he objected it could be granted by the Congress over his objection. The bill, H. R. 6399, which was endorsed by the Attorney General, differed from the Senate bill in two important respects.

First, it extended the scope of the Senate bill to provide for the granting

of immunity not only in proceedings before congressional committees but also in court or grand jury proceedings.

Second, it left the ultimate power in the Attorney General rather than in the congressional committees to grant immunity, the theory being that he is the chief law-enforcement officer, responsible for law enforcement, and he, therefore, should have the correlative right to grant immunity. He would presumably know more about whether or not immunity should be granted and whether there were other considerations that should enter into a decision on that question than a congressional committee could possibly know.

The bill as reported by the Committee on the Judiciary, which gave this subject long thought and study, is, one might say, in-between those two approaches. It does provide for the granting of immunity in both proceedings before congressional investigating committees and before courts or in grand jury proceedings, but it does not leave the final determination as to the granting of immunity in either the hands of the investigating committee or the Attorney General, but rather the court.

The bill might well be divided into two separate parts, sections (a) and (b), having to do with the investigating procedure before a congressional committee and section (c), dealing with the granting of immunity in a court or grand jury proceeding.

As to (a), proceedings before a congressional committee, it provides that if a congressional committee or either House of Congress itself concludes that it is desirable to grant immunity to some witness in order to obtain evidence regarding some higher up or someone else, then the congressional committee shall give notice to the Attorney General of an application to a court and the court shall be the final arbiter as to whether or not immunity should be granted. The Attorney General can appear in court and say: "I agree with the committee," or he can appear there and say, "I disagree with the committee. This is a case where immunity should not be granted," and the court will have the final word in the matter.

Section (c) deals with proceedings before a court or grand jury. In that case it says that if the United States attorney in a particular area has a prosecution before him and feels that immunity should be granted to some prospective witness, he shall first get the approval of the Attorney General to the granting of that immunity and then shall appeal to the court and the court will pass on the question, and if convinced of the propriety, issue the order for immunity.

Now, there is another very important respect in which this bill as reported for action today differs from the bill passed in the other body and also differs from the original administration-endorsed measure H. R. 6399, and that is this: An amendment was offered and accepted by the committee sponsored by our distinguished colleagues, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. McCULLOCH] and the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MEADER], which limited the operation of this entire procedure to crimes involving the national

security, so that this bill as now worded and now before us exclusively applies only to investigations dealing with or prosecutions for the crimes of treason, sabotage, espionage, sedition, seditious conspiracy, and violations of certain specific statutes, all of which deal with the Communist conspiracy. It is, therefore, a very much narrower bill than that originally offered.

In this field of subversion the same principles are applied and should be applied, in my judgment, to witnesses who obstruct congressional investigations and fifth-amendment witnesses who block a grand jury inquiry or trial in court. It is a logical combination. I think it would be very unwise and unfortunate if we were to pass a bill as limited as the one which was passed in the other body, dealing only with proceedings before congressional committees. I think if we decide, as I hope we will, that the immunity power is necessary and desirable for use by investigating committees, the conclusion is inescapable that the same power ought to be conferred on the people in the Justice Department who are responsible for enforcing the laws we enact. The fifth amendment provides that no person shall be compelled in any criminal case to be a witness against himself. This has been expanded by interpretation far beyond its literal meaning, so as to excuse anyone from testifying under compulsion and under oath in any proceeding as to facts which might directly incriminate him or which might contribute indirectly to the detection of a crime for which he could be prosecuted.

There are certain limits when the privilege disappears, as, for instance, if the period of limitations has run on the crime. It can be waived if the witness voluntarily offers incriminating testimony. It has no application under the court decisions to crimes committed by others. It will not attach to facts which are criminal only under the laws of some jurisdiction other than that which is seeking to compel the testimony. But, all in all, this privilege is very broad. Moreover, since it is the witness himself who must decide whether a particular question or line of questioning is likely to incriminate him, the possibilities of abuse are very great.

It has long been recognized that this privilege can be destroyed or bought off, one might say, by the Government. The theory simply is, that if all possibility of incrimination is removed in a particular situation, then obviously the privilege will cease to exist. Originally in England, this was done by means of a royal pardon. In this country, the device adopted has been a legislative pardon, that is, the so-called immunity statute. It is really a sort of bargaining process. Every time immunity is conferred, the witness receives something of potentially very great value, namely, a pardon for some unpunished crime; in return, he is supposed to give testimony or evidence which the interrogating authority wants. You can see that this bargain could sometimes be unfair. The prosecutor or the congressional committee, without knowing what the witness was going to

spring until he gave his testimony, might confer immunity for very grave crimes in return for evidence which might turn out to be of very trifling value.

The feature of the bill before us which I especially commend to your favorable attention—is intended to take care of this problem of blind bargaining. It requires, in the case of congressional investigations, virtual agreement between all three branches of the Government—legislative, executive, and judicial—before an effective grant of immunity is conferred. In court proceedings it requires approval of both the prosecutor and the court.

Attorney General Brownell, and Director J. Edgar Hoover, of the FBI, and their respective staffs are doing a wonderful job of exposing and bringing to justice Communist conspirators and plotters and spies through brilliant undercover work and prosecution in the courts. It is inevitable, and absolutely proper, that we over here in Congress cannot be kept fully informed as to what the Department is doing. We do not know about these big cases until they are broken, the defendants indicted, and the whole matter thrown into court. It is not only possible, it is likely, that if we had a free hand in dealing out immunity in return for testimony, we would stumble right into the middle of the police work that is being so effectively done by the other branch, and would blow some of these prosecutions sky high.

Here is an imaginary interrogation, by a hypothetical committee having the power to grant immunity, demonstrating what could have happened with respect to the spy, David Greenglass, in the Rosenberg case:

QUESTION (by Member of Congress). Mr. Greenglass, did you visit and talk with certain Russian agents on a farm in New Mexico?

MR. GREENGLASS. I refuse to answer on the grounds that my answer might incriminate me.

MEMBER. Since you have claimed your constitutional privilege, I am authorized by the committee and by law to grant you immunity from prosecution for your answer to that question. I now grant you immunity. With that knowledge, I now direct you to answer the question.

MR. GREENGLASS. Yes, I did.

MEMBER. What did you discuss with these Russian agents?

MR. GREENGLASS. I refuse to answer relying upon the fifth amendment to the Constitution.

MEMBER. Since you have claimed your constitutional privilege, I am authorized by the committee and by law to grant you immunity from prosecution for your answer to that question. I now grant you that immunity. With that knowledge, I now direct you to answer the question.

MR. GREENGLASS. I discussed with them plans for stealing and giving to the Communists certain atomic secrets.

Had the foregoing occurred, the Government could not have prosecuted David Greenglass and might have had very serious difficulty in proving its case against the Rosenbergs themselves. The only thing that would have prevented such an outcome, had a valid immunity statute been in force, would have been, prior reference to an outside authority or

as is provided in this bill, the Attorney General and the court.

It should be apparent that—and the record of recent investigations by congressional committees and grand juries clearly so demonstrate—subversives and criminals have readily seized this constitutional protection of the innocent and by their abuse of it have prostituted it to such an extent that it is fast becoming looked upon by many law-abiding persons with doubt and suspicion. That such public apprehension for any of our Bill of Rights should exist indicates forcefully the immediate need for a true reform of such a condition. A reformation is essential that will root out the basic cause of this apprehension and diminishing faith of the fifth amendment, namely the abuse of it, and restore it to its proper place in the respect and confidence of the body politic.

The power to grant immunity is one of tremendous responsibility, the exercise of which must be guarded by discretion and wisdom. All possibility of abuse must be obviated lest it become a loophole for the escape from punishment for the guilty. It must at all times be the perfect medium whereby a true balance is reached between the need and right of the Government to obtain the necessary information to carry out its constitutional functions and the constitutional right of an individual not to incriminate himself. This bill strikes such a balance.

THE SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

MR. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALTER].

MR. GRAHAM. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALTER] 5 additional minutes.

MR. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, the measure we have before us has been given great consideration by the Committee on the Judiciary. I do not know of any legislation before that committee which has received greater consideration. All of us are mindful of those things that I know are in the minds of all the Members of this body. But when we come to the final analysis, I am sure that you will agree with me that the intolerable situation that exists today must be dealt with, and with the safeguards that have been placed in this legislation, I can, without reservation, urge the Members to vote for this measure.

As Mr. KEATING has stated, this bill has been amended so that its operation is limited to cases of national security. In the final analysis, I think I can say that 98 percent of the matters that will be affected through this legislation will be those coming before the Committee on Un-American Activities of which I happen to be a member, unfortunately. No one can sit on that committee, as I have during the past few years, without feeling that this great Republic ought to be in a position certainly to conduct its business without having raised before it frivolous objections that are daily raised by the long parade of witnesses appearing before that committee. I shall not call them fifth amendment Communists, largely because I do not like the person

who coined that phrase, but I shall say that these people who hide behind the fifth amendment are literally doing just that.

I had occasion to examine the testimony of those people who were cited for contempt, just recently. I assure you that had the Supreme Court decided properly, without leaning over backward, in a line of decisions to give aid and comfort to these people who are literally hiding behind the Constitution, we would not be here today. I think the members of the Committee on the Judiciary will agree with me. Just for a moment, let us look at this one decision in the *Cristoffel* case. There the Supreme Court held that unless it was shown affirmatively that a quorum was present, then it must be presumed that a quorum was not present. That is in direct violation of the very basic rule of law. Then going on to the decisions that follow it, it certainly seems to me that we would be derelict in our duty if we did not try to do something and actually do something to overcome the mischief that has been done by the highest court of the land.

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

Mr. WALTER. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. MEADER. The gentleman has referred to the *Cristoffel* case. I wonder if the gentleman would agree with me that the court in that case announced the very novel and dangerous doctrine, that the judiciary would undertake in the future to say whether or not the Houses of the Congress correctly applied the parliamentary rules.

Mr. WALTER. The significant part of it, and I agree with what the gentleman says, is the fact that that question was not raised by the people who were convicted. It was not raised until it got into the Supreme Court, where the Court itself raised the question.

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

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

Mr. GROSS. Would this legislation reach those employees of the United Nations who sought refuge back of the fifth amendment and were indicted, may I say, by a New York grand jury?

Mr. WALTER. I am sure it would. I do not know of any rule of law under which an American citizen employed by an international organization may hide behind his employment to escape the provisions of the law of the land.

Mr. GROSS. The International Court of Justice so held.

Mr. WALTER. Let us see what we have done. Under this bill we have made it very plain that it applies only to cases affecting the national security. As the bill came over here from the Senate, it related to all crimes, but this applies only to those matters affecting the security of the United States. I assure you that if I am one of the conferees, and I know that I speak for the members of the subcommittee of which it is my privilege to be a member, we will not yield from that position; so that if we get legislation and when we get it, and I am sure we will,

it will be legislation dealing only with the national security.

Here is one thing that appeals to me about this legislation. I assure you that I approached it with grave misgivings. It is, before a person can be granted immunity the court is called upon to act on the question of the materiality and the germaneness of the matter under inquiry.

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

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

Mr. JAVITS. Will the court pass upon the advisability or lack of inadvisability in fact of granting immunity?

Mr. WALTER. I am sure that it is intended that the matter be submitted to the court in order to pass in the first instance on the question of whether or not failure to answer a question would be grounds for contempt. That, of course, brings it very squarely within the purview of those decisions that hold that the question asked must be material.

Mr. JAVITS. I think this is the turning point of the bill. In my opinion as a lawyer, the court would only pass on the issue of germaneness of the testimony to the legislative inquiry and the jurisdiction of the committee. The court would not I believe inquire into the advisability or lack of it in giving an immunity bath. Therefore, I believe, the opinion of the Association of the Bar in New York against the bill would continue the bill in its present form. I think that is the turning point of the bill.

Mr. WALTER. After all, when it comes to the question of the wisdom, I just think that is a question of materiality.

Mr. JAVITS. The Congress will have decided that and the court will just rely upon the decision made by the committee or the House?

Mr. WALTER. I do not think so. I think this goes much further than that.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 12 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, I would like the Members of the House to consider the tortured history of this bill now under only 40 minutes of debate without opportunity to amend it. Consider its legislative amputations and mutations; its reconstructions from the Senate committee to its present form. We find what? A shredded, untested changeling.

First we had general immunity of a wide range covering all fields and all subjects. Then we had special immunity covering only espionage and defense. Then we had the testimony limited to that given before congressional committees. Then it covers testimony before grand juries and before the court, plus congressional committees. The sole arbiter of pardoning—and it is a pardoning bill—was a congressional committee. The Attorney General was merely to stand by. Then the Attorney General appears as an advocate. Then he appears as a consultant. Then he is out in the cold. The power of immunity was left exclusively at one time with the Attorney General. Then the power restlessly moves back to the Congress

and out of the courts. Now three branches of Government are involved before immunity can be nailed down—the executive, the legislative, and the judicial.

The multiplicity of changes indicates how much wariness and uncertainty and doubt still remain with the proponents of this immunity bill. Only the day before yesterday, at the very 11th hour, changes were made in the bill. The bill was to be taken up yesterday without your having the printed bill before you and without any report. They were not yet printed. Only my objection to such procedure held up the consideration. Members have not had an opportunity to read the report on the bill. I commend the reading of the minority report to all members of the committee.

It has been said—and these are not my words—that the bill is so loosely drawn that it rattles. It bristles with constitutional snarls and questions. It is full of befuddlement, puzzlement, and devilment. I like to use the phrase Churchill used in application to this bill:

It is a riddle inside; an enigma wrapped in mystery. It will plague the Congress for days and years to come.

I oppose this chipping away of the fifth amendment. This privilege against self-incrimination arose as a protection against inquisitorial methods of interrogation and prosecution which prevailed in Europe and England until the expulsion of the Stuarts from the throne of England in 1688. The fifth amendment is a protection against confession by thumbscrew and self-accusation by torture and self-incrimination by cruelty to loved ones.

We have shunned forceful self-incrimination in all forms throughout our history.

The privilege has been well entrenched in the English common law.

In the United States constitutional law 46 State constitutions have such an amendment. The privilege is broad. The privilege is liberally construed.

It extends not only to responses in themselves directly incriminatory but also to evidence which would furnish a link in a chain of evidence needed to prosecute for a crime.

I remind the proponents of this bill that our forefathers when they wrote the fifth amendment had in mind a lot of history which the proponents seem to have forgotten.

I like to quote Hawthorne, who said:

There are those who go all wrong by too strenuous a resolution to go right.

We tried this once before. We passed such a law in 1857. It was repealed in 1862. This is nothing new in our history. We tried it as a result of the anti-slavery agitation, the jitters of 1857 and thereabouts. We tried it to our chagrin and our shame. I repeat: A similar bill was on the statute books from 1857 to 1862. The Congress had a right to grant immunity or pardon for testimony before a committee. What happened? Let me read to you from the Congressional Globe of January 16, 1862:

I understand that almost every day persons are offering to testify before the investigating committees of the House in order to

bring themselves within the pardoning power of the act of 1857. It is to prevent any more such cases of pardon that we asked the House to pass this bill. The bill to repeal.

Why, culprits appeared before the congressional committee who had the temerity to say that they had embezzled from the United States sums well nigh up to \$2 million, and that they pilfered and stole the moneys from the Indian trust funds and they were rendered impervious from punishment because of the law then in effect. That law was not too dissimilar to the bill before us. I know the gentleman from New York [Mr. KEATING] will say the bill is a bit changed now because you have to go to the courts for immunity. But there is for practical purposes no change because once a congressional committee institutes proceedings that seek to cloak the miscreant with immunity no jury anywhere would convict a man. The congressional committee said he should be free from punishment. I say this, although a court might say he is not entitled to the immunity. The jury would follow the Congress and acquit.

There have been abuses of the privilege. There is no doubt about it. There has been a parade of witnesses who may have been guilty and who pleaded the fifth amendment, but that is the price we must pay for our liberty. Liberty is a precious thing—you cannot buy it cheaply. It is dear, and because there are some abuses is no reason why we should throw out the window the fifth amendment. I can tell you this: There has been that queue of recalcitrant witnesses availing themselves rightly or wrongly of the fifth amendment because of the conduct of, the unfair conduct and the arbitrary conduct of, some chairmen of our committees in the Congress. Because of the threatened unfair treatment these witnesses have set up the shield of the amendment. They refused to be hounded, browbeaten, and bullied by some of the chairmen of our investigating committees who do not have any idea of elemental civility and courtesy and decency. I say there would be no need for this bill if there had been fairness accompanying the activities of members of our congressional committees. Reform the chairmen, reform the committees, and you will not have any need for a bill of this sort.

Let me scotch once and for all the idea that the invocation of the fifth amendment is tantamount to guilt. In a case decided in 1915, Mr. Justice McKenna said:

If it be objected that Burdick's refusal to answer was an implication of crime, we answer not necessarily in fact nor at all in theory of law.

That should end forever this ridiculous statement that because a man invokes the fifth amendment he is guilty. The fifth amendment is for the innocent as well as the guilty. It is an umbrella that shields us all. Also to brand anyone as a fifth-amendment Communist is as damnable, in my opinion, as it is indefensible. It is an opinion that is born of a wealth of ignorance of our constitutional history.

We are in a climate of jitters and fear. Unfortunately, we cannot legislate outside that climate. There is an unbecoming shrillness fed into hysteria by political would-be saviors, in this approach to internal communism. But we, as responsible men and women must forsake the emotion and passion of the moment, out of which springs this proposed legislation. This bill involves short cuts that bode greater evil than the danger sought to be eliminated—a cure worse than the disease.

Where and when will this crusade end? We passed, and I voted for, a wire-tapping bill; a bill to make Communists stateless; to make espionage in peacetime a capital offense; to increase penalties for harboring Communists; to make jumping bail a felony in addition to forfeiture of bond.

After this bill there will come another bill to have the court require testimony of recalcitrant witnesses under penalty of sanctions.

Do we need any more legislation in this war against communism? Under the Smith Act, 103 were indicted in 13 cases; 72 were convicted, and 28 await trial. One hundred and fifteen Communists and their leaders have been arrested under the Smith Act. That is a rather impressive record. What more do you want? What legislative lack does sections (a) and (b) of the reported bill fill?

I am reading from the minority report, and I commend it to you:

It is not the function of Congress to expose private personal guilt. It is not the function of the Congress to prepare cases for prosecution. It is not the function of Congress to relieve the executive branch of the Government of its constitutional responsibility of law enforcement. When a committee of Congress investigates, it does so to gather evidence for its own purposes, that of legislating wisely and adequately. The investigations of Pearl Harbor, Teapot Dome, the work of the Truman Defense Committee, and the LaFollette Civil Liberties Committee did not suffer for lack of congressional power to immunize witnesses. In the areas of treason, sabotage, espionage, sedition, the Communist conspiracy, etc., the Congress has not heretofore hesitated to legislate, though lacking the power of immunization, session after session in its history.

This bill will encourage informers, will indemnify rogues. They would testify the way some committees want. They would be led into speculation and exaggeration and lies concerning the political views and associations of friends and associates. Some would testify to anything to save their own skins. The testimony would be cut to suit the cloth of the examiner. The malevolent, the wicked, and the frightened would testify as desired. The innocent whose testimony would conflict with these informants would be prosecuted for perjury.

This bill is filled with perjury traps.

I would like to commend to you the statement of Mr. Welch, who was counsel for the Army in the recent hearings before the Senate. He said as follows:

Our Founding Fathers were familiar enough with the history of the Middle Ages to know that "justice" in that time took some peculiar forms. They knew that the formal trial of a citizen often began by

placing him to torture, with someone standing by to take down that era's equivalent of a stenographic transcript of the "confession" he made in his agony. The transcript was then piously and lugubriously produced in court as proof of the poor devil's guilt.

The framers of the Bill of Rights were determined that this should never happen in this fair country of ours and in this spirit, which I can hardly find blameworthy, they wrote the fifth amendment. Now, to be sure, the fifth amendment has been resorted to in the intervening years by many rascals, by many guilty men and doubtless there are persons invoking it today who will one day be found guilty. But no matter who invokes the amendment, it stands in our Constitution as one of the guardians of our liberties. It is for all men to use. Guilt will have to be proved in other ways, not in a way reminiscent of the medieval dungeons.

It would be a pity if the net effect of these long and laborious hearings, the confusion and the travail were merely to undermine our Nation's faith in the document that made the Nation possible. If the phrase "fifth-amendment Communist" has in any way eroded your faith in the Bill of Rights, read it once again, I pray you.

So, Mr. Speaker, I ask that the Members vote down this bill so hurriedly and inadequately considered in this House, a bill as highly important as the one which seeks to destroy one of the cornerstones of liberty.

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

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

Mr. KLEIN. I have two questions I wish to ask about the bill. Is it not a fact that the bill really does not give true immunity? Because, while it avoids Federal prosecution for the crime it does not avoid any State prosecution.

Mr. CELLER. I will say to those who are advocates of States' rights that there is grave danger there that the State prosecutors may be hobbled in their attempts to prosecute for State crimes, because in the testimony that may be made concerning subversion a man may have said that he committed crimes under State law; he may have committed a theft, he may have embezzled, he may even have committed a murder. It is likely that the State prosecutors would be barred from prosecuting that culprit for the State crime he admitted in the State courts because of this bill. Those are some of the dangers that I ask you to look into carefully. The bill is so ineptly worded, so carelessly drawn, so badly put together that the lawyers will have years of field days and the courts will be sorely put to it for years with cases in the effort to tell really what the legislation means. But I warned in committee that State prosecutors would be hobbled and impeded.

On the other hand they may not be impeded and State prosecution may ensue, in which event the immunity granted would be useless since not complete. I defy anyone to tell me from the terms of the bill whether the State can or cannot prosecute upon the testimony given wherein a crime was admitted.

There is a further point to which the testimony of the Chicago Bar Association before this committee gave much needed clarity.

"The scope of protection granted by the current section is well summarized in the

recent opinion in *Adams v. Maryland*. Justice Black, speaking for the unanimous Court (Justice Frankfurter concurred in the result and Justice Jackson wrote a separate concurring opinion), stated that section 3486 prevented the use of testimony given before a congressional committee in a State court prosecution, as well as in the Federal courts; and that it applied whether or not the witness had first claimed his privilege against self-incrimination when requested or ordered to testify.

"All current proposals to replace section 3486 would take away from witnesses before congressional committees the protection afforded by the current section. The witness who did not claim the privilege before testifying would have no protection against use of his testimony in Federal or State prosecutions."

Moreover, much serious study must be given to the question as to whether the granting of immunity is not in effect the granting of a pardon and hence an encroachment on the powers of the Executive. We look to the definition of a pardon as first enunciated by Chief Justice Marshall:

"A pardon is an act of grace, proceeding from the power entrusted with the execution of the laws, which exempts the individual, on whom it is bestowed from the punishment the law inflicts for a crime he has committed."

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for one further question on this bill?

Mr. CELLER. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. KLEIN. The point I want to make is that while this bill might give immunity from criminal prosecution, is it not a fact that testimony given as a result of the immunity conferred under this bill might very well affect a person's right to employment, affect a person's right to live in a Federal housing development, or his right to membership in trade unions?

Mr. CELLER. Oh, yes; there are all kinds of sanctions. The immunity does not cover many disabilities. It promises more than it can give. There is no immunity from private sanctions—expulsion from labor union, loss of employment, ostracism of friends, disability and discrimination in housing and schooling of children, public opprobrium, refusal of passport, possible internment in a camp—if one is an alien—during emergency proclamation proclaimed by the President.

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. Speaker, according to my count the opposition has 3 minutes remaining and we have 5. I maintain that we are entitled to the last speech.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask for a recapitulation on the time count.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Pennsylvania has stated it correctly. The gentleman from New York has 3 minutes remaining, the gentleman from Pennsylvania 5.

Does the gentleman from New York desire to yield further time?

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. MULTER].

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, the only agreement, I think, as to this bill is that it is a very important bill. I cannot understand how this House will undertake to pass upon a bill of such tremendous importance, touching upon one of the

very fundamental principles of our Constitution, that of requiring witnesses to testify against themselves, without even having copies of the hearings before it.

It was not until this morning that we got the report of the committee. I doubt whether very many Members have had an opportunity to read either the majority report or the minority views on the bill. None of us has had an opportunity to read the hearings on this bill.

Under date of July 28 I placed in the Appendix of the daily RECORD the report on pending immunity bills written by the committee on Federal legislation of the Association of the Bar of the City of New York. I need not comment on the reputation of that bar association or of the 21 members of the New York bar who constituted that committee, all of them eminent and prominent lawyers of high repute. If you will refer to that report in the RECORD, you will find that this bill even in its present form does not meet the objections that were urged against it by 20 of the 21 members who signed that report. One of those members is opposed completely to giving authority to the Congress to grant immunity to witnesses. The others approve the principle in part and then only if safeguards are written into the law which you will not find in this bill.

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

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

Mr. JAVITS. The only difference between the bill and that committee's report is that this bill requires notice to the Attorney General and a court appearance. Does the gentleman believe that makes any difference in the principles enunciated by the Bar Association?

Mr. MULTER. It does not affect the principles involved. If this bill is so urgent and so important, let us bring it before the House under an open rule. Let us consider it completely, debate it thoroughly, amend it and make it a good bill. This Congress can never justify passing upon legislation of this kind with only 40 minutes of debate, and with no opportunity to offer amendments. No one has yet given a single reason as to why this bill must be passed during the closing hours of this session of Congress. If any reasons exist, then the protection of the liberties and freedoms of the American people require that this Congress remain right here on the job until we have fully and fairly and completely discussed this bill and acted upon it, but only after due and careful consideration.

To pass this bill at this time in its present form will make us ludicrous.

Labeling bills antisubversive will catch no Communists and convict no criminals, and will not bring about the enactment of any good legislation.

Not a single sponsor of this legislation can point to one instance when the Congress has been prevented from legislating upon this very important subject because any one or more witnesses have refused to testify.

No one in or out of this Congress can think of, suggest, or imagine any kind of

legislation that should be proposed, or that has not been proposed on the subject which should be proposed or could have been proposed or will be proposed if some recalcitrant witness is compelled to testify.

Every legislator worthy of the title must concede that the enactment of this bill will not adduce a single fact that will help this or any other Congress to legislate.

The only other purpose of this bill then, can be to uncover criminality and prosecute the guilty.

That part of this bill which gives the right to the Congress to grant immunity to witnesses in order to compel them to testify can only have the opposite effect.

The moment any witness refuses to testify because of the privilege accorded to him by the fifth amendment, even though presumed innocent until proved guilty in our law courts, in the court of public opinion he is presumed to be guilty, and no amount of argument, however logical or legalistic, eradicates that opinion from the public mind.

At the same time, however, every time a witness invokes that privilege, by that very act he alerts the prosecuting agencies of our Government to the fact that here is someone whose conduct requires criminal investigation. Hundreds of such persons who claimed the privilege have since been indicted and convicted and sentenced to jail. This bill will stop that.

Any time and every time a congressional committee or a subcommittee desires to grant immunity to a witness from criminal prosecution it can effectuate that purpose under this bill. Instead of catching criminals, congressional committees will be accorded the Executive right to grant pardons. The only difference will be that whereas even the President cannot grant a pardon until the criminal has been convicted, by this bill, the Congress will give itself the right to grant pardons even before indictment.

The enactment of this bill will be a step further in the direction of destroying the separation of powers which has been the strength of our American Government.

Heretofore the Congress enacted the legislation making criminal such conduct as is against the public interest and in such legislation it set forth the punishment to be imposed upon those found guilty. The investigation and prosecution of criminals up to now has been left to the executive departments, with the right of pardon if the third branch, to wit, the judiciary, has conducted a trial which resulted in the conviction.

By this bill we roll the three functions into one. The Congress will now investigate, not for the purpose of legislating but for the purpose of exposing crime, and it will then, with or without the aid of the executive departments, seek a court order to immunize the criminal from prosecution even before adducing the facts concerning the crime.

Our theory of justice has heretofore been "let a hundred criminals escape prosecution rather than convict a single innocent person." This bill changes that philosophy to "let the guilty be excused

from prosecution rather than follow the time-tested methods of indicting those against whom proof of a crime exists."

Let me again direct the attention of our colleagues to the fact that this Congress makes itself a laughing stock when a bill of this tremendous importance is pushed through with only 40 minutes of debate and with no opportunity to offer amendments, while a bill of so little importance as the labeling of imported trout is brought before the House under an open rule, permitting 1 hour of debate, and without limitation as to amendment. Truly this Congress, by this kind of action convicts itself of being more interested in protecting trout than in protecting the hard-won liberties of the American people.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. DODD].

Mr. DODD. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to a suspension of the rules for the passage of this bill, S. 16.

This measure was passed in the Senate as early as April of this year and now we find it suggested that it be rushed through the House of Representatives in the closing hours of the 83d Congress under a suspension of the rules and with only 40 minutes provided for discussion and debate on the legislation.

A great constitutional question is at issue before us.

We are being asked to tamper with the fifth amendment, part of our precious Bill of Rights, and to do so as we would pass a traffic ordinance for the District of Columbia.

Some of the finest legal minds in this country, by their writings and utterances in the past year, have indicated their deep concern over this proposal.

Some of the best constitutional lawyers in the Nation have made clear that they are opposed to this measure.

One of the best expressions with respect to the problem was made by Dean Griswold of the Harvard Law School on February 5, 1954, before the Massachusetts Bar Association.

Recently Mr. Joseph N. Welch, a distinguished lawyer at the Massachusetts bar, and recently counsel for the Army in the Senator McCarthy hearings, has written a persuasive and most intelligent article concerning this whole problem.

Many of us feel that the present bill has been poorly drawn and that it presents grave constitutional complications.

For example, from a reading of it, no one can tell whether the immunity granted extends to prosecutions in the State courts and this is but one of the obscurities in the legislation.

I was able to get a copy of this bill only 1 hour ago, and yesterday an attempt was made to bring this matter before the House before the committee reports or the committee bill was available to us.

This is another symptom of the hysteria and panic which has afflicted the Nation.

It is a reckless way to trifle with the constitutional rights of the American people.

This is a sure symptom of blind anti-communism which has thrown the Nation into a fever and which causes it

to convulsively thrash about with great damage to itself and to the cause of freedom.

It is provoking and exasperating to have American citizens appear before congressional committees and refuse to say whether they are now or ever have been members of the Communist Party, and as such, participants in the Communist conspiracy.

But the fifth amendment certainly must have been written with just such a difficult situation in the minds of the Founding Fathers.

The fifth amendment was not written for easy times or simple questions.

It was written because the men who drew up the Bill of Rights knew the danger of forcing men to give evidence against themselves.

In those early days of the Republic there were great problems of loyalty and of allegiance and there were serious disturbances born of sedition.

But the wise men who gave us our precious constitutional liberties knew the history of the star chamber, the rack and the rope and the hot iron.

They knew that great questions would confront this Nation long after their time and they wrote the fifth amendment to provide for those probabilities and for such times as these.

I have fought Communists and communism all of my mature life.

I do not believe that we can effectively overcome this menace in the world by falling back to the practices of the dark eras of history.

In the long run it is far better that some Communists go undetected in our midst and that the task of running them down remain a difficult one rather than we give up our precious constitutional heritage in a fit of national bad temper.

For these reasons, I am opposed to this legislation and I shall vote against suspension of the rules and the passage of this bill.

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. HYDE].

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Speaker, this bill is necessary and salutary in its purpose. It has been said on the floor today that there is nothing new in this legislation, no change from the legislation of the past century, which was found to be bad. That is a misstatement of the fact.

There is a decided change in this legislation from the legislation as it existed in the last century. The legislation to which the gentleman from New York referred merely required appearance in order to get immunity. Under this legislation the witness must plead the fifth amendment and then must be granted immunity before he obtains it. That, of course, is a fundamental change, it is a fundamental difference from the legislation about which the gentleman from New York said there was no change.

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

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

Mr. KEATING. And also under this bill the immunity is not granted until the Attorney General and the court have reviewed it, whereas under the bill re-

cited by the gentleman from New York it was just the congressional committee that had the power.

Mr. HYDE. That is right.

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

Mr. HYDE. Not now.

Mr. CELLER. The gentleman has questioned a statement of mine and I think he ought to yield.

Mr. HYDE. I probably should, but I have not the time. I will be glad to yield if I have time.

Mr. Speaker, there has been a great deal of misunderstanding about this bill.

It has been said that this is an infringement upon the fundamental rights of our citizens. Let us get this straight. No fundamental rights are being taken away. If a witness is protected, as he will be under this bill, against prosecution for or on account of any transaction, matter, or thing concerning which he is compelled to testify, his constitutional rights are preserved. Now, since the protection of the witness is the issue here, that is the fundamental thing about which we are talking. By its very nature, granting immunity cannot be abused so far as that witness is concerned. How can you abuse him if you are granting him immunity from prosecution?

One of the previous speakers also said that this particular procedure of granting immunity is untested and untried. I would call the attention of the House to the fact that actually there is nothing new in this. For years this Congress has given the power to grant immunity to several Government boards and commissions, and incidentally in those cases they do not have to get the approval of the Attorney General, they do not have to get the approval of the court. Immunity can be granted by the examiner in the case, and that is all there is to it.

Now, the constitutional power of Congress to investigate and, in the course of its investigation, to obtain sworn testimony, is an inherent and important legislative power on a level with the executive power to prosecute and pardon criminals. It is argued that Congress should not investigate crimes but only make investigations relating to legislation. Technically, that is perhaps correct. But, does anyone deny that the investigation by the Senator from Delaware into the Internal Revenue led to good results, and, I might also add led to legislation. Just this week the Committee on the Judiciary adopted favorably a piece of legislation which arose out of those investigations into misconduct in the Internal Revenue.

Now, it is also argued that because congressional hearings are not secret the witness will be severely damaged even though he is given immunity. I would suggest to the House that it is interesting to observe that the same people who argue that the witness would be damaged because the hearings are not secret are the very ones who scream the loudest when you try to make them secret and hold hearings in executive session. I admit this is perhaps a weakness, that witnesses should be heard in executive session, but as soon as you do that, the

very same people objecting to this legislation will object to that as being star chamber proceedings or make some other such objection.

Mr. Speaker, this legislation or legislation similar to this has proved to be of aid to Government boards and commissions, and I am sure it will be of great help to the Congress.

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

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

Mr. FORRESTER. I would like to say to the House that the gentleman who so kindly yielded to me has been investigating this legislation ever since its inception, and I believe the gentleman will agree that I have, too. I believe that the gentleman will agree further that instead of this being "jumping up" legislation, it has had the heartbeat and the heartthrob and the earnest consideration of every Member. I certainly hope that when I go back home I can tell the people we passed this legislation.

Mr. HYDE. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. BURDICK. 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 North Dakota?

There was no objection.

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Speaker, there are three great documents which are the very basis and foundation of our liberties, and those are the Declaration of Independence, the Constitution of the United States, and the Bill of Rights. Our course in the pursuit of liberty and freedom was charted by those three documents. Our forefathers who charted this course, and who lived amid the scenes of the Revolution against the tyranny of Great Britain, made provisions for safeguarding the sacred rights of a citizen, and blazoned across the path of history the doctrine that here in this new Government it should exist forever for the people. This was in direct opposition to the theory held at that time by almost all governments, namely, that the people existed for the Government. This theory is still held by some of the powerful governments of the earth, but here we have steadfastly maintained our original concept of a government existing for the people.

The fifth amendment, which this Congress is now seeking to amend by legislative action, is one of the historical clauses in the Bill of Rights. It was placed there as a protection against tyranny, and it should never be amended, abridged, or altered except by a constitutional amendment.

If this Congress, by legislative action, can whittle down the protection guaranteed to a citizen by that amendment, and thus change or minimize the importance of that part of the Bill of Rights, we are doing it at the risk of losing our independence, and, as I understand and believe, in violation of the Constitution itself.

An act as important as this one should not be brought before the Congress in the last hours of the session, and should not be hastily considered. It is designed

to give new and extraordinary powers to the Attorney General in the prosecution of a certain line of cases. In our zeal to protect this Government against one subversive group we should not build up autocratic power in one man which might result in establishing a Government policy as severe as were those of Hitler and Mussolini. As far as free people are concerned, one "ism" is as bad as another.

Another unconstitutional phase of this bill is that in granting immunity to a witness it invades States' rights. The Congress cannot grant immunity in prosecutions in State courts unless the immunity granted applies to all prosecutions.

In the cases spelled out in this bill, suppose a witness before a committee of Congress, when asked this question, "Are you now or have you ever been a Communist?" replies, "I have been and still am a Communist." That ends that matter right there, because it is not unlawful in itself to be a Communist. In that case the only thing the Government could do is remove that person from any position he may hold in the Government. If the witness relies on the protection granted by the fifth amendment and refuses to testify, he can be and ought to be removed from the Government payroll. Even if this bill were passed with all the immunities provided, the end would be no different than operating under the present law.

To increase the power of the Attorney General and whittle away by legislation at an attempt to change the fifth amendment without resorting to the regular process established for amending the Constitution will accomplish no gain in the move to put Communists out of any position in the Government, but will be dangerous to the millions of people in the United States who are not Communists. We cannot take protection away from one group without taking it from all groups, and therefore, before voting for such a bill we should take time to consider it more fully than we can at this 11th hour of this session.

This bill recently came to the Judiciary Committee. A substitute bill was considered, and an amended bill was considered, and other amendments have kept coming in morning, noon, and night for the past 3 days. The course from the Attorney General's office to the Judiciary Committee has been red hot, and the rides made by the horsemen of the Attorney General's office rival the ride of Paul Revere.

Since the Attorney General does not definitely know what he wants, and comes up with new versions thrice daily, how are the Members of this Congress to know what is really wanted? I, at least, will not vote for this bill until I know definitely what the Attorney General wants, and have had time to study the measure. I do not propose to throw overboard any part of the Bill of Rights upon a moment's notice.

Mr. REAMS. 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 Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. REAMS. Mr. Speaker, this bill, to amend the immunity provisions relating to testimony given by witnesses before either House of Congress or their committees, expresses a deep-seated desire to speed the process of eradicating Communists and other subversives from our society. This desire is shared by all of us. To make a contribution toward such an end is so popular at this time that no Member can be completely immune to the desire to participate in such action.

However, we must take the long-range and farsighted view of what we are doing. The Bill of Rights, and particularly the fifth amendment, has proven its place too well in the history of the protection of civil rights to be weakened or abandoned at the time when they may be more needed than ever before.

The record of this Congress and its individual Members in fully cooperating with the law enforcement agencies in fighting communism is strong enough that it does not need the support of this bill to convince the people that we are not soft on communism. Unless this bill is sound and farsighted, we should not pass it. If it will lead the Congress into conflict by the legislative body encroaching on the judicial function, we should proceed cautiously. If it will be the cause of confusion and embarrassment to prosecuting and district attorneys in the several States in carrying out their duties, we should not pass this act.

This bill is designed to secure from witnesses testimony with reference to treason, sabotage, espionage, sedition, seditious conspiracy, or the overthrow of this Government by force or violence, which is now being withheld because of the provisions of the fifth amendment.

It is my belief that this legislation would be unwise in three separate respects—first, if it is broad enough in its scope and strong enough in its effect to secure the desired results, it will be so far-reaching as to interfere with prosecution, not only in the United States courts, but in all the courts in every State. In the proposed amendment which we have before us, with a copy of the bill, the language is—"but no such witness shall be prosecuted or subjected to any penalty or forfeiture for or on account of any transaction, matter, or thing concerning which he is compelled, after having claimed his privilege against self-incrimination, to testify or produce evidence, nor shall testimony so compelled be used as evidence in criminal proceedings against him in any court." I believe there can be no doubt about this language covering State courts as well as United States courts.

The second objection to this legislation is that provision of this bill whereby immunity shall not be granted without first having notified the Attorney General of the United States of such action and thereafter having secured approval of the United States court for the district wherein such inquiry is being held. This is such a clumsy procedure as to make the act of little use. While the nature of the action before the United States district court is not defined other than "having secured approval of the United

States district court." I do not assume that this is an action which cannot be appealed to the court of last resort in each individual case. The time consumed between making the application and the hearings of appeal would certainly involve weeks, and perhaps months.

The third of the principal objections I have to this bill is that this general type of immunity to an individual provided for in this bill goes too far in opening the door for abuses. This applies both to the committee or court conducting the hearings or investigation, and to the witnesses who have invoked the protection of the fifth amendment.

I feel reasonably sure that the bill is drawn in such a way as to escape violation of the rights of an individual under the fifth amendment. Nevertheless, it does require a person to be his own accuser. Any statute passed by this Congress which would grant immunity must be so drafted as to make it possible, and even necessary, to apply it with the greatest of discrimination. Otherwise, it will be a sanction and a license to nullify the Bill of Rights, and particularly the fifth amendment. We are at this time outraged by repeated instances of disloyal citizens hiding under the cloak of the fifth amendment by claim of defense against self-incrimination. This, at times, has appeared to be public mockery of sound principles of justice. But it is at times like this that the temptation to throw away the safeguards of freedom is so great. We must resist this temptation; we must continue to strive toward better methods of apprehension and greater responsibility on the part of all citizens.

I cannot believe that this bill is the answer to the problem before us. The granting of immunity is always the use of an extraordinary power. In opening up the use of this power as wide as we would if this bill were enacted into law would be like the opening up of the proverbial Pandora's box from which evils innumerable would result.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the *RECORD* and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, in good conscience considering my deep convictions as a lawyer as to constitutional and other objections and the district I represent, I cannot support this bill.

The privilege of a witness to refuse to answer on the constitutional grounds of self incrimination is one of the most fundamental freedoms that we have. It is hundreds of years old and cannot be impaired without the most profound consideration, certainly not after a 40-minute take-it-or-leave-it debate. This protection is critically important to the individual, probably the most important protection he has against the overwhelming power of the state. Right now it is being invoked by witnesses—certainly irritatingly and undoubtedly excessively—in investigations of subversion and communism. But there was a

time when it was an invaluable protection in cases of religious persecution under the laws of England. The member of any minority, religious or racial does not dare to have his thinking subverted by the anti-Communist drive—vital as it is—into forgetting what such a power to deprive an individual of the privilege of pleading self-incrimination before a congressional committee can mean tomorrow.

The view I have taken is the view of the Committee on Federal Legislation of the Association of the Bar of the City of New York which in the prevailing opinion in considering this measure concluded as follows, on July 7, 1954:

In summary, we believe that recent events have not demonstrated the need for congressional power to grant immunity, but have underlined the necessity of reaffirming the distinction between the functions of the different branches of the Government. In no area is that distinction of greater importance than in that of criminal prosecution. Legislative grants of immunity would lead to invasion of that area by the Congress. And the proposal in the Keating bill that this be authorized only when approved in advance by the Attorney General would further break down the division by giving to that executive officer a control over congressional action.

If the Attorney General receives authority to grant immunity by compelling testimony in any court or grand jury proceeding, the Government would be enabled to get required evidence from any witness. Should a congressional investigation point to the likelihood that evidence of crime might be uncovered by an immunity grant, the Attorney General could present the matter to a grand jury, where the rights of both the Government and the witness would be fully protected. This would bring about a salutary restoration of balance between the two branches of the Government, while maintaining the procedural safeguards of the criminal law.

I consider congressional investigations one of the firmest foundations of our freedom and investigations of subversion and communism to be an entirely appropriate area for the Congress to pursue investigations vigorously, but the bill before us will not materially aid the legislative power of investigation in the field of subversion and communism but will seriously push back American freedoms.

The fundamental defect of this bill is that the power to grant immunity is given to any congressional committee—acting by two-thirds vote it is true—but still any committee. With 19 standing committees of the House of Representatives and many special committees, we are giving a grant of power which has the promise of great mischief and of which we cannot tell the end result. For under the power to grant immunity from criminal prosecution in the often superheated political atmosphere of the Congress, rogues could go scot free while honest men could be seriously compromised.

The bill presented to us also gives the power to grant immunity to the courts in criminal cases involving subversion, espionage, treason, and similar crimes and in proceedings before grand juries. I favor this power, but it is joined with a similar power to congressional committees and this I do not favor as it has in it the seeds of great national mischief.

But the bill is presented to us under a suspension of the rules, no amendment is possible, it cannot be divided and I must take it or leave it. I believe that on balance it is very unwise legislation and should be rejected.

The application to a court provided for in the bill before us does not save it because the court will, in my opinion as a lawyer, only determine it can pass upon procedural matters leaving the question as to the advisability or inadvisability of granting immunity to the congressional committee involved. In that case, the congressional committee itself becomes a prosecutor and judge without any of the protections of a court of law. For example, grand-jury proceedings are secret while congressional committee sessions are generally public, so that the mere charge made in such a session is often taken by the public as proof. In court a witness compelled to testify against himself under immunity has the right to call other witnesses, his lawyer has the right to cross-examine, and there are rules of evidence and of law to be followed. This is certainly completely different from most congressional hearings as run today. Neither House of the Congress has adopted rules of procedure for its investigating committees, therefore every committee makes its own rules, if any.

Nor has a case been made out to show that the security of our country requires this abridgment of a basic freedom. Of the 115 Communist leaders taken into custody under the Smith Act, 103 have been indicted, 78 have been convicted, and the Federal Government has not suffered a serious reverse in these cases. While witnesses before congressional committees today who plead the privilege against self-incrimination are promptly marked men insofar as any position of responsibility or public trust is concerned and even in their social and civic life.

The proposal before us is just too dangerous to the life and future of our country, I am deeply convinced. I know full well the intensity of the Communist struggle but I cannot lend myself and my district to so dangerous a jeopardy of our freedoms to prove it. I have already proved by determination in the fight against communism on a thousand battle lines from voting indictments of witnesses before congressional committees for contempt, to making peacetime espionage a capital crime and to the manifold battles I have fought in the field of foreign affairs in our historic struggle against communism.

I would like to juxtapose the bill before us to another bill that will come up next by the same author. H. R. 4975, entitled "A bill to prescribe a method by which the Houses of Congress and their committees may invoke the aid of the courts in compelling testimony of witnesses." I am for this bill and this is the right way to help congressional committees to deal with recalcitrant witnesses. The privilege against self-incrimination is undoubtedly, on occasion, improperly pleaded because the question asked could not incriminate if answered. H. R. 4975 gives a way to get a court ruling on the spot and to compel a wit-

ness to go on with his testimony instead of waiting for the legal machinery to punish for contempt to take its course. So too for the witness himself, he will be much more careful about what he refuses to answer if he knows that his refusal can be dealt with summarily by a court and that his punishment for contempt is practically assured if he does not answer.

H. R. 4975 is a way to make congressional investigations more efficient; S. 16 will not make them any more efficient, leaves us wide open to grave national injury and would be a monumental abridgment of our fundamental freedoms.

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, at 4 o'clock today is many days too late to bring a bill of this major proportion to this floor and then limit the total time to 40 minutes for both sides. Its importance and bearing on the whole field of congressional investigations and criminal law at Federal level dictates that it should not have been crowded into such an inadequate amount of time.

The substitute bill only came to my hands an hour or so ago. No copies of hearings are available. It is a poor way to legislate on matters closely akin to the rights, privileges, and protections given under the fifth amendment of our Constitution.

But the administration is determined to clear it today and not allow more time.

Look at a few points in the amendment before us. Section 1 provides that only a majority of the Members present on the floor of the House at the time, shall have authority to vote to grant immunity. Should it not be that at least a quorum of the House membership must be present and voting? I think it should so require.

As you know, the House Un-American Activities Committee, of which I am one consists of only nine members. Hence under subsection 2, if only six members so vote, immunity may be granted. But most of the time our committee functions with subcommittees of from 2 to 5 committee members so that not all members hear the testimony or see the witness. This presents some practical problems to solve with utmost care.

And this amendment does not mention anything about subcommittees, and what authority it may have to vote immunity. Can a one-man subcommittee result in a grant of immunity? I state that no one-man committee should be lawful for any purpose where the possibility of the question of granting immunity can rise.

Mr. Speaker, I shall vote for this bill as I readily realize the need of some advance in this field of meeting subversives before our committee and other committees also. But, last week when I sent my memo against one-man committees to every Member of this House, I had no idea this bill would be here before us today.

The purport of this bill speaks louder than anything I said, against allowing one-man subcommittees.

With all due respect, I must admit that during my 8 years in this body I have never seen more than just 1 or 2 occasions, when the human frailties or weaknesses of human beings sitting as

less than the full congressional committee, would not have been conducive to sound or fair judgment in the question of immunity to a witness.

As I say, I shall vote for this bill. I do so with the declaration that its provisions must be applied and executed with utmost caution and care. I could not have voted for it if it had not been amended so as to limit it to cases relating to treason, sabotage, espionage, sedition, and conspiracies to overthrow our constitutional form of government by force and violence. Nor could I have voted for it if it had not been made compulsory to first obtain an order, after a proper hearing and showing before a Federal court, after notice to the Attorney General. This will stop hasty, ill-considered and unwarranted action by any Congressman who may for a moment or so let his better judgment be kept under a bushel.

Experience with this bill will probably prove essential changes must be made. We can do that. We should do it as promptly as experience teaches us.

This bill will not be a shotgun cure-all. It can lead to abuses in the hands of inconsiderate men.

But the need of something different than we now have is apparent. I shall vote for the bill in the firm conviction that it need not violate any rights of American citizens and its use can help protect our Nation against the criminal and subversive conspiracy now being directed against it.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, I am opposed to the consideration of this bill under suspension of rules, with debate limited to 40 minutes. Within the last month, we have spent on occasions, as the gentleman from Connecticut observes, approximately 2 legislative days debating a change in the size of a peach basket, and as I recall the leadership spread the debate on three relatively minor education bills, proposing various committees and conferences, over 2 or 3 days just a few weeks ago. Despite this generous allotment of time to relatively unimportant bills, the leadership today is presenting under severe limitations a bill, which was reported from committee on August 3. The report on this bill involving controversial questions of law, of court, and congressional procedure, and of constitutionality, has just been made available. There is insufficient time to debate the bill, and even too little time to ask pertinent questions.

Given sufficient time to study this measure, to inquire as to its effects, I might support it, but under the present circumstances, with questions unanswered, with doubts as to its constitutionality, with fears as to its possible effects, I am opposed to suspending the rules and recommend that this motion be defeated and the bill reported in regular manner with a rule, providing for full debate and amendment.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I deeply regret that this measure is coming before us in this manner. In the closing days of the session it is brought up under suspension of the rules. That means that debate is limited to a total of 40 minutes and that no amendments can be offered. Apparently it was not

even in the calculations of the leadership when last week the leadership forced the passage of a resolution for sine die adjournment, which meant that at that time the House had completed the full schedule of legislation contemplated.

Yet the legislation that is brought before us today, in a manner prohibiting all amendments and restricting to 40 minutes the time for deliberation, is of transcending importance.

The most precious rights of the American people are embodied in the Bill of Rights of our Constitution. The priceless heritage translated into our Bill of Rights stems from great and historic events of 739 years ago when King John signed the Magna Carta on the field at Runnymede. In the more than seven centuries that have intervened there have been many times when the spirit of the Magna Carta has been periled by the ambitions of evil men and the passions of the times. Always when the atmosphere has cleared, and the minds of men became again poised, Magna Carta was restored to a position even more exalted.

If we are to hold this priceless heritage each generation must be dedicated to the task of preserving it. Each generation has had and will continue to have provocative periods, when good and well-intentioned people in indignation over the misuse by evil persons of the protections of the Magna Carta and of our own Bill of Rights will be moved to do that which in effect would destroy the entire structure.

Mr. Speaker, I have talked with many Members of this body and on both sides of the aisle, and I have not found one who feels that we should proceed at this time and in this manner on a matter which is so very close to the heart of our Bill of Rights. What they are afraid of is that a vote against this bill will be construed as a vote in favor of someone whom no one likes. With elections but a few months removed, and our country engaged in an expensive and dangerous cold war with communism, many of them feel that they must take into consideration the political phase of their vote on a record rollcall.

Mr. Speaker, I feel that the preservation of the Bill of Rights transcends any question of whether I or any other Member of this Congress should be a Member of the 84th Congress. There are times when it is more important to do the present duty than to look for opportunities to duty yet uncalled for. I shall vote against this bill with the conviction that by so doing I have done the job given to my generation dedicated as preceding generations to protection of the Bill of Rights and the spirit of the Magna Carta from which it emanated.

I would say that we have reached the stage in the 83d Congress when every Member must stand up and be accounted for, whether he gives priority to his own interest in reelection in a period of excitement or of devotion to the preservation of the Bill of Rights and the spirit of Magna Carta.

I am not saying that the objectives of this legislation could not be obtained

if we were permitted to offer amendments of restraint and of limitation. Perhaps it could. But we are not permitted to offer such amendments. Indeed, we are not permitted even to discuss the bill more than three-quarters of 1 hour. We are told that this is a measure to protect us against subversive activities against which we are all united, and that to vote against it would brand us as being supporters of those activities. This is in the nature of putting a gun to the temple of a virtuous person and telling him to subscribe to something put before him or of being the victim of the resultant shot from the portending weapon. I will not surrender the rights wrested from King John over 7 centuries ago and preserved by our own Bill of Rights under such pressure.

If this should prove out to be the issue in the campaign deciding my reelection, I will abide by the decision of the electorate. I appreciate that by my vote today I am raising that issue. I was 15 when the sainted William McKinley called for volunteers in the war with Spain. I was just turning 16 when I was one of 19,000 American soldiers who at the siege of Santiago dethroned the power of Spain. I again entered the service when I was 35 and left a family the members of whom I loved devotedly to serve again in the uniform of the United States. If anyone raises against me this issue with less proof of their devotion to the United States of America and its ideals in the campaign of November because of my vote today I am willing to meet him on the issue of service to our country and of sacrifice entailed thereby, and of area and branch of service involved in such service.

Mr. Speaker, I shall vote against this bill because it is destructive of the Bill of Rights in our Constitution. I might point out that we tried this procedure more than half a century ago, and that it resulted only in giving immunity to persons who had stolen in brazen thievery countless millions of the money of the taxpayers of America. In other words, it protected scoundrels. Five years later because of the popular indignation that had been aroused, the Congress repealed the act that had operated only to protect scoundrels.

Mr. Speaker, I feel strongly that this is the time when we in the 83d Congress must stand up and be counted. We stand either for the Constitution and its priceless Bill of Rights, or we stand to be numbered in the group placing political expediency above devotion to the Constitution.

If there are no considerations of political repercussions, and each Member of this body resolved the decision of his vote by the dictates of his own judgment and conscience, the vote against this measure would be overwhelming.

I appreciate the concern of my beloved colleagues having in mind their own fate in the forthcoming elections. I appreciate that many are younger in years than am I, and that they are looking toward the future. Fortunately, my only concern is in standing by the Constitution, the Bill of Rights, and Magna Carta, regardless of what my vote on

this measure may contribute in either an affirmative or negative force to the decision of my constituency as to my continuance as a Member of the 84th Congress.

I shall stand by the Constitution of the United States, by the Bill of Rights, and by the spirit of Magna Carta with the conviction that I am doing the right thing.

Mr. Speaker, this I am convinced is the hour of decision.

When we had before us the wiretapping legislation, we in the House reformed the measure to the extent of placing the authority in the courts and not in the Attorney General. As I recall it only 11 Members of the House voted against the measure as amended by the House to give the authority to the courts and not to the Attorney General. Even so amended and to the surprise of everyone in the Congress, the newspapers of the United States, including the Republican Chicago Daily News, criticized the House of Representatives in voting approval of this bill. Every bar association in the United States of America passed resolutions that the bill should not have been passed. I do not recall the instance of a single newspaper of national standing that approved of the passage of this bill for which most Members of this House voted because not of conviction but of possible political repercussions.

The 83d Congress also passed by consent and as a routine measure a bill requiring the registration of any instrumentality employing the presses of the United States in the production of communistic literature. This was rushed through on the Consent Calendar and took every one of us by surprise, inasmuch as it was represented as something necessary to control subversive activities. It passed the House by unanimous consent, not a voice being raised against it, including my own, and I understand it passed the other body in similar manner. In other words, it passed both this body and the other body by unanimous consent and without debate.

Mr. Speaker, it so happens that in the city of Chicago there is a newspaper owned, controlled, and edited by Colonel McCormick, who is the believer in and advocate of the gentleman from Wisconsin who serves in the other body and who has never been accused of or suspected of alliances with subversive influences. The Chicago Tribune saw in this bill which had passed by unanimous consent both this and the other body an attack upon the Bill of Rights.

Mr. PHILBIN. 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 Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, the zealous preservation of constitutional liberty and all our free institutions now under bitter attack by diabolical subversive forces is surely one of the most urgent needs of our time. We cannot preserve these great heritages by whit-

ting away piecemeal at the sacred edifice of personal liberty.

I cannot here fully elaborate upon my strong reasons for opposing this bill. But I must state candidly that I am unalterably opposed to any and all measures which in effect weaken and limit the protections and safeguards which the Constitution sets up to guarantee the freedom of the individual.

Our Bill of Rights and our Constitution distinguish this Government from totalitarianism. These immortal documents contain the fundamental rights which accord to American citizens and all those living under the American flag a larger measure of personal liberty than has ever been enjoyed by any nation or people in all history.

The fifth amendment protects our citizens against self-incrimination and self-degradation. It enjoins the conviction of anyone by virtue of his own compulsory admissions. It thus affords to all the means of protection against tyranny and oppression whether it be by the powerful State, the courts, executive officers, bureaucrats drunk with power, congressional committees, or other tribunals. Under this Government no man shall be forced or required to give testimony against himself which might tend to incriminate or degrade him. That is a fundamental principle of our law which has been scrupulously observed since the establishment of this Government.

It is not enough to say that this bill requires court approval before immunity may be extended. The basic question remains, Will this Government allow the legislative branch to exercise functions which do not belong to it, which are clearly the province of another branch charged with interpreting and enforcing the criminal laws? If the legislative branch shall hold and exercise such a power over witnesses appearing before its committees, even though it shares it in a palpably clumsy and unprecedented manner with the courts, the door is open to great abuse of power, to an abominable form of tyranny over our citizens and people. It is said that the bill is harmless in that it operates only upon the condition of approval by the Attorney General and the courts. To my mind this is one of the strongest arguments against the bill because it shows conclusively that in this feverish effort to compel testimony against the clear mandate of the Constitution, this bill would invoke in one sweep the joint action of the executive department and of the courts, in matters essentially the province of Congress.

The bill limits the class of cases where the immunity both may be administered to subversion, sabotage, espionage, sedition, and related areas thus setting up special laws for one group of witnesses and continuing present laws for all others. This is a curious and bizarre result which burlesques the function of legislative committees and opens the door to discriminatory treatment of witnesses.

The idea of allowing a congressional committee to initiate immunity from criminal prosecution is a glaring departure from customary law and procedure and will lead to great abuse.

Such a power in the hands of a committee might not materially elicit valuable information concerning subversives and their ilk but it might permit rogues and scoundrels to take shelter behind congressional immunity and in effect absolve them from their crimes. It is a power never intended by the Constitution to reside in the legislative branch of this Government.

This measure would vest Congress with law-enforcement powers whereas our committees are authorized by our laws only to seek evidence for the purpose of taking remedial legislative action. This is an improper and unwise enlargement of the powers and functions of our committees in a field where clarification, and limitation to insure fair procedures, rather than the extension of existing powers, are definitely required.

There is no way of knowing from analysis of this bill just where the immunity power would lead us. It is entirely possible that under this law general immunity might conceivably be granted to all types of criminals and this would forge another link in the chain of corruption and malefaction which threatens to choke and stifle free government.

It is not only protection against self-incrimination that is involved in the fifth amendment but also protection against self-degradation. There are many reasons other than legal wrongdoing that impel witnesses to refuse to answer questions of congressional investigators; religion, politics, family and personal matters of greatest privacy but no criminality are often involved in a refusal to answer.

The promptings of conscience, the self-imposed demands of honor, extreme but lawful concepts of ethics strictly within the sphere and the right of the individual might well be at issue in such a situation.

The club of tyranny should never be wielded over the head of an American whether he is in the courts or the committees of this Congress. Compulsions to believe can never be visited upon a human being because his mind and his soul belong to his God and himself. And compulsion to speak up when his own lips might condemn him to servitude or other punishment is offensive to our Constitution, our laws and our way of life. If a man is guilty of a crime, let the Government convict him under our legal procedures and after a fair trial. The ancient rule that a man is innocent until he is proved guilty is just as binding upon a committee of Congress as it is upon our courts.

This is a great constitutional question. I will decide it in keeping with my concept of the Constitution and the laws. Let Congress do its duty under our great charter of liberty. And let the courts and the Executive do theirs. But in the name of every patriotic value we cherish as a great people, let us never diffuse and scatter the responsibility of the three great branches of this Government as in my opinion the pending bill would do.

Another thing—I was not able to get a copy of this revised bill until the de-

bate began. I humbly submit that the House ought to give this measure more careful and more extensive consideration.

The SPEAKER. All time has expired. The question is on suspending the rules and passing the bill, as amended.

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 294, nays 55, not voting 83, as follows:

[Roll No. 135]

YEAS—294

Abbutt	Dorn, S. C.	Lipscomb
Abernethy	Dowdy	Long
Adair	Doyle	Lovre
Addonizio	Durham	Lucas
Alexander	Edmondson	McConnell
Allen, Calif.	Elliott	McCormack
Allen, Ill.	Ellsworth	McCulloch
Andersen,	Engle	McDonough
H. Carl	Fallon	McGregor
Andresen,	Feighan	McIntire
August H.	Fenton	McMillan
Andrews	Fernandez	McVey
Arends	Fino	Mack, Wash.
Ashmore	Fisher	Mahon
Auchincloss	Forand	Matthews
Ayres	Ford	Meador
Bailey	Forrester	Merrill
Baker	Fountain	Morrow
Barden	Frelinghuysen	Miller, Md.
Bates	Friedel	Miller, Nebr.
Battle	Gamble	Mills
Beamer	Garmatz	Morano
Becker	Gary	Morrison
Belcher	Gathings	Mumma
Bender	Gavin	Natcher
Bennett, Fla.	Gentry	Neal
Berry	George	Nicholson
Betts	Golden	Norblad
Bishop	Goodwin	Norrell
Boggs	Graham	Oakman
Boland	Grant	O'Brien, N. Y.
Bolton,	Gregory	O'Hara, Minn.
Frances P.	Gross	O'Konski
Bolton,	Gwinn	O'Neill
Oliver P.	Hagen, Calif.	Osmers
Bonin	Hagen, Minn.	Ostertag
Bonner	Halleck	Passman
Bosch	Harden	Patman
Boykin	Hardy	Pelly
Bramblett	Harris	Pfost
Bray	Harrison, Nebr.	Phillips
Brooks, La.	Harrison, Va.	Pilcher
Brooks, Tex.	Harvey	Pillion
Brown, Ga.	Hays, Ohio	Poage
Brown, Ohio	Herlong	Poff
Brownson	Heseltan	Polk
Broyhill	Hess	Preston
Budge	Hiestand	Rabaut
Burleson	Hill	Rains
Busbey	Hillelson	Ray
Bush	Hinshaw	Rayburn
Byrnes, Wis.	Hoeven	Reece, Tenn.
Campbell	Hoffman, Ill.	Reed, Ill.
Cannon	Hoffman, Mich.	Reed, N. Y.
Carlyle	Holmes	Rees, Kans.
Carrigg	Holt	Regan
Cederberg	Hope	Rhodes, Ariz.
Chelf	Hosmer	Riley
Chenoweth	Hruska	Rivers
Chiperfield	Hunter	Roberts
Church	Hyde	Robeson, Va.
Clevenger	Ikard	Robison, Ky.
Cole, Mo.	Jackson	Rodino
Cole, N. Y.	James	Rogers, Fla.
Colmer	Jarman	Rogers, Mass.
Cooley	Jenkins	Rogers, Tex.
Coon	Johnson, Calif.	Rooney
Corbett	Johnson, Wis.	Sadlak
Coudert	Jonas, Ill.	St. George
Cretella	Jonas, N. C.	Saylor
Crosser	Jonas, N. C.	Schenck
Crumpacker	Judd	Scott
Cunningham	Kearney	Scudder
Curtis, Mass.	Kearns	Seely-Brown
Dague	Keating	Selden
Davis, Wis.	Kersten, Wis.	Shafer
Dawson, Utah	Kilday	Sheppard
Deane	King, Calif.	Shuford
Dempsey	King, Pa.	Sikes
Derounian	Knox	Simpson, Ill.
Devereux	Krueger	Simpson, Pa.
Dingell	Laird	Small
Dondero	Lane	Smith, Kans.
Donohue	Lanham	Smith, Va.
Dorn, N. Y.	Latham	Smith, Wis.
	LeCompte	Spence

Springer	Trimble	Wickersham
Staggers	Tuck	Widnall
Stauffer	Utt	Williams, N. J.
Steed	Van Zandt	Williams, N. Y.
Stringfellow	Velde	Wilson, Calif.
Taber	Vorys	Wilson, Ind.
Talle	Vursell	Wilson, Tex.
Teague	Wainwright	Winstead
Thomas	Walter	Wolverton
Thompson,	Wampler	Yorty
Mich.	Warburton	Young
Thompson, Tex.	Watts	Younger
Thornberry	Westland	Zablocki
Tollefson	Wharton	

NAYS—55

Aspnall	Hays, Ark.	Miller, Kans.
Barrett	Hollifield	Multer
Blatnik	Howell	O'Brien, Ill.
Bowler	Javits	O'Hara, Ill.
Buchanan	Jones, Ala.	Patten
Burdick	Karsten, Mo.	Philbin
Byrne, Pa.	Kean	Price
Celler	Kelley, Pa.	Reams
Chudoff	Kelly, N. Y.	Rhodes, Pa.
Condon	Keogh	Rogers, Colo.
Dawson, Ill.	Kirwan	Shelley
Dodd	Klein	Sieminski
Dollinger	Klucynski	Smith, Miss.
Eberharter	McCarthy	Sullivan
Fine	Mack, Ill.	Whitten
Gordon	Madden	Wier
Granahan	Magnuson	Williams, Miss.
Green	Marshall	
Hart	Metcalfe	

NOT VOTING—83

Albert	Hale	O'Brien, Mich.
Angell	Haley	Patterson
Bennett, Mich.	Hand	Perkins
Bentley	Harrison, Wyo.	Powell
Bentsen	Hébert	Priest
Bolling	Hillings	Prouty
Bow	Holtzman	Radwan
Buckley	Horan	Richards
Byrd	Jensen	Riehlman
Canfield	Jones, Mo.	Roosevelt
Carnahan	Kee	Scherer
Chatham	Kilburn	Scrivner
Clardy	Landrum	Secrest
Cooper	Lantaff	Sheehan
Cotton	Lesinski	Short
Curtis, Mo.	Lyle	Sutton
Curtis, Nebr.	Machrowicz	Taylor
Davis, Ga.	Maillard	Thompson, La.
Davis, Tenn.	Martin, Iowa	Van Pelt
Delaney	Mason	Vinson
Dies	Miller, Calif.	Weichel
Dolliver	Miller, N. Y.	Wheeler
Donovan	Mollohan	Wigglesworth
Evins	Morgan	Willis
Fogarty	Moss	Withrow
Frazier	Moulder	Wolcott
Fulton	Murray	Yates
Gubser	Nelson	

So (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Mr. Wigglesworth with Mr. Roosevelt.
Mr. Canfield with Mr. Delaney.
Mr. Horan with Mr. Vinson.
Mr. Hillings with Mr. Landrum.
Mr. Wolcott with Mrs. Kee.
Mr. Taylor with Mr. Buckley.
Mr. Hand with Mr. Powell.
Mr. Miller of New York with Mr. Lantaff.
Mr. Gubser with Mr. Miller of California.
Mr. Riehlman with Mr. Yates.
Mr. Withrow with Mr. Mollohan.
Mr. Short with Mr. Chatham.
Mr. Jensen with Mr. Dies.
Mr. Martin of Iowa with Mr. Evins.
Mr. Patterson with Mr. Bolling.
Mr. Cotton with Mr. Byrd.
Mr. Weichel with Mr. Carnahan.
Mr. Angell with Mr. Machrowicz.
Mr. Scrivner with Mr. Willis.
Mr. Kilburn with Mr. Hébert.
Mr. Clardy with Mr. Haley.
Mr. Dolliver with Mr. Fogarty.
Mr. Nelson with Mr. Frazier.
Mr. Curtis of Missouri with Mr. Moss.
Mr. Bow with Mr. Moulder.
Mr. Van Pelt with Mr. Morgan.
Mr. Sheehan with Mr. Davis of Georgia.

Mr. Curtis of Nebraska with Mr. Davis of Tennessee.

Mr. Fulton with Mr. Lesinski.
Mr. Harrison of Wyoming with Mr. Priest.
Mr. Prouty with Mr. Richards.
Mr. Mailliard with Mr. Morgan.
Mr. Mason with Mr. Cooper.
Mr. Radwan with Mr. Thompson of Louisiana.

Mr. Scherer with Mr. Donovan.
Mr. Bentley with Mr. Murray.
Mr. Hale with Mr. O'Brien of Michigan.
Mr. Bennett of Michigan with Mr. Perkins.

Mr. WINSTEAD, Mr. HAYS of Ohio, Mr. BOLAND, and Mr. CROSSER changed their vote from "nay" to "yea."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The title was amended to read: "An act to permit the compelling of testimony under certain conditions and to grant immunity from prosecution in connection therewith."

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND REMARKS

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks on the bill just passed.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. CONDON. 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 California?

There was no objection.

Mr. CONDON. Mr. Speaker, I arise in opposition to S. 16 and associate myself with the position taken by the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER]. As the majority report itself recognizes, "the answer to the precise question is not too clear"; the question being, of course, whether or not the Congress by any enactment proposed to grant immunity can, in fact, grant immunity from prosecution by any other jurisdiction. Certainly, Congress cannot avoid the other evil effects of compulsory testimony and perhaps limited immunity.

Leaving this question to one side, there has been no evidence presented which indicates that any Federal prosecution within the prescribed limits of S. 16 has ever failed because some person availed himself of his rights under the fifth amendment. On the contrary the Smith Act prosecutions have been uniformly successful.

The fifth amendment was one of the original 10 amendments collectively known as the Bill of Rights. Without the Bill of Rights there is serious doubt whether our Constitution would ever have been ratified by the Original Thirteen States. Though the guilty may invoke their privilege under this amendment, it has never been my understanding that the fifth amendment was adopted solely for the protection of the innocent. I had always thought that the fifth amendment was basic and available to all who come within the jurisdiction of our law.

I question the advisability or need for whittling this basic protection. Those who feel that witnesses should be forced to incriminate themselves, even though they may not thereafter be prosecuted, would do better, in my opinion, to propose a constitutional amendment striking the self-incrimination clause from the fifth amendment.

Mr. SIEMINSKI. Mr. Speaker, from the hemlock cup of Socrates to the screams at Salem, from the cries of the French Huguenots to the curses at Cromwell's cruelties, history appears to caution against use of the methods called for in S. 16, a bill to loosen a man's tongue when charged with endangering the Nation's security, a bill to loosen his tongue when he will not talk by granting him immunity from punishment, no matter how dastardly to others his actions in crime have or might have been.

The bill seems to spare the mastermind and condemn the jackal. The "brain" has henchmen on whom to squeal, fingermen rarely do. Has anyone yet heard who masterminded the disappearance and distribution of 500 tons of opium that vanished from the world's market in 1950, and which, watered down for sale by pushers, grossed, if completely sold, over \$2 billion? The papers have been filled with wholesale arrests and convictions of dope peddlers. Applied to narcotics, this bill could serve as a green light to the big-time brain. Applied to treason, sedition, and conspiracy to overthrow the Government, be it by fraud, force, violence, or deliberate and unwarranted division, this bill holds out hope for the brain and condemns the jackal.

Lucky Luciano? Perhaps he saved considerable lives at Salerno by his intimate knowledge of the terrain in Sicily, which he is reported to have given to the military in exchange for pardon and exile. A devil's brew. The lives lost at Anzio, at Rapido, and at Monte Cassini seem to have balanced those saved at Salerno. And Luciano is reported carrying on his game from abroad. What was gained? Italy for the free world? Perhaps. Who can say?

Christendom? Forty percent of the world's population, in 1,954 years, how it has wept with man's inhumanity to man. And before Christendom, in Greece, the hemlock cup of Socrates. By our standards, his trial was a mockery of justice. Charged with endangering the national security, he was arrogant, defiant. The Greek counterpart of the Congress of the United States, in open vote, by a good majority, condemned him to death. His teachings inflamed sensibilities, insulted the gods. His prosecutors, because of his renown, wanted to exile him, grant him immunity. He scorned them, openly, defiantly. He would not talk, or recant. Only the hemlock loosened his tongue; in a dying gasp, it curled back, down his throat.

Today, Socrates, in some quarters, is said to have given Europe its sense of soul; our Lord Jesus Christ showed man its beatitude in redemption. Both were killed. Man inflamed; how mortal, how weak.

And before Socrates, and before our Lord Jesus Christ, 40 centuries ago, at Jericho, is revealed the cruelty of man against man. Slaughter. Slaughter. Fear. Ignorance. Bedevilment.

Then there was Saladin, pride of Islam. In the crusades, he made the Christians reel, turned them back from the promised land. Islam? To deviate from its belief in the one and all-powerful God, meant death, not excommunication or exile, but death.

Then, after five or six hundred years of Islamic domination, the Christians in Spain threw off Moslem rule, with its concept of women as chattel. And in that fight for liberation, the kindly Christians, hardened like steel to the sensibilities of others and inflamed by the arrogance and defiance and invidious display of others, cast aside the municipal laws which guaranteed utmost protection to the individual. Blood flowed. Islamic influence was driven out of Spain. At what price?

What of the Orient? And its attempt to loosen men's tongues? In November of 1950 in Hamhung, North Korea, the following story came into X Corps headquarters: A traitor—North Korean—was captured. He would not talk. His captors stretched him out on the ground, ripped open his clothes and on his stomach, placed a live rat; then they covered the rat with a pan, on which they put burning coals. The man still would not talk. The rat had only one way to go. It dug into the entrails of the man.

Man. How weak, when inflamed.

The organizations of man have gone full cycle, each split down the middle by man's haste with man. First there was big family, with its feudalism and serfs; then there was big church with its struggle against Islam; then there was big business, with its struggle against the concepts of family and church, in its quest for profit and production, with labor expendable; then came big government with mass participation in democratic America while only in name and mockery in Soviet Russia. Each has been to the fore in claiming the allegiance of man—big family, big church, big business, and big government. And each time that man has been frightened, and panicked, indiscretion followed with bloodshed in its train. Will we ever learn?

Can we ameliorate with promises of immunity the harm done by the guilty? Does not the manliness of America speak up to say: "To each his just deserts, so help him God?"

Why do we try to release our moral brakes, as this bill does, at a time when absolute standards of honesty, purity, unselfishness and love beckon us here on earth?

The measure should not pass. Let us apprehend the guilty, try them, one by one, if need be, firmly and with sure-footedness and the ages will not mock us as they do the Greeks because of Socrates, the Romans because their laws failed to protect Christ, and the men at Jericho because of their wanton slaughter. And as the ages will mock the men of the Kremlin for like slaughter.

Mr. CLARDY. Mr. Speaker, I oppose this measure to grant immunity in certain cases for many reasons. Not the least of these is the fact that it constitutes a still further surrender of the power and duty of the Congress. No legislative investigation and no legislative committee should subordinate its powers and authority to the other branches of Government as would be necessary under this proposal. I can never agree that it is wise for the Congress to act or withhold action at the word of either the executive or the judiciary. This is a step down the road to eventual dictatorship.

As a member of the House Committee on Un-American Activities, I feel strongly about the refusal of Communists to testify and to wrongfully invoke the fifth amendment. My experience tells me, however, that this measure will not do that for which it is supposedly designed—make these confirmed Communists talk and cooperate with the committee. The witnesses at whom this measure is aimed rejoice in martyrdom—this will not bring evidence on Communist Party activities. Why enact something that will not do the thing it is supposed to do?

The measure is loosely drawn and full of legal defects in my opinion. In my judgment it will be declared unconstitutional on several grounds. I doubt the right of Congress to grant the full immunity required if a witness is to be held in contempt for failure to answer after the provisions of this bill have been invoked and applied. I do not believe that we can cover State crimes—yet without that the immunity granted will not be broad enough to destroy the protection of the fifth amendment.

There are many other reasons why I think this bad legislation, but I shall cite only 1 or 2 more. I think this an invitation to graft and corruption. Venal politicians could whitewash criminals with complete safety. It is no answer to say that present officers will not succumb to temptation. We legislate for the long future.

Lastly, I am always disturbed over efforts of any branch of Government to whittle away the rights guaranteed the citizens by the Bill of Rights. I do not think it wise to attempt to circumvent the constitutional protections by legislative acts no matter how clever they may seem and no matter how serious the problem may appear. Here the 3 branches of Government would seem to combine in an effort to defeat the protective effect of the fifth amendment just because some enemies of the people improperly invoke the section. I am deeply apprehensive that in our zeal to get at those we know are enemies we may destroy something we cannot replace. For if the courts, contrary to my legal opinion, should uphold this measure it can do much more harm than its sponsors may imagine. I think we do not need this legislation for the safety of the Nation—yet that is really its only justification. I do not think it will produce more evidence—yet that is its avowed purpose. I hope it will be defeated.

Mr. MOSS. Mr. Speaker, under authority to extend my remarks regarding S. 16, I wish to point out that this is the first rollcall on an important issue during my service in the House of Representatives which does not clearly show the position I took on that issue. Since the rollcall on it merely shows that I am paired on the vote, I wish to state that had I been present when the roll was called, I would have voted "aye."

In approving S. 16, I do so with many doubts as to how far we should go in modifying the guarantees of freedom accorded to the individual by the Constitution and the Bill of Rights.

I feel this bill does approach the point beyond which we cannot go in the future without materially affecting our individual rights to resist probing by governmental inquiries.

I hope the bill does aid our Government in its efforts to root out acts of disloyalty and subversion. It is because of this hope that I have added my approval to the legislation.

Mr. SHELLEY. Mr. Speaker, I have sat through this debate on S. 16, the witness immunity bill, with a great deal of curiosity. I was curious to see how far 40 minutes of debate on one of the most controversial pieces of legislation which has come before the House could go in clearing up the doubts and fears in my own mind as to the wisdom of passing this far-reaching measure—a measure which in effect amends the Constitution of the United States. I was also curious to see whether in this short debate the Members of the House would be provided with a clear explanation of just what this bill does—an explanation on which all members of the committee would unanimously agree—or whether we would be given any sound reason why the House should abdicate its responsibility to use its soundest judgment and give most mature consideration before passing legislation as vital to our democratic processes as is S. 16.

Mr. Speaker, my own doubts as to the form of or the necessity for witness immunity legislation have not been resolved by this short high pressure debate. It is quite obvious that there is no unanimous agreement, even among our constitutional lawyers, as to just what this bill would do—particularly regarding the effect of immunity conferred through its provisions on actions in State or lesser courts, and whether the district court before approving a grant of immunity will pass on the advisability or inadvisability of such action. It is also quite clear, Mr. Speaker, that the only reason which has appeared for pushing this bill through at this time without adequate debate is that it is a matter of political expediency.

The right of an individual to protection against self-incrimination was not lightly written into our Constitution. I cannot and will not be a party to an action tampering with that right until I have been convinced that every aspect of the change has been exhaustively explored and until I know that we are not curing the temporary annoyance of witnesses' refusal to answer by killing a basic protection guaranteed to both the

guilty and the innocent under the fifth amendment in the Bill of Rights. The Bill of Rights also prohibits star chamber proceedings. When we attempt to amend it through the kind of star chamber proceeding the leadership is forcing on us today, it makes me more than ever determined to insist on orderly procedures before approving the action. The extremely limited debate on S. 16 and the refusal to permit amendments does not constitute an orderly proceeding for legislation of such great importance, and I shall vote against the bill as a protest against that high handed procedure.

Although it may have become trite, I cannot help saying that I am as strongly opposed to communism and its methods as anybody here on this floor. But our weakest defense against that vicious system is for us to use the system ourselves in fighting the commies. Any action tending to deprive our citizens of their civil rights is a step in that direction. When this House permits itself to become a counterpart of the Russian Parliament, the supreme Soviet, and to meet simply to rubber stamp decisions or demands of the administration in power, we are also moving in the direction of action in the Communist pattern. We cannot adequately protect the people of the United States from attacks on their rights under our democratic system by yielding to political pressures to modify our system, no matter how urgent that pressure may be, unless we have assured ourselves that no fundamental principle is placed in danger through such action.

It is as frustrating to me as it is to every loyal American citizen to witness the spectacle of a procession of suspected subversives using the cloak of the fifth amendment in refusing to testify about their activities. But reasoned thinking should convince us that this situation has not yet reached a point where unreasoned emergency action on our part is necessary to provide the answer. The present bill might relieve some of our frustration, but 40 minutes of debate on a bill which was not available in its final form until today is not enough to give us assurance that it will do more than that as an instrument in a really effective fight against subversion.

Let us remember that an individual's testimony against himself, whether it be under immunity from criminal penalties or not, can bring with it far greater punishment than that which the law provides. The fifth amendment was written at a time when various forms of torture were still in common use as a means of wringing confessions from those charged with crimes. Some may be inclined to think that the Founding Fathers had no more in mind than protecting the innocent against such practices when the provision against self-incrimination was included in our Bill of Rights. But I am not sure that they were not also looking ahead to times such as these, when suspicion and fear, aroused by the inflammatory tactics of political demagogues, have caused a large segment of the public to try their fellow citizens in the newspapers and on the street corners rather than in the courts. I am not convinced that S. 16 in its present form

offers protection against that kind of a conviction to those who may be forced to tell their story to congressional committees or to the courts—even though the story they tell would not in itself be grounds for criminal action.

Mr. Speaker, these are only some of the thoughts in my mind in connection with this bill and with H. R. 4975, the bill which we will shortly debate under these same limited conditions and which would invoke the aid of the United States district courts in compelling testimony by a witness before congressional committees. Let us not be stampeded into hasty action on these measures simply because the administration feels that it must have a record to point to on anti-subversive legislation when they talk to the voters this fall. Let us remember that this is a democratic body with the primary purpose of insuring that this country continues as a democratic Nation with full guaranties of civil liberties to its people. For my part I shall not permit real or fancied threats of political punishment to force me to abandon consideration of those guaranties. I shall vote against this legislation now, and until the questions I have raised have been answered to the point where I feel that I can support it with personal and political integrity.

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H. R. 4975, the purpose of which is to prevent Communists and near-Communists from hiding behind the fifth amendment of the Constitution when called upon to testify before the courts or congressional committees.

If this bill is passed, it will help unmask citizens of our country who are following the Moscow line in an attempt to spread Communist doctrine, espionage and sabotage, and advocating the overthrow of our Government.

It will give the courts an opportunity, in cooperation with the Attorney General of the United States, to grant immunity to a witness who will then be compelled to testify or go to jail.

Mr. Speaker, it has become a common practice for these traitors within our gates, who seek to destroy our Constitution and to overthrow our Government, to refuse to swear whether or not they are Communists before the committees of the Congress and the courts, and claim protection under the fifth amendment in order that they may continue their treachery and may continue to destroy the very Constitution that contains the fifth amendment, which they now hide behind.

I want to congratulate this administration, the Attorney General, and the Congress of the United States for the vigorous manner in which, from the opening day of this session, they have pressed forward in writing new laws that will strengthen the hand of Government against the most dangerous enemies with whom we have ever had to cope.

I also wish to congratulate the Un-American Activities Committee in the House, and both of the committees in the Senate who have been doing such splendid work in the defense of our country here on the homefront.

Mr. Speaker, I am not one who believes you should use kid gloves and the

powder-puff approach in dealing with the Communist traitors who seek to overthrow the Government; who would destroy our freedom and liberty; and who would establish a reign of the godless totalitarian ideology of communism; who would destroy our churches and religion; who would deliberately kill millions of our people, and throw millions into concentration slave camps, as they have done in Russia and in China, should Russia succeed in conquering the world.

They have killed countless millions in both of those countries, and are now holding in these two countries over 15 million people in slavery.

Only a few weeks ago the Members of this House passed House Resolution 627, informing our allies and the nations of the world that we are opposed to Communist China being admitted to the United Nations. Since that time we have passed several bills in this House to make it more difficult for communism to live or grow in strength in this Nation of ours.

Mr. Speaker, never before in one session of the Congress has so much legislation been passed to protect our Government and to make it possible to convict these Communists and to deport alien Communists living within our gates.

One of the outstanding bills passed provides for the first time in our history that any person, Communist or otherwise, who spies in peacetime and gives such information to a foreign government is punishable by death, if tried and found guilty by the courts.

We also passed H. R. 7120, which gives the Government the right to take away the citizenship of individuals who advocate the overthrow of our Government by force and violence. Why not?

Then, we passed an important bill which would permit the use of telephone wire tapping evidence, in cases of subversion and kidnapping.

Mr. Speaker, one only has to recount some of the things Communist spies have done in our Nation in the past few years, to realize the great damage just a few of them have done.

They stole the secrets of the atomic bombs and passed them on to Russia, making it possible for her to develop the bomb 3 years earlier than she otherwise would have done. This has cost us billions of dollars in national defense to meet the threat of Russia, and if we get into another war, it may cost us the lives of millions of American soldiers and civilians.

The atomic bomb and the H-bomb have put Russia in a position where she may be able to conquer all of Europe and Asia, with their countless millions of people.

Yet, Mr. Speaker, when the committees of the House and the committees of the Senate and the law enforcement agencies of the United States Attorney General, and the Members of Congress come to grips with this terrible enemy within our land, you hear much unjustified criticism through the press and among the people, against the public officials who are trying to hunt out these Communists who seek to destroy our Government.

J. Edgar Hoover once said that the Communist sympathizers, the fellow

travelers, and misguided people who are influenced by Communist propaganda, run into hundreds of thousands in our Nation, and said, in substance, the influence of these misguided people was adding great strength to the influence and the purpose of the real Communists.

Mr. Speaker, sometimes I wonder if good, well-intentioned people, who criticize congressional committees of dealing too harshly with those who refuse to say, under oath, whether or not they are Communists, or whether or not they are now engaged in subversive activity in an effort to overthrow our Government, have forgotten the crosses that mark the graves of over 25,000 of our fine young American boys who were killed by the Communists in Korea; it may be that they have forgotten the hundreds of our American boys who were captured and who were later found by the roadsides with their hands wired behind them, and brutally killed by their Communist captors.

Never has there been known in the history of the world such international banditry, rape, brutality, and violence as has been perpetrated by the Chinese Communists, and by the Communist government of Russia. Russia seeks to conquer the world, and will treat us in this same manner, if successful.

Make no mistake about it, there is one group of people whose joy increases as the criticism of our public officials, who are trying to expose the Communists, increases. That is the hard-core Communist group. It pleases them, beyond measure, and encourages them to continue their vicious work against our Government, and the freedom and liberty of our people.

Mr. Speaker, notwithstanding this interference, the Congress and the executive department, in a continued hard drive since this administration took over, 18 months ago, have kept the Communists on the run.

The American people, who were shocked at the cases of Alger Hiss and Harry Dexter White, and other so-called red herrings, have loudly applauded the efforts of the Eisenhower administration to dig out and expose and convict the Communists.

HERE IS THE RECORD TO DATE

The fight against communism by the present administration has resulted in the arrest of 116 top party officials and functionaries, up to May 29 of this year. Included in these 116, were top 12 Communist Party leaders in the United States, all members of the so-called politburo of the party.

Already, 72 of the big leaders have been convicted and 9 others are facing trial. In a little over a year and a half of the present administration, the Department of Justice has convicted 41 Communist leaders, and ordered 9 others to trial; deported 93 alien subversives; deported 1,399 alien criminals and racketeers, violators of narcotic laws and persons with immoral conduct records; issued orders for deportation of 268 persons with records of subversive activity or affiliation; barred entry to 127 into United States ports of entry; commenced denaturalization proceedings against 25 citizens who are deemed to be subver-

sives; pushed through a stricter Government-wide loyalty-security program for Government employees, firing 2,429 Government employees up to December 31, 1953, in a drive to clean out Reds, pinks and other security risks.

We have relentlessly arrested, jailed, convicted and deported these enemies of the American way of life.

The Communist threat to our Government and our Nation is a challenge we met head-on as soon as we came into power.

We shall continue to arrest, jail, convict and deport these Reds as long as you, the American people, give us the authority and power to do so.

THE BRAZOS RIVER AUTHORITY

Mr. BURLESON. 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 Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. BURLESON. Mr. Speaker, on yesterday, August 3, I introduced H. R. 10151, entitled "A bill to authorize purchase of a portion of the bonds issued by the Brazos River Authority, an agency of the State of Texas, to finance the early development by it of the water resources of the Brazos River Basin, Tex."

There is, of course, no hope that this measure can be considered by the Committee on Public Works during this session of the Congress. However, the purpose of introducing the bill at this time is to establish a predicate to request the Army engineers to investigate the feasibility of the project. A further purpose for introducing the measure at this time is in order that the various departments and agencies of the Government may, in the interim between now and the convening of the 84th Congress, have opportunity to study and file reports which they may desire.

This measure is unique in that it asks no gift of funds from the Federal Government. It merely asks a loan from the Federal Government on which 2½ percent interest will be paid by the Brazos River Authority, an agency of the State of Texas.

This bill proposes a constructive method by which the Federal Government will participate in a comprehensive water-conservation program in Texas by investing Government money in one-third of the bonds issued by the Brazos River Authority to finance the project. I have referred to this proposal as being unique. It is unique in that the local people of the State of Texas, through the Brazos River Authority, are doing something for themselves in conserving water which has almost become a matter of life and death in our part of the country without a gift of taxpayers' money.

The Authority proposes to construct not less than five new dams and reservoirs, and to enlarge its existing Possum Kingdom—Morris Sheppard—Reservoir. The project costing some \$140 million would be financed, principally, through the pledge of revenues from hydroelectric generating units to be installed at the several dams, and involv-

ing extensive use of reversible turbines, on the pump-back method of reuse of the falling water. The Authority proposes to sell the power and energy to wholesale users in Texas.

According to Authority's plans and engineering estimates, the development will accomplish these objectives: provide approximately 1,400,000 acre-feet of additional water storage, of which approximately 900,000 acre-feet will always be available when needed for domestic, industrial, and agricultural uses; practically double the amount of dependable water which would otherwise be available for downstream, consumptive uses; and provide approximately 541,000 kilowatts of dependable hydroelectric capacity, which based on recognized value of such power and energy, will yield revenues sufficient to finance the project.

The Secretary of the Army would be authorized to purchase up to one-third of the bonds necessary to pay the construction cost, but not exceeding \$50 million, bearing 2½ percent interest, and maturing within 50 years but after payment of the other two-thirds of the bonds. The Secretary would not be permitted to buy the bonds until the feasibility of the project has been determined by the Chief of Engineers of the Army, including a determination that the development contributes to net conservation of water for consumptive uses, and flood control, nor until private investors have furnished the other two-thirds of the money necessary for the project.

Questions have been raised as to the feasibility of the project, as to its net contribution to conservation of water for consumptive uses, and whether it provides adequate flood protection. It is obvious that these questions cannot be resolved during this session of Congress but since the bill provides that the feasibility investigation to be made by the Corps of Engineers of the Army is to be at the expense of the Authority, I have concluded that the bill should be introduced at this time, on the assumption that after the Congress has recessed the Army may proceed with its investigation on an informal basis, and that other independent engineering studies may be made before a committee hearing is required.

Certainly, if the project is determined to accomplish its worthy objectives it should merit favorable consideration by the Congress.

THERE IS PLENTY OF TIME FOR ENACTMENT OF THE 50-50 CARGO BILL BEFORE ADJOURNMENT IF THERE IS A WILL TO PASS IT

Mr. GARMATZ. 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 Maryland?

There was no objection.

Mr. GARMATZ. Mr. Speaker, it is a good political trick in the closing days of a congressional term—with an election approaching—to report out a mass of

popular bills, so that their authors or supporters can obtain proper credit, but then let the bills die on the House or Senate Calendar.

That trick is being worked overtime in the closing days of this Congress. Even while the House leadership was driving all through July for a July 31 adjournment, bills which had been dormant in committee for months, suddenly began coming to life in the past weeks and have been pouring out of committee in floods.

Many of them will never come up in the House and among those which have come up or will come up, many will never get out of Senate committee. Often they are extremely minor matters not entitled to formal House consideration in the midst of an adjournment rush, but they come through here anyway presumably, just to give their sponsors a chance to make some political hay back home.

Under the circumstances, I am unable to understand, Mr. Speaker, why an extremely important measure—S. 3233, the so-called 50-50 cargo bill to write into permanent law, the often enacted provision for preference to American flag-vessels, on Government financed cargoes—is being pigeonholed in the House Rules Committee on the ostensible grounds that the House "does not have time" to take it up before adjournment.

Last week, when the Rules Committee refused to clear the way for House debate on this measure, it was true that the House leadership was talking in terms of a July 31 adjournment and was seeking to pass an adjournment resolution dated for the end of the month. Many of us thought then and said then that a July 31 adjournment date was impossible, in view of the snarled-up situation in the Senate, which was then still running a day-and-night debate on the atomic energy bill.

SENATE AND HOUSE VERSIONS ALMOST IDENTICAL

That adjournment resolution, after having been defeated once was passed on a second try, and the word from the House leadership was that the House was ready to adjourn whenever the Senate caught up. The implication was that there was no chance and no time to take up additional important issues.

But here we are, still in session, still taking up a raft of bills—many of them extremely minor in nature—but with no opportunity to bring up for debate a measure which has the solid support of the entire merchant marine industry in the United States and which is vital to the health of that presently distressed industry.

Mr. Speaker, if S. 3233 were to receive a rule and come before the House, it would not be—as it is with many of these other bills—a futile gesture. We can pass that bill and have it ready to go to the White House in the next few days if the Rules Committee and the House leadership will only let it come up here in the House.

The Senate has already passed S. 3233. The Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee of the House approved it July 20, and requested a rule to clear it for House debate. We have added only one amendment to the bill and that is all—one dealing with the Panama Canal

Company. That company operates three Government-owned ships between New York and the Canal Zone and serves primarily the needs of the Panama Canal and its workers. It was the belief of the committee that no restriction should be placed on this service. The slight difference between House and Senate versions could be worked out in only a few minutes time—either by Senate concurrence in the House amendment or by a short conference committee meeting.

ACTION, NOT WORDS, WILL HELP MERCHANT MARINE

Therefore, the argument that this Congress will "not have time" to complete action on this bill if it were given a rule for House debate is not supported by the facts. The only inference we can draw is that there is a definite leadership policy against enacting this bill and that the bill therefore is being deliberately pigeonholed.

This would be a great disservice to the merchant marine of the United States. It would be a bad blow to American merchant seamen, so many of them today on the beach for lack of berths. They cannot find jobs because the American shipping industry is in distress; and one of the reasons it is in distress is that our own Government is not observing the spirit of the 50-50 cargo policy on offshore procurement.

I call upon the House leadership to suit actions and deeds to words in this instance—to follow through on the many fine statements we hear from the White House and the congressional leadership expressing concern for the merchant marine. The way to follow through with effective deeds would be in clearing the way for House action on a bill which will give reassurance and relief to this important defense industry which is now deep in a mire of economic troubles caused partly by actions or inaction of our own Government.

INVOKING THE AID OF COURTS IN COMPELLING TESTIMONY OF CONGRESSIONAL WITNESSES

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H. R. 4975) to prescribe a method by which the Houses of Congress and their committees may invoke the aid of the courts in compelling the testimony of witnesses, amended to read as follows.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That (a) either House, any committee or subcommittee of either House, and any joint committee of the two Houses of Congress may, by an affirmative vote of a majority or its actual membership, invoke the aid of the United States district courts in requiring the attendance and testimony of witnesses and the production of evidence, in furtherance of any inquiry such House, committee, subcommittee, or joint committee is authorized to undertake.

(b) The United States district court for the district within which the inquiry is carried on may, in case of contumacy or refusal to obey a subpoena issued to any person by either House, any committee or subcommittee of either House, or any joint committee of the two Houses of Congress, issue an order requiring such person to appear (and to produce evidence if so ordered) and give evidence relating to the matter in question

before such House, committee, subcommittee, or joint committee, as the case may be; and any failure to obey such order of the court may be punished by the court as a contempt thereof.

(c) Attorneys of the Department of Justice shall furnish legal assistance in invoking the aid of the United States district courts under subsection (a) to either House, or any committee, subcommittee, or joint committee which requests it.

The SPEAKER. Is a second demanded?

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I demand a second merely to allow the author of the bill to explain it.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, a second will be considered as ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, the purpose of this bill is to provide a new method by which the Houses of Congress and their committees may compel the testimony of witnesses by invoking the aid of the courts without going through the present cumbersome and long drawn-out contempt of Congress proceedings.

What happens today when a witness defies a congressional committee by refusing to respond to a subpoena or by refusing to testify or produce evidence? The short answer is, in many cases, nothing. In theory, and a few times—long ago—in practice, the committee which is thus defied, appeals to its parent body, that is, the House or Senate, and the latter causes the witness to be arrested and brought to its own bar. If the defiance continues when the question is asked or the order repeated before the House or Senate assembled, the witness may thereafter be punished by imprisonment until he purges himself, if he happens to have tangled with the Senate, or until the end of the session in which the defiance occurred, if the imprisonment is by order of the House.

This distinction, which is meaningless in fact, arises from the analogy to punishment for certain contempts of court which are limited to the term for which the court is sitting. The Senate, being a continuous body, is supposed to have no term for this purpose. There are other even more complicated and meaningless elements here, but as I said, this device of taking the time of the full Senate or House of Representatives to bring in a defiant person and punish him directly has not been used for half a century and would be wholly impracticable today. Just think what a howl would go up if Congress attempted to deal with a witness in this fashion.

The alternative—what actually does happen in such situations—is but little better. A Federal statute, enacted in 1857, makes it a misdemeanor punishable by a fine of \$100 to \$1,000 and imprisonment for 1 to 12 months, for any person summoned as a witness by authority of either House of Congress to refuse to testify or produce papers before such House or any committee thereof. This is now section 192 of title 2 of the United States Code.

Another section, section 194, then specifies that whenever a witness has defied the congressional authority, as

prescribed in section 192, the facts of the case are to be reported by the President of the Senate or the Speaker of the House to the United States Attorney for the District of Columbia, "Whose duty it shall be to bring the matter before the grand jury for their action." These two sections are, as a practical matter, the entire measure of the power of Congress to protect itself against abuse and defiance by persons from whom it seeks evidence or testimony. The more carefully I study them the more I wonder how they could have been drawn to operate so badly.

For instance, if the offense is to be a simple misdemeanor, with the light penalties prescribed, then there is no reason in the world why each case should have to be formally presented to a grand jury, as section 194 requires. But I shall not make a detailed criticism of these statutes, because the only point here is that they are hopelessly inadequate, from the point of view of Congress. Everything is stacked against the committee and in favor of the witness.

First there has to be a resolution from the committee to its parent House, which must then be acted upon by that House and referred by the President or the Speaker to the United States attorney. Then there is the grand jury presentment with all its attendant delays after which the case has to find its place on the crowded dockets of the local courts where it may languish for months or even years before coming to trial. If the witness—who has become a defendant somewhere along the line—has good defense counsel, he can stall and delay almost indefinitely. When his trial finally comes around, the issues are often dead, the inquiry is frequently closed, and sometimes even the committee before which his offense occurred has ceased to exist. No wonder it is a pretty good gamble to walk out on a congressional inquiry if you are being cornered or embarrassed too much.

Excepting in the cases of notorious Communists, there have been a mere handful of contempt convictions out of dozens and dozens of grand jury presentments—and, of course, even following a conviction the penalty is usually trifling, often only a fine. And even among the Communists, there have been no convictions directly overturning a fifth amendment plea. So the combination of the fifth amendment privilege against self-incrimination with this entirely inadequate machinery for enforcing congressional contempts has seriously impaired the congressional power of inquiry.

And, of course, the problem is by no means limited to the fact that defiant witnesses go unpunished or receive inadequate punishment for their offenses. More important, the power of inquiry itself is frustrated in that under no circumstances does the committee ever get what it really wants, which is the testimony or evidence. That was the object of the original proceedings in which the witness was hailed before the bar of the full House; but it has been lost sight of in reliance on this criminal sanction. The most the committee can ever have as the result of a contempt

citation is the very dubious satisfaction of seeing the defiant witness punished lightly long afterward. And that is obviously no contribution to the investigative assignment the committee is supposed to be carrying out.

I have labored this discussion of the problem a little to stress to you that it appears more important than the problem of rules or no rules, and of equal importance with the immunity concept which you are studying—since, even with the immunity device at its disposal, the committee would still be unable to compel testimony if the witness simply persisted in his refusal.

H. R. 4975 is a complete remedy and solution. We developed it in the course of rather extensive studies which were carried on by my staff in connection with our work on rules of procedure for investigations.

What this bill does, in essence, is merely to authorize any congressional committee—and I added the House and Senate themselves, since the present law, section 192, includes them and since their authority should seemingly not be less than that of their subordinate committees—to apply to a Federal court for assistance. The assistance is to be given in the form of a court order, so that the defiant witness finds himself facing the authority of the court and all the traditional sanctions which are available to enforce court orders when the order issues.

This is really no innovation, since Congress has made exactly similar provisions, in nearly a score of statutes, for various agencies and quasi-judicial bodies within the executive arm. Nearly all the boards and commissions, such as the Interstate Commerce Commission, Securities and Exchange Commission, Federal Trade Commission, Civil Aeronautics Board, and so forth, which have fact-finding powers also have statutes very similar to H. R. 4975 which permit them to apply to a Federal court for assistance in enforcing their subpoenas and their own orders compelling testimony, and so forth. So the device has been tried out again and again and has been found to work very well.

Now what happens if a witness defies a congressional committee with this new law in effect? The chairman or committee counsel may apply at once to the district court—and you will note that provision is made for assistance from Department of Justice personnel if it is required. Within a matter of hours, or certainly within a day or two, the application will be heard by a Federal judge, and if the demand is proper and reasonable, his order will issue at once.

I think I am justified in stating flatly that such an order will be obeyed in all ordinary circumstances. And even where an appeal is sought, only some extraordinary showing would cause the original order to be stayed in the interim. In the terms that interest us primarily, that means that the witness would instantly and completely comply with whatever the committee had ordered him to do, with no possibility of any nonsense whatsoever.

Now there is something else about this proposal that I have not alluded to so

far, but which is also of tremendous importance. I said the order would issue if it was proper. That means, conversely, that the judge would refrain from issuing an order if the committee were demonstrably wrong in its demands. And look what that means for the witness: If he is really being browbeaten or compelled to answer irrelevant questions or subjected to any of the other things that people have gotten so worked up about as potential abuses of the investigative power, he will be able to go right down to the court, too, and have a hearing as to why he should not be compelled to comply.

I think most of the loose charges about the way witnesses are abused up here before our committees are unfounded. I have no personal experience with any such situation. But in any event, this device would pretty well put an end to the possibility of such abuses. It would be very reassuring to everyone to know that, in the event of any real showdown, both the committee and the witness could have a hearing before an impartial Federal judge and settle their dispute fairly and finally without any delays.

Perhaps most important of all would be the operation of this new proposal in relation to the problem raised by witnesses who plead the fifth amendment privilege against self-incrimination. It will be much easier for a judge, privately in his chambers if he wishes, to explore the exact basis of a plea of privilege than it ever is for the chairman or counsel of a committee in the midst of its hearings.

When a witness asserts the privilege, and the Chair has ruled that the assertion is improper—or immunity has been granted, for that matter—the witness may of course still refuse to answer. Under present practice, that is where the matter ends, unless the committee wishes to cite him for contempt. And, as I have noted, there has never been a contempt conviction, out at the other end of that line of procedural hurdles, on this ground. This would be the point at which an order would be sought, and if the judge were satisfied that the plea was improperly interposed, the witness would be stripped of it forthwith.

I am satisfied that in many cases this plea has been abused. Congressional committees have consistently respected such a plea. A court could go into the facts to see whether it was genuine or otherwise. As a matter of fact, the device might also be very helpful in another way in connection with immunity grants, that is, the committee could and would probably test any questionable plea of immunity by applying for a court order and thus bringing about examination by the judge before it so much as considered granting immunity. Thus the danger of giving immunity in response to a plea which was unsound or improper would be practically eliminated because you would have the court entering into the proceedings beforehand and making the most careful of all possible determinations as to the validity of the witness' claim.

I believe this bill would be an effective piece of legislation to clarify and strengthen the legitimate investigative powers of Congress and its committees.

I hope it will have the enthusiastic support of the membership.

This procedure of hauling a witness in here to the floor of the House or to the floor or the other body is completely unrealistic, in my judgment. This bill this is brought before the House today is a realistic approach to a very serious problem which has greatly disturbed a great many of us.

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

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

Mr. DINGELL. The gentleman is not disturbing that privilege of the House of bringing a witness here?

Mr. KEATING. No.

Mr. DINGELL. That still remains intact?

Mr. KEATING. That is correct.

Mr. DINGELL. And unimpaired?

Mr. KEATING. That is right.

Mr. DINGELL. I should like to ask another question. But you are circumventing the House by going directly to the courts from the committee, are you not?

Mr. KEATING. I think that is a fair statement.

Mr. DINGELL. And to that degree you are making less potent the membership of this House as a whole, less than heretofore?

Mr. KEATING. I think the gentleman has raised an interesting point and one that should be mentioned. It is a fact that by this procedure the congressional committee itself would apply to the court for an order requiring the witness to answer. Then he would be proceeded against for contempt of court if he did not answer.

Mr. DINGELL. In other words, what the gentleman is trying to do here is to shortcircuit the action or speed it up directly from the committee to the courts. But would that still leave the option in the committee to bring the matter to the House if it so chose?

Mr. KEATING. Yes; I was just going to say that the committee itself, if it desired to take advantage of this old statute, could bring the witness before the bar of the House or of the Senate. It could still do so. That would be up to the committee itself, I would assume, to make the decision whether to bring the matter to the House. As a matter of fact, they could still bring it to the House to act as it has in the past. Then the witness would be charged with contempt of the Congress. Under this bill, he would be charged with contempt of the court.

Mr. DINGELL. What I am trying to arrive at is this. I should like to see a means or a method evolved by which a committee could get more speedy direct action. Also, I want to preserve the full privileges of the House as they exist now.

Mr. KEATING. I think they are preserved under this bill.

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

Mr. KEATING. I yield.

Mr. MEADER. Does not this procedure, in effect, give congressional committees the same method for getting an enforceable subpoena as is now given to administrative tribunals, such as the

National Labor Relations Board, the Interstate Commerce Commission, and others?

Mr. KEATING. That is correct. The gentleman has brought up a very good point. This is something which we in Congress have given to many of the administrative agencies and certainly we should have the same power ourselves.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. Dobb].

Mr. DODD. Mr. Speaker, for the same reasons that I opposed the passage of S. 16 that was jammed through the House a few minutes ago with only 40 minutes allowed for discussion, I oppose the passage of the present measure.

Several weeks ago we devoted 2 days to discussion and debate on the proper size of a bushel basket, and this afternoon on two measures involving grave constitutional problems we are rushing through legislation with only minutes allowed for discussion and consideration.

Have we completely lost our sense of responsibility?

What is the hurry?

What are we trying to do?

With only minutes for consideration, we may be impairing constitutional rights that we have held for 165 years. This is not the way a great legislative body should handle such important matters.

And this is the way in which we will break the faith of people in representative government.

A few days ago the majority leader pressed hard for adjournment of this body on July 31.

He must have thought that these matters should be given more time and that they should go over to another session of Congress.

And now with a resolution to adjourn having been passed by this House, we are rushing through constitutional changes under suspension of the rules.

I ask the Members of the House to vote down such a suspension of the rules and to defeat passage of this bill.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I am very much in favor of H. R. 4975, which I notice was introduced on May 4, 1953, because on that same date I introduced what is now known as H. R. 4979 and which in substance is the same identical bill. In fact, section (b) of H. R. 4975 is identical with section (b) of H. R. 4979 as originally introduced. I wish to recommend and congratulate the committee for bringing out this measure as one that is much needed and in my opinion will cool the ardor of many of those who are now invoking the fifth amendment. Under present law, as I understand it, a witness appearing before a congressional committee is his own judge as to whether or not the answer to any question would incriminate him, and if he invokes the fifth amendment the committee is helpless to do more than refer the matter to the House of Representatives. H. R. 4975 authorizes the judge of any United States court to determine whether or not the answer would incriminate the witness; and if the judge's decision is that it would not, then the witness is in contempt.

The idea for this measure came to me from the late George A. Wilson of Iowa, who had a very distinguished career as a lawyer, district attorney, district judge, State senator, Governor, and United States Senator. Early in the year 1953 he wrote me a letter setting forth the idea as contained in this measure, together with an article written by Senator Wilson about it which had appeared in the Sioux City Journal of Sioux City, Iowa. About that time David Lawrence, in an article in the Washington Evening Star, commented editorially, upon Senator Wilson's idea. I took this information to the Drafting Service and requested that a bill be drawn embodying Senator Wilson's idea. I notice that my good friend, Mr. KEATING, had a similar idea about the same time as both bills were introduced on the same date and are virtually the same.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill, as amended.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EMERGENCY CREDIT

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (S. 3245) to provide emergency credit, amended to read as follows.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That until June 30, 1955, the Secretary is authorized to make emergency loans for any agricultural purposes, except for refinancing of existing indebtedness, aggregating not to exceed \$15 million to farmers and stockmen in any area or areas where the Secretary determines that there is a need for such credit which cannot be met for a temporary period from commercial banks, cooperative lending agencies, the Farmers' Home Administration under its regular programs, or under act of April 6, 1949, or other responsible sources.

Sec. 2. Loans under this act shall (1) be made only to individuals or partnerships who are actively engaged in the operation of farms or ranches; (2) not exceed \$15,000 in the case of any one loan; (3) not be made to any one borrower so as to increase the total indebtedness of such borrower under this act to an amount in excess of \$20,000 (including principal and accrued interest); (4) be made at such rates of interest and on such terms and conditions as the Secretary shall prescribe for such area or areas; and (5) be secured by the personal obligation and available security of the producer or producers.

Sec. 3. The Secretary may utilize the revolving fund created by section 84 of the Farm Credit Act of 1933, as amended (12 U. S. C. 1148a), for making loans under this act, and for administrative expenses in connection with such loans. Sums received by the Secretary from the liquidation of loans made under this act shall be added to and become a part of the said revolving fund.

The SPEAKER. Is a second demanded?

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I demand a second.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, a second will be considered as ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Speaker, an identical House bill passed the House on June 7. This bill provides for emergency credit, authorizing the Secretary of Agriculture to make available emergency loans in the amount of \$15 million in situations arising out of an economic emergency. If the funds are not needed for that purpose they will be available for other loans made by the Farmers' Home Administration. I am advised by the Secretary of Agriculture that with the drought situation becoming worse every day it is anticipated they will need these funds, and that in making their calculations as to their ability to handle the drought situation they are taking these funds into account.

In view of the fact that a similar bill has already passed the House, I do not believe any further explanation is needed at this time.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, there is no question but that this bill is an emergency measure. It is a bill which, of course, is brought up under suspension of the rules, because it was on the Consent Calendar yesterday and for some reason or other it was passed over without prejudice. Bringing up a bill of the importance of this one under suspension of the rules is a procedure of which I approve, and which I think the leadership is wise in following. There are other emergencies besides this particular emergency. There is the emergency confronting the American people with reference to the price of coffee. I had an interesting colloquy with my friend the gentleman from Kansas yesterday, the distinguished chairman of the committee, and also my distinguished friend the gentleman from California [Mr. JACKSON] on the subject of coffee and whether or not a bill which is on the Speaker's desk would be called up for the purpose of enabling the House to pass on the question of a Senate amendment including coffee as subject to the Commodity Exchange Act. I know of no subject which, from the domestic angle, attracts more keenly the interest of the American people. Any one who uses coffee is a consumer. As I say, there is no subject which attracts more keenly the interest of the American people than the question of coffee and the speculation in coffee. With all due regard to what my friend the gentleman from Kansas said yesterday about there being a doubt whether the speculation caused an increase in the price of coffee—the sharp increase that has taken place, the American people think, and I think they are pretty nearly right, that speculation in the United States has played a very important part in the sharp increase in the price of coffee to the American people. There is no question that the American people have been compelled to pay probably tens of millions of dollars more for coffee during the last year and one-half than they would if speculation had not taken place. This bill is an emergency bill which I favor. The question of coffee, and including it in the Commodity Exchange Act, seems to me also to be an emergency, and I hope before this session is over, the bill will be brought up and the Senate amendment concurred in.

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

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield.

Mr. EDMONDSON. I would like to direct a question to the chairman of the committee. I understood him to state that this bill does not make any provision for refinancing loans and that refinancing loans are excluded from the provisions of the bill.

Mr. HOPE. That is correct. Of course, where the borrower is in financial difficulty and has loans from other lending agencies, there is always an effort made to take care of that indebtedness by getting a standby agreement from the other creditors. But it is not the thought that this legislation would be used for the purpose of bailing out other creditors. We want to make these funds go as far as we can to those who need the funds. It does not make any provisions for refinancing.

Mr. EDMONDSON. I want to state my personal appreciation, and I am sure the appreciation of my constituents for this legislation being reported out. I am for the bill and I intend to vote for it. But I wonder if it would be in order for the chairman to tell us if there are any plans to bring out legislation for refinancing loans. The information I have from my district, which is in a drought area, is that we are in danger of a real siege of foreclosures down there and that our farmers and stockmen have been so hard hit by 3 straight years of drought that unless there is some provision made for refinancing along the lines of the Andersen-Schoepel bill that passed the Senate the other day and which is now in the committee headed by the distinguished gentleman from Kansas, we are going to have a major disaster that could affect the entire Nation in its ultimate effects. I just wonder if it would be in order for the gentleman to tell us whether the committee has any plans to bring out legislation for refinancing loans to meet this emergency at the base of the problem on the financing of these farms and cattle ranches.

Mr. HOPE. I will be very glad to tell the gentleman what the committee has done. The committee had a hearing on the bill to which the gentleman referred earlier this week. At that hearing, we heard from the head of the Farmers Home Administration and also from a representative of the Farm Credit Administration. It was the conclusion, after hearing that testimony, and after hearing from those who were in favor of the legislation, to which the gentleman has referred, that it was not necessary at this time to pass refinancing legislation.

The head of the Farmers' Home Administration, Mr. McLeish, stated that in practically all cases they have been able to get standby agreements with creditors, and in that way they can make Government money go a great deal further than if they have to use it to refinance existing indebtedness. It may be later on the situation will develop where refinancing is needed, but the committee felt that for the time being this bill, together with other funds that have been made avail-

able, would be sufficient to take care of the situation. But when the Congress returns if the situation appears to be different, I know the committee will take up the matter.

Mr. EDMONDSON. I thank the gentleman.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND REMARKS

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on the bill H. R. 4975.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?
There was no objection.

EMERGENCY CREDIT

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN].

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, I take the floor to say that I, too, am glad to see our Committee on Agriculture bring before the Congress this bill extending credit to these farmers who can qualify for loans by the Farmers' Home Administration. Through the years I have served on the appropriation group handling the Farmers' Home Administration program as well as all other farm programs. I think the step taken here is one which is greatly needed. I think the bill lacks a great deal, however, of meeting farm credit needs, I should say, the constantly increasing needs which American agriculture has for farm credit. The Farmers' Home Administration has certain definite limitations which keep this program from meeting the great need of American agriculture for money with which to operate. I understand our great Committee on Agriculture is about to reinstate the authorization for Federal Land Bank Commissioner loans. Many of you will recall during the thirties the Federal land bank would make a land loan and then it would make an additional loan of 10 or 15 percent, which loans were known as Commissioner loans. This was an effort to make available a little extra money in order that those engaged in agriculture could continue to operate and not let their farms be worn out or depleted. The records show that insurance companies, banks, and those who are today engaged in making loans to farmers are constantly increasing the amount of their loans with resulting mortgages, which means that this great segment of our country on which the prosperity of our Nation rests, our farmers, are going into the hole financially to a greater and greater extent each and every day.

Do you not know? Cannot this administration see what that means? Can you not see the relation between this situation and the prices farmers receive? The price of what the farmer buys is going up. What he receives is going down. I tried to point this out and I believe I proved our case when the farm bill was up. However, the majority voted to reduce price supports and, thereby, the price the farmer receives.

Here is something someone needs to get over to you, and that is that in this

complex society of ours, with legal guaranties to labor, and the bargaining rights of labor unions, the minimum-wage laws, protective tariffs, and the Interstate Commerce Commission granting freight-rate increases, with the American consumer demanding more and more attention to the finished product, such as frozen foods, individual containers, more and more service, which of course he identifies as a part of his grocery bill, we must of necessity give the same attention to the producer of the raw material. The farmer must have his fair share of the laws for the good of all of us.

His production for a number of years has virtually been bottled up in the United States and held off world markets at competitive prices because of a Government policy of helping our allies by giving them first chance to sell at our farmers' expense. The law does not require that, in fact it does not contemplate any such course.

Notwithstanding the need for more income to those engaged in agriculture, and our distinguished chairman of the Committee on Agriculture who presents the pending bill agrees with my sentiments on agriculture, or I with his, we are here seeing the Congress trying to meet the plight of the American farmer caught in a financial squeeze by extending further credit. Apparently the administration recognizes the farmers' problem but we find at the same time this administration trying to reduce the farmers' income. If those two things make sense except in this way that if you reduce the farmer's income you increase his need to borrow money to get by. It does look as if anyone could see the cause for what we are having to do here today.

Again I would like to point out to you that in the support program of the basic farm commodities, the great benefit does not necessarily come from the fact that the farmer can sell his product to his Government through the Commodity Credit Corporation; the greater benefit is that the buyers, the middlemen, those who buy the raw material, have to start their bidding at the support level and not below. When you reduce the support level you reduce the bidding price of those who purchase from the farmers, and not withstanding the farmer feels the injury immediately and then needs to borrow more money to the point that we are having to increase, every week almost, the loans that are available to him, the benefits of reduced price supports on basic raw materials are not carried forward to the consumer but are absorbed by that group between the farmer and the consumer.

The testimony of this Department of Agriculture, under Secretary Benson, who has led the fight to reduce support levels on basic commodities, the records of his own Department show that since 1945 the cost of handling farm commodities from the time it leaves the farmers' hands to the consumer has increased some 83 percent—but the farmers' share has gone down.

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTEN. I yield.

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. I want to commend the gentleman from Mississippi on the great fight he has made for the American farmer, and the manner in which he has presented the problem at this time.

I also want to point out that in the situation with which the farmer is faced now his financing needs are not going to be met unless we make some changes. The reason is simply this, that the small merchants in these towns who have carried these farmers can no longer do so. The farmer faces a situation where he has got to have production and subsistence loans, and the little merchant cannot get any of that money, but the farmer has to have the money for other purposes.

The Small Business Administration is not meeting the need here and apparently is not attempting to out in my section of the country. We must do something to help these farmers. So I appreciate the gentleman and the fine fight he is making here.

Mr. WHITTEN. I thank the gentleman and am glad to see that he and others from the farm area recognize this problem and have contributed greatly to trying to help. What the gentleman points out further proves that the farmer's plight first reaches those small-business men, then, those with whom they do business. A destitute agriculture will reach the Empire State Building, do not think it will not.

The American farmer is getting in worse financial condition. He is having to borrow more and more to make it. This administration tries to help by making credit available but at the same time make the farmer's situation worse by reducing the prices he will receive. Is it not utterly ridiculous at the same time you see the farmer having to go further in debt to be reducing the prices that the farmers get when the cost of what he buys is going up? Let me remind you the benefits of reduced prices to farmers are not going to the consumer; they are going to be absorbed in the spread between the farmer and the consumer. But the administration is trying to cure the farmer's price squeeze by reducing his price supports, and by substituting the modern parity formula based on his prices heretofore received and ignoring his increasing costs to which the old formula is tied. The effect is to further reduce price supports.

Mr. MILLER of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTEN. Let me say this and I will yield to my friend, the gentleman from Kansas, in just a moment. Surely all of you recall the difficulties faced by the farmers throughout the United States in the early 1930's. They were mortgaged to the hilt and the break in prices received set off the great depression.

In my whole area there were not a half-dozen individuals who actually controlled the land to which they had legal title because it was mortgaged to the hilt. The land bank, the insurance companies really owned the land. The average farmer lived and worked each year on the difference between what he could borrow to make the crop and what

he had to pay out—and believe me that was precious little. Today the farmer's cost of making a crop is so great that he can lose in 2.7 years his whole farm. That is, in 2.7 years. That means that the moment he goes into debt and continues to go into debt the greater and greater is his risk. Farming is a business, an expensive business. Drought, disease, insects, weather, they are just some of the farmer's problems. The farmer must be a capitalist, he must be a laborer. His business carries the greatest risk you can imagine.

Now, about 20 years ago the farmer began to get something like his fair share of the protection of laws similar to industry and labor. Only since then have farmers somewhat prospered as others. Only since then has the farmer been able to put back into the soil a fair share of soil fertility taken out by crops.

Today those laws are under attack. Today when the farmer's financial problems are greater, when his costs are higher, when his income is reduced, the problem would be met by this administration by reducing his price supports and lending him more money. That is no sound farm program.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman the balance of the time on this side.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, I say once again that the country is going to prosper as agriculture prospers. The records shows that in every 5-year period of our history the national income has averaged about seven times the farm income. When you put American agriculture back into the virtual ownership of the insurance companies, the land banks and yes, the Government, even though we have to extend this credit which many farmers need because of dire necessity, when his borrowings go back to the point where he does not control his farm but the man who lends him the money does, when you put him back to where his prices received are greatly reduced and reduced more every day, you are not only endangering agriculture but you are endangering the foundation of our American economy. The same administration offering more loans with interest is trying to relieve the farmer's price squeeze by reducing his prices. I am glad we are passing this bill but I say again at best it can only give some temporary relief to a small percentage of farmers who have to almost take a pauper's oath to qualify. Would it not be more sound, and yes, more economical in the long run, to help protect his income?

Mr. MILLER of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. MILLER of Kansas. I was just wondering whether the gentleman would agree with me in this: That in any degree to which we have reduced the price supports and reduced parity to the farmer we just reduce his buying ability, his purchasing ability and his economic situation in the country by just that much?

Mr. WHITTEN. Yes.

Mr. MILLER of Kansas. Would the gentleman further agree from his knowledge of American agriculture and American history, that there never was a time in the history of this country, until we had the farm program, when the American farmer had any reason to believe that he would get a fair price for his products?

Mr. WHITTEN. I certainly agree with the gentleman. The farmers condition has been worse since his products have been largely kept off world markets at competitive prices by governmental policy. May I say further that since the gentleman from Kansas has been here I find myself agreeing with him most of the time. He is an able, informed Member of this House who makes a great fight for those things I believe are basic to the welfare of all of us.

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

Mr. WHITTEN. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCORMACK. Would the gentleman care to comment upon what seems to be a deliberate plan to have the people in the cities, the consumers there, blame the poor farmers for the high cost of living?

Mr. WHITTEN. I see no other explanation for some of the speeches made. They would tend to inflame the consumers in our cities. The Department of Agriculture speakers do not show the farmer is getting less. They do not show the extra costs to the consumer comes from extra freight and handling charges from individual packaging, frozen foods and the many other extra service consumers demand today. The farmer does not get that. Such extra costs for our food competes with what the farmer does get. It tends to reduce his prices. However, if the farmer's prices received are lowered under our system such amounts would not go to the consumers. All of this is proven by records of the Department. Take the example of a loaf of bread. When bread retailed for 12 cents, the farmer received 2.9 cents. Now the farmer's return on the wheat in a loaf of bread has gone down from 2.9 cents to 2.5 cents per loaf and the retail price for a loaf of bread has gone up to 16.7 cents. Reductions in the farmer's prices, as provided by the farm bill recently passed, will not be reflected in reduced prices to the consumers. Furthermore, when you reduce the price of the raw material, if the reduction were carried forward into the finished product, and there is nothing to indicate it would, it means less than 1 cent per package of cigarettes and so with other consumer articles. All of the statements are proven by the records in the Department of Agriculture. These facts are not the subject of speeches by the administration. Why are such facts ignored and such charges made against farm price supports unless the purpose be to inflame the voters in our cities? To me there seems to be no other logical answer.

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

Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. HAGEN] has asked me to state whether this bill would operate to

give farmers in his area who were suffering from economic difficulties because of insect infestation and grasshoppers an opportunity to secure loans. I will say to the gentleman that that is the purpose of this legislation. It is to operate in areas which have not been declared disaster areas by the President but where farmers have suffered economic loss due to any cause.

Mr. HAGEN of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, in other words, will the farmers in northwestern Minnesota, who have lost crops because of the armyworm infestation this year and last year because of floods, have the opportunity of securing these emergency loans?

Mr. HOPE. Yes. Of course, if the area had been declared a disaster area, they would have been given relief under that program, but this gives relief to those areas which have not been declared disaster areas, but where farmers are in economic difficulties.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill, as amended.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the bill was passed.

REPORT OF STUDIES OR INVESTIGATIONS TO THE HOUSE

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of House Resolution 697, to amend House Resolution 91.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That House Resolution 91 is amended by inserting at the end thereof the following paragraph:

"The committee may report to the House at any time during the present Congress the results of any studies or investigations made under authority of this resolution, together with such recommendations as it deems appropriate. Any such report which is made when the House is not in session shall be filed with the Clerk of the House."

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

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I wonder if we could have a few words of explanation of what that is all about.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, the purpose of this resolution is to authorize the Committee on Ways and Means to report to the House at any time during the present Congress the result of any studies or investigations made under the authority of House Resolution 91.

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

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

INCREASE IN RATES OF NON-SERVICE-CONNECTED PENSIONS

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mrs. ROGERS].

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I call up the bill (H. R. 9962) to increase by 5 percent the rates of pension payable to veterans and their dependents and 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; and pending that motion, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that general debate continue for 1 hour, the time to be equally divided and controlled by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. TEAGUE] and myself.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts.

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 con-

sideration of the bill H. R. 9962, with Mr. NICHOLSON in the Chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, the bill which we are considering today would increase by 5 percent the rates of pension payable to veterans and their dependents.

Pension, it should be kept in mind, is for non-service-connected disability, and is an old and honorable system having been in effect many years prior to the adoption of the compensation provision which is applicable to service-connected injuries.

This bill is in line with H. R. 9020 which passed the House on July 21, and as will be recalled, provided a 5 percent increase in the service-connected rates. This bill provides the same amount of increase for the non-service-connected cases.

The Veterans' Administration points out that there are a total of 544,000 veterans involved, and 399,100 cases of dependents of deceased veterans who would benefit from the passage of this legislation. The first-year cost would amount to \$35,958,000.

Members have previously been furnished a copy of a chart showing the exact effect of this 5 percent increase, and I ask unanimous consent to insert at this point this chart.

As so many of the Veterans and the widows are elderly, there are likely to be deaths this next year and in the future years in increasing numbers.

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

There was no objection.

(The matter referred to follows:)

INCREASED RATES OF PENSION, H. R. 9962

Title: To increase by 5 percent the rates of pension payable to veterans and their dependents.

Mr. MACK of Washington. Introduced and referred July 20, 1954.

Analysis: Increases the rates for non-service-connected pension as indicated below:

	Existing rates	H. R. 9962	Number affected	Estimated first year's cost
WORLD WAR I, WORLD WAR II, AND KOREAN CONFLICT				
Veterans.....			482,700 veterans.....	\$20,210,000
Permanent and total disability.....	\$63.00	\$66.15		
Permanent and total disability and age 65.....	75.00	78.75		
Rated permanent and totally disabled, continuous period of 10 years.....	129.00	135.45		
Aid and attendance.....				
(NOTE.—The foregoing rates are available to Spanish-American War veterans. However, substantially all such veterans on the pension rolls are being paid the greater rates set forth below.)				
Dependents.....			310,600 cases.....	9,257,000
Widow, no child.....	48.00	50.40		
Widow and 1 child.....	60.00	63.00		
Each additional child.....	7.20	7.56		
Children where there is no widow:				
1 child.....	26.00	27.30		
2 children (equally divided).....	39.00	40.95		
3 children (equally divided).....	52.00	54.60		
Each additional child (total equally divided).....	7.20	7.56		
SPANISH-AMERICAN WAR				
Veterans.....			61,800 veterans.....	3,707,000
90 days' or more service:				
1/10 disability or more.....	96.75	101.59		
Age 62 or over.....				
Aid and attendance.....	129.00	135.45		
70 through 89 days' service:				
1/10 disability or more.....	64.50	67.73		
Age 62 or over.....				
Aid and attendance.....	83.85	88.04		

	Existing rates	H. R. 9962	Number affected	Estimated first year's cost
SPANISH-AMERICAN WAR—Continued				
Dependents.....			81,700 cases.....	2,564,000
Widow.....	51.60	54.18		
Widow who was wife of veteran during service.....	64.50	67.73		
Additional for each child.....	7.74	8.13		
Children where there is no widow:				
1 child (to age 16).....	59.34	62.31		
Each additional child (to age 16), total equally divided.....	7.74	8.13		
1 child (age 16 or over).....	26.00	27.30		
2 children (age 16 or over) equally divided.....	39.00	40.95		
3 children (age 16 or over) equally divided.....	52.00	54.60		
Each additional child (age 16 or over), total equally divided.....	7.20	7.56		
CIVIL WAR				
Veterans.....			1 veteran.....	77
Basic rate.....	96.75	101.59		
Aid and attendance.....	129.00	135.45		
Dependents.....			5,600 cases.....	170,000
Widow.....	38.70	40.64		
Widow age 70.....	51.60	54.18		
Widow who was wife of veteran during service.....	64.50	67.73		
Additional for each child.....	7.74	8.13		
No widow, 1 child.....	46.44	48.76		
Each additional child, total equally divided.....	7.74	8.13		
INDIAN WARS OR CAMPAIGNS				
Veterans.....			200 veterans.....	\$14,000
1/2 disability or more.....	\$96.75	\$101.59		
Age 62 or over.....	129.00	135.45		
Aid and attendance.....				
Dependents.....			1,200 cases.....	36,000
Widow.....	38.70	40.64		
Widow age 70.....	51.60	54.18		
Widow who was wife of veteran during service.....	64.50	67.73		
Additional for each child.....	7.74	8.13		
No widow, 1 child.....	46.44	48.76		
Each additional child, total equally divided.....	7.74	8.13		
WAR WITH MEXICO				
Dependents.....			3 cases.....	90
Widow.....	50.00	52.50		

EXPLANATION OF LAWS GOVERNING NON-SERVICE-CONNECTED PENSION FOR WORLD WARS I, II VETERANS AND OF SERVICE ON OR AFTER JUNE 27, 1950

Under existing law (Veterans' Regulation No. 1 (a), part III, as amended), veterans of World War I, World War II, the Spanish-American War, Philippine Insurrection, and Boxer Rebellion are eligible for pension based on permanent and total non-service-connected disability. Pension is payable to any such veteran who served in the active military or naval service for a period of 90 days or more during such wars and who was discharged therefrom under conditions other than dishonorable, or who, having served less than 90 days, was discharged for disability incurred in service in line of duty. The veteran must have been in active service before the cessation of hostilities and be suffering from non-service-connected permanent and total disability not incurred as a result of his own willful misconduct or vicious habits. The rate is \$63 per month, except that where the veteran shall have been rated permanent and total and has been in receipt of pension for a continuous period of 10 years or reaches the age of 65 years and is permanently and totally disabled, the rate is \$75 per month. A rate of \$129 per month is authorized in the case of an otherwise eligible veteran who is, on account of age or physical or mental disability, helpless or blind or so nearly helpless or blind as to need or require the regular aid and attendance of another person. Such pension is not payable to any unmarried person whose annual income exceeds \$1,400 or to any married person with minor children whose annual income exceeds \$2,700. Any person who served in the active service in the Armed Forces of the United States on or after June 27, 1950, and prior to such date as shall thereafter be determined by Presidential proclamation or concurrent resolution of the Congress, is also eligible for pension under part III as provided in the act of May 11, 1951 (Public Law 28, 82d Cong.)

In the administration of the aforementioned provisions the determination of permanent total disability is made on a very

liberal basis. Such a rating is granted (where the requirement of permanence is met) when there is a single disability of 60 percent or 2 or more disabilities one of which is 40 percent in degree, combined with other disability or disabilities to a total of 70 percent, and unemployability attributed thereto. Although age alone is not considered as a basis for entitlement to such pension, it is considered in association with disability and unemployability in determining permanent and total disability. The aforementioned percentage requirements are reduced on the attainment of age 55 to a 60 percent rating for one or more disabilities, with no percentage requirement for any one disability; at age 60 to a 50 percent rating for one or more disabilities; and at age 65 to one disability ratable at 10 percent or more. When these reduced percentage requirements are met and the disability or disabilities involved are of a permanent nature, a permanent and total disability rating will be assigned, if the veteran is determined to be unable to secure and follow substantially gainful employment by reason of such disability.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I would like to say to the Chair that many of these men are totally and permanently disabled. Many of the Spanish-American War veterans are from 85 to 90 years of age—their average age is 76. The so-called pension has been in existence for a long time and veterans of all wars must be aged or have serious disabilities or handicaps to qualify.

There is also a provision that if a single veteran has more than \$1,400 income he does not get any of this compensation; the same is true of a widow. The limit is \$2,700 for veterans and widows with dependents.

I am sure this bill has never been seriously studied or understood by those who object to its passage.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Washington [Mr. Mack], the author of this bill, who has

been tireless in his work as chairman of the Committee on Pensions—I believe this bill will pass the Senate—and become law.

Mr. MACK of Washington. Mr. Chairman, the bill H. R. 9962 was introduced by me upon the unanimous instruction of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

The purpose of the bill H. R. 9962 is to restore part of the pensions for disabled war veterans and the widows and orphans of veterans of World War I, II, and Korea who are non-service-connected that were provided for in the original bill H. R. 9020. Congress will pass a postal pay bill before adjournment, allowing a 5 percent or more increase to postal employees.

The probabilities are that the House will pass a bill giving a 5-percent pay increase to most Federal employees.

This House has passed a bill granting more than a 5-percent increase to millions of elderly persons who are under social security.

The House has passed and the Congress will undoubtedly approve a bill which gives a 5-percent increase in benefits to the service-connected disabled veterans; and more than a 5-percent increase to the widows of service-connected veterans, and to the parents of service-connected deceased veterans. This 5-percent increase formula is designed to take care of the rising cost of living. The only persons being neglected and not granted this increase are the non-service-connected veterans, and their dependents of World War I, World War II, the Korean war, and the Spanish-American War.

In the veterans' pension bill that was passed on July 21, the House gave a 5-percent increase in compensation to

2,038,000 service-connected veterans. Under this bill we grant a 5-percent pension increase to 943,700 non-service-connected veterans, their widows, and their orphans.

At the present time, the widow of a non-service-connected war veteran receives a pension of \$48 a month. Under this bill she will receive a 5-percent increase, or an increase of \$2.40 a month. The Spanish-American War widow now receives a pension of \$51.60 and will receive under this bill a pension increase of about \$2.60 a month and will receive \$54.20.

The only non-service-connected veteran of World War I, II, or Korea who can receive a pension is one who is totally disabled and is unemployable. Such veterans receive pensions now of \$63, \$75, and \$129. These pensions will in each case, under the terms of this bill, be increased by 5 percent.

If Congress is going to increase the wages and salaries of all Federal employees, if Congress is going to increase the pensions of those under social security and railroad retirement, it seems to me reasonable we ought to give the same percentage of increase in pensions to the non-service-connected war veteran and to the non-service-connected widow and orphan of such veterans. This is the unanimous position of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs. This bill, H. R. 9962, is presented here today on instructions of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MACK of Washington. I yield.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. The gentleman mentioned social security and the relationship of that to this bill. Is it not true many of these people also can and do draw old-age and survivors' insurance benefits in addition to the pension; or is there a restriction that you can draw only one or the other?

Mr. MACK of Washington. I believe there is no restriction. Of course, the pension laws of this country are such that a veteran can draw a railroad retirement pension, a social security pension, a veteran's pension, a State pension, and a pension from a private employer, all at one and the same time. Perhaps these laws should be reviewed.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Maybe these people have drawn and are going to draw the increased social security benefits, so that should not necessarily indicate what should be done in connection with this bill.

Mr. MACK of Washington. The veterans of World War I, II, and Korea, in order to draw a pension, must not only be totally disabled and totally unemployable but also are subject to an income limitation of \$1,400. If a veteran has more than \$1,400 a year income from any source, he cannot draw the pensions provided for in this bill.

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

Mr. MACK of Washington. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. FORD. The gentleman has mentioned increases in social security and the legislation we passed last week increasing benefits under railroad retire-

ment. Is it true, however, in connection with the increases in benefits given under social security and the prospective ones given under railroad retirement, that the people who get them have paid more into the fund, they have contributed, whereas in this program there is no contribution?

Mr. MACK of Washington. The contribution of the veteran was that he contributed his time and subjected his life to great risk in the defense of his country. For that we owe him some obligation, I think.

Mr. FORD. There still was an increase in the contributions under social security, and there is none here, of course.

Mr. MACK of Washington. That is correct.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MACK of Washington. I yield.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Also, many of them are too old to benefit under social security.

Mr. MACK of Washington. Mr. Chairman, here is what my bill, H. R. 9962, which we are discussing here today does:

It increases by 5 percent the monthly pensions of 399,100 widows and orphans of the veterans of World Wars I, II, and Korea.

It increases by 5 percent the present monthly pensions of 61,700 Spanish-American War veterans who are dying off at the rate of more than 7,000 a year.

It increases by 5 percent the present monthly pensions of 482,700 totally disabled and totally unemployable veterans of World Wars I, II, and Korea. These veterans to receive a pension must be totally disabled, totally unemployable, and have an income of less than \$1,400 a year.

A total of 943,700 war veterans, their widows, and orphans will receive a 5-percent increase in their present pension if this bill passes the House today, is approved by the Senate, and the President.

Mr. TEAGUE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. HAGEN].

Mr. HAGEN of California. Mr. Chairman, I would like to point out that this legislation did have the support of the Veterans' Committee, after a series of maneuvers. It was something in the nature of a shotgun wedding with the Veterans' Committee being compromised twice. The first time we reduced the amount that we approved by 5 percent, and then of course this particular category of beneficiaries was left out of the original legislation. We are now presented with their case, which certainly is a justified one, because the raise we granted service-connected veterans and their dependents was theoretically based on a cost-of-living increase and not by way of discriminating between them and the category benefited by this bill. If a cost-of-living increase is in order for one group, it certainly is in order for another, unless we, at this late date, are going to distinguish between the merits of their claims. This bill is eminently fair. As a matter of fact, it does not go far enough. If you will look at page

2 of the report and read the niggardly amounts that some of these dependents and disabled veterans get, you will appreciate, I am sure, the need for this legislation.

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

Mr. TEAGUE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. MATTHEWS].

Mr. MATTHEWS. Mr. Chairman, as a member of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, I certainly am in favor of this legislation. I am very glad that we have this opportunity to consider it. I believe most of us are familiar with the provisions of this legislation, which we are discussing, and I think we are all agreed that it takes care of a certain category of our veterans and their dependents who are very much in need of some extra aid. I congratulate the chairman of our committee and the ranking minority member for the work they have done on this legislation. It certainly has my wholehearted approval.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KERSTEN].

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, while I am in favor of passage of this bill, I believe that the 5-percent amount should have been increased to 10 percent. I also believe that the service-connected disability rates should likewise have been 10 percent instead of 5 percent.

The reason for my feeling that these percentages should have been larger is because that these amounts come to the people in the low-income brackets, but more important than that, these amounts come to the people who have the greatest demand from our Government for care in their need. The men who risked their lives in the defense of our country are entitled to the greatest consideration from our Government because if it had not been for their efforts and the risking of their lives, we would have neither a Government nor a country to call our own. The economic wealth, the material advantages, the position of world power that the United States enjoys today, even our tax-raising ability to support this Government and its sending money overseas, all exists because of the servicemen of this country who kept it intact from the designs of those who have sought to destroy us in war.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK], the distinguished majority floor leader.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, just a moment ago some reference was made to the adjustment to the cost of living. As was pointed out when we had the other bill before us, the cost of living has increased only 1.8 percent from the time that the last adjustments were made. I want to make this further statement. At the time we had the other measure before us, dealing with service-connected compensation matters, a number of us did the best we could to try to work out veterans' legislation which would be reasonable and which we could properly expect would become law, and

hence useful to those whom we sought to benefit. As far as I am concerned, that is still my position. I think what we did in that arrangement, which was worked out with the members of the committee on both sides of the aisle, was fair and reasonable.

Mr. TEAGUE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. MILLER].

Mr. MILLER of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, it is my understanding that the sole purpose of this bill is to bring the amount of compensation to disabled, non-service-connected veterans, up to the present standard of living and in accordance with the increased cost-of-living. It seems to me if there is any segment of society in this country which is deserving of equal consideration and, in fact, of special consideration, it is those people who have been asked by our Government to go out and risk their lives for the perpetuation of our American institutions. For that reason, I am very much in favor of the passage of this bill.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Washington [Mr. PELLY].

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Chairman, I am very much interested in the discussion which has just taken place regarding an increase in pensions and benefits. The gentleman from Washington [Mr. MACK] in his full remarks on this legislation also indicated the belief that in addition to an increase for veterans and for their dependents and widows, there was a reasonable expectation that the House would have an opportunity to vote on wage increases for postal workers and classified Federal civil-service personnel.

I want to say, Mr. Chairman, that it would be exceedingly unfortunate if this opportunity does not present itself. I recognize the fairness in an increase for all salaries and pensions at this time which are under the control of the Congress. I know that in my own district there are a great many Federal employees who have been not only adversely affected by the increase in the cost of living but in particular have been under great hardship due to inflation and the reduction of the buying power of their wages. So, Mr. Chairman, in supporting this present privileged resolution, I want to express my great hope that this Congress before it adjourns will not fail to grant similar increases to the post-office employees and also to the classified civil-service employees.

Mr. TEAGUE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. O'HARA].

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I will go back to my constituents with the distinction of having served in the 5-percent Republican 83d Congress. I think that is what the veterans are going to call this Congress. I think it is a doubtful honor. It started out with 10 percent, but the leadership of a party that the veterans of the Civil War kept in power many years, said was too much. This leadership was not going to give the non-service-connected veterans anything, and they left the Spanish-American veterans and their widows out in the cold.

Then the Stars and Stripes, edited by a great American, Mr. Inman, carried a streamer across the first page that the GOP had deserted the veterans. Then the Veterans of Foreign Wars met in national convention and every delegate got to his feet and cheered a resolution denouncing this administration for desertion of the worthy veterans. So finally you come in here with 5 percent; a 5-percent gratuity to the veterans. Well, I am glad you gave this crumb. I know the few dollars you are giving the aged widows of Spanish-American War veterans will be appreciated. Yes, 5 percent will be appreciated. You are giving the veterans a crumb, also you have given to the 83d Congress a name that it will be known by, "the 5-percent Congress"; the 5-percent 83d Congress that accepted a 100-percent performance of American youth in the demands of war and after it was all over gave a 5-percent recognition.

I yield back the remainder of my time, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. TEAGUE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. LONG].

Mr. LONG. Mr. Chairman, it will not take me long to say what I have in mind. It sounds unreasonable when you stand here and argue about giving the widows and orphans of the men who have given their all in defense of this great country of ours a 5-percent increase in pension. May I remind you that these are people who cannot work. These are people who do not earn one dime. They are helpless. But yet, my friends, a few days ago the Congress went all-out and gave \$3 billion to foreign aid to help foreign people. That would be enough to pay this increase in pension for a thousand years.

This very year this Republican Congress has cut the taxes on the "big shots" and have given relief to those in the higher brackets in a sum sufficient to pay these poor war widows and orphans and the helpless to whom we are indebted for their services to this country in time of war. The sum that the taxes are being reduced on the "big shots" would probably be enough to pay these pensions for these poor deserving people for 10,000 years. So just think it over, my friends, and see if you cannot find it in your hard Republican hearts in these days of economy and balancing the budget at least to stop long enough to recognize, in a substantial way, the services rendered by those who have made it possible for this Republic to exist—the veterans of this great United States of America.

Mr. TEAGUE. Mr. Chairman, this is a very simple piece of legislation, giving a 5-percent increase to some 975,000 veterans or their dependents. The bill benefits approximately three different classes. Over 400,000 veterans who are totally disabled and unemployed, of World War I, II, and Korea are effected. Approximately 400,000 of these veterans are affected. Many of them are Civil War, Spanish-American War, and Indian war dependents, and most of them are over 75 years of age. The remaining beneficiaries, about 300,000 are widows and dependent children. They are wid-

ows and dependents of many men who have service-connected disabilities but who died of a nonservice-connected disability. Of course, as the gentleman from Washington [Mr. MACK], said this group is also covered by the income limitation of \$1,400 for a single person and \$2,700 if they are married.

The cost of this bill is approximately \$36 million the first year.

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

Mr. TEAGUE. I yield.

Mr. HALLECK. Is it true that the Veterans' Administration and the Bureau of the Budget both recommend against the passage of this bill?

Mr. TEAGUE. I think it is true that they recommended against passage of any kind of legislation of this character.

Mr. HALLECK. I have examined the report, and the way I read it—and I think I read it correctly—the report from the Veterans' Administration is specific on this bill. It reports adversely and says that the Bureau of the Budget concurs in that decision.

Mr. TEAGUE. The report that I have is "that advice has been received from the Bureau of the Budget that there would be no objection to the presentation of this report to the Committee and that for the reasons stated therein the Bureau of the Budget recommends against favorable consideration of H. R. 9962."

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

Mr. TEAGUE. I yield.

Mr. EDMONDSON. I want to join with other members of the committee in endorsing this bill. I do not believe it should be forgotten that this is a benefit only for totally disabled veterans, for their widows and for their orphans. These are benefits conferred out of the gratitude of its heart for our country upon men who are not able to earn their daily bread. I think it is something that this Congress in view of the national situation has to do. The need is great and I hope the bill will be passed.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TEAGUE. I gladly yield to my chairman.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I would like to ask the gentleman if he does not believe that the reason that pension bills from the Committee on Veterans' Affairs are privileged is because it is so difficult sometimes to secure pension legislation by rule of suspension. It is obvious in my mind that was the reason they were made privileged resolutions. It is the only way many of these veterans can receive any kind of help. I do not see why we are running scared anyway. We do the legislating, not the Bureau of the Budget or the Veterans' Administration.

Mr. TEAGUE. Mr. Chairman, I for one am not running scared.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I know the gentleman is not afraid of anything.

Mr. TEAGUE. I personally feel it is wrong that we have to bring veterans' legislation to the floor in this manner. It is not right that these have to be called up as privileged resolutions. Since I

have been here quite a bit of legislation concerning veterans has come up this way. If there is a group of people in the United States who value this country and what goes on in the country it is the veterans. Their problems are entitled to consideration on this floor without having to resort to special privilege.

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Chairman, I am in favor of the adoption of the bill now before us, H. R. 9962. I commend the distinguished chairlady, the gentlewoman from Massachusetts [Mrs. Rog-

ers], and the members of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs for bringing this worthy legislation before us for consideration.

The purpose of this bill is to increase by 5 percent all monthly rates of pension payable to veterans of the Armed Forces and their dependents under any public law administered by the Veterans' Administration with certain minor exceptions.

This bill is comparable to section 1 of H. R. 9020 which provided a 5-percent in-

crease in the rates of compensation for service-connected disabled veterans. H. R. 9020 passed the House on July 21, 1954.

The report of the Veterans' Administration indicates that H. R. 9962 would affect approximately 544,700 veterans and 399,100 cases of dependents of deceased veterans, to make the total first-year cost approximately \$35,958,000.

The present rates and the rates proposed in H. R. 9962 are set forth in the table which appears below:

Increase in rates of non-service-connected pensions

	Existing rates	H. R. 9962	Number affected	Estimated first year's cost
WORLD WAR I, WORLD WAR II, AND KOREAN CONFLICT				
Veterans.....			482,700 veterans.....	\$20,210,000
Permanent and total disability.....	\$63.00	\$66.15		
Permanent and total disability and age 65.....	75.00	78.75		
Rated permanent and totally disabled, continuous period of 10 years.....	129.00	135.45		
Aid and attendance.....				
(NOTE.—The foregoing rates are available to Spanish-American War veterans. However, substantially all such veterans on the pension rolls are being paid the greater rates set forth below.)				
Dependents.....			310,600 cases.....	9,257,000
Widow, no child.....	48.00	50.40		
Widow and 1 child.....	60.00	63.00		
Each additional child.....	7.20	7.56		
Children where there is no widow:				
1 child.....	26.00	27.30		
2 children (equally divided).....	39.00	40.95		
3 children (equally divided).....	52.00	54.60		
Each additional child (total equally divided).....	7.20	7.56		
SPANISH-AMERICAN WAR				
Veterans.....			61,800 veterans.....	3,707,000
90 days or more service:				
1/10 disability or more.....	96.75	101.59		
Age 62 or over.....	129.00	135.45		
Aid and attendance.....				
70 through 89 days' service:				
1/10 disability or more.....	64.50	67.73		
Age 62 or over.....	83.85	88.04		
Aid and attendance.....				
Dependents.....			81,700 cases.....	2,564,000
Widow.....	51.60	54.18		
Widow who was wife of veteran during service.....	64.50	67.73		
Additional for each child.....	7.74	8.13		
Children where there is no widow:				
1 child (to age 16).....	59.34	62.31		
Each additional child (to age 16), total equally divided.....	7.74	8.13		
1 child (age 16 or over).....	26.00	27.30		
2 children (age 16 or over) equally divided.....	39.00	40.95		
3 children (age 16 or over) equally divided.....	52.00	54.60		
Each additional child (age 16 or over), total equally divided.....	7.20	7.56		
CIVIL WAR				
Veterans.....			1 veteran.....	77
Basic rate.....	96.75	101.59		
Aid and attendance.....	129.00	135.45		
Dependents.....			5,600 cases.....	170,000
Widow.....	38.70	40.64		
Widow age 70.....	51.60	54.18		
Widow who was wife of veteran during service.....	64.50	67.73		
Additional for each child.....	7.74	8.13		
No widow, 1 child.....	46.44	48.76		
Each additional child, total equally divided.....	7.74	8.13		
INDIAN WARS OR CAMPAIGNS				
Veterans.....			200 veterans.....	14,000
1/10 disability or more.....	96.75	101.59		
Age 62 or over.....	129.00	135.45		
Aid and attendance.....				
Dependents.....			1,200 cases.....	36,000
Widow.....	38.70	40.64		
Widow age 70.....	51.60	54.18		
Widow who was wife of veteran during service.....	64.50	67.73		
Additional for each child.....	7.74	8.13		
No widow, 1 child.....	46.44	48.76		
Each additional child, total equally divided.....	7.74	8.13		
WAR WITH MEXICO				
Dependents.....			3 cases.....	90
Widow.....	50.00	52.50		

The adoption of this legislation is not only appropriate but necessary if we are to give our veterans and their dependents the recognition they are entitled to have. The high cost of living that justifies the passage of legislation to increase the pay of Federal employees equally justifies the increase of pensions to veterans and their dependents. I am pleased to give my full support to the bill, and I trust it will have the favorable consideration of the Members.

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Chairman, last July 21, when we were considering H. R. 9020 I voiced my deep disappointment that we were not permitted by the leadership to vote on that bill as it was first and unanimously reported by the House Veterans Affairs Committee.

I stated then my conviction that eliminating the original provisions providing reasonable cost-of-living increases to all our disabled veterans, particularly Spanish-American War veterans, their

widows, and dependents was a denial of fundamental justice.

I am therefore particularly gratified that the injustice is now being openly admitted and recognized, and rectified to some extent, by this bill to increase by 5 percent all monthly rates of pension payable to all veterans and their dependents under any public law administered by the Veterans' Administration, with certain exceptions.

I urge and hope this measure will be unanimously adopted without any further argument or delay.

Mr. TEAGUE. Mr. Chairman, there are no further requests for time on this side.

The CHAIRMAN. There being no further requests for time the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That (a) all monthly rates of pension for disability, age, or death payable to veterans or their dependents under any public law administered by the Veterans' Administration are hereby increased by 5 percent, subject to the provisions of subsection (b) of this section.

(b) Subsection (a) shall not apply to pension payable under sections 4756 or 4757 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (38 U. S. C. 229, 230), the act of April 27, 1916 (39 Stat. 53), as amended (38 U. S. C. 391 and the following), or the act of February 23, 1929 (45 Stat. 1409).

SEC. 2. This act shall take effect on the first day of the second calendar month following the date of its enactment.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise and report the bill back to the House with the recommendation that the bill do pass.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. NICHOLSON, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 9962) to increase by 5 percent the rates of pension payable to veterans and their dependents, had directed him to report the bill back to the House with the recommendation that the bill do pass.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the previous question will be considered as ordered.

There was no objection.

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

The bill 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 bill.

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

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND REMARKS

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks on the bill just passed.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. DINGELL. 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. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, there is neither rhyme nor reason for prolonged debate on the pending bill, H. R. 9962,

providing a mere 5-percent increase for veterans who are disabled and their dependents and classed as nonservice connected.

Ten percent would have been more realistic and fully justified in view of the cost-of-living trend. There are altogether too many classifications and exceptions made as between needy veterans and their dependents, where as a matter of fact a veteran in need, helpless, and starving deserves the same amount of aid whether his plight is due to battle injury or amputation resulting from disease. All veterans in need suffer hunger, cold, and pain alike, and as veterans deserve aid without hairline distinctions.

EXTENSION OF DETENTION BENEFITS UNDER WAR CLAIMS ACT OF 1948 TO EMPLOYEES OF CONTRACTORS WITH THE UNITED STATES

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I call up House Resolution 691 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (S. 541) to extend detention benefits under the War Claims Act of 1948 to employees of contractors with the United States, and all points of order against said bill are hereby waived. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill, and shall continue not to exceed 1 hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority members of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. It shall be in order to consider without the intervention of any point of order the substitute amendment recommended by the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce now in the bill, and such substitute for the purpose of amendment shall be considered under the 5-minute rule as an original bill. At the conclusion of such consideration the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and any Member may demand a separate vote in the House on any of the amendments adopted in the Committee of the Whole to the bill or committee substitute. 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 with or without instructions.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH], and yield myself such time as I may require.

Mr. Speaker, I rise to urge the adoption of House Resolution 691 which will make in order the consideration of the bill, S. 541, to extend detention benefits under War Claims Act of 1948 to employees of contractors with the United States.

Mr. Speaker, this bill is intended to correct inequities which exist under the present provisions of the War Claims Act of 1948 in connection with the payment of benefits to prisoners of war and civilian internees during World War II.

The second major provision in the bill would compensate certain groups of persons and corporations for property

losses suffered in connection with the sequestration of credits by the Japanese in the Philippine Islands during World War II.

The final purpose of S. 541 would be to provide for a study to be conducted of the physical and mental consequences of malnutrition and other hardships suffered by prisoners of war and civilian internees.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 691 provides for an open rule, waiving points of order against the bill and allows 1 hour of general debate on the bill. The rule also would allow the consideration of the substitute amendment now in the bill as an original bill for the purpose of amendment. A separate vote may be demanded in the House on any of the amendments adopted in the Committee of the Whole to the bill or Committee substitute. A motion to recommit with or without instructions would be in order under this rule.

Mr. Speaker, the Bureau of the Budget, according to the report on this bill, has not objected to the submission of the report of the Foreign Claims Settlement Commission on this bill.

I hope that the House will adopt the rule and that the bill itself will have the full and thoughtful consideration of the Congress.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. ROGERS].

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, this bill would carry out a recommendation of the War Claims Commission submitted to the Congress on January 16, 1953. It would right a long-standing injustice to United States nationals, including survivors of Bataan and Corregidor, who had bank deposits and other credits in the Philippines while those islands were a part of the United States. It would also, as an act of simple justice, reimburse those Philippine banks which at their own expense, voluntarily saved American nationals from loss by paying off their bank deposits and other credits notwithstanding the Japanese confiscation of such deposits and credits.

In the Japanese Peace Treaty we took from these United States nationals the right to claim compensation from the Japanese for the property that had been taken from them. This legislation would carry out both the legal and moral obligation of the United States to compensate its own nationals for the rights thus taken away from them by the treaty.

Never before in our history has the United States failed to compel a defeated enemy either to return all of the confiscated property of American nationals or to compensate such American nationals for such property. It may be that we had the sovereign right to waive these claims against Japan. By exercising that right, however, the United States became obligated under the Constitution to provide full and complete compensation to the United States nationals whose claims it waived. The last clause of the fifth amendment states "nor shall private property be taken for public use, without just compensation."

The proposition that the United States must compensate its nationals for the waiver of claims of such nationals against a foreign government is not novel. As early as 1821, Henry Clay, in referring to the waiver by the United States of the so-called French Spoliation Claims, stated that "the rule of equity furnished by our Constitution, and which provides that private property shall not be taken for public use without just compensation, applies and entitles the injured citizen to consider his own country a substitute for the foreign power."

This conclusion was concurred in by Chief Justice Marshall, as well as by many of the most distinguished statesmen in American history, including Madison, Pickering, Clinton, Edward Livingston, Everett, Webster, Cushing, Choate, and Sumner. See, in this connection, the Memorandum as to French Spoliation Claims, printed in 1912 for the Committee on War Claims, House of Representatives, 62d Congress, 2d session.

The basic proposition has been firmly established by a series of decisions of the Court of Claims arising out of the same waiver. Thus, in *Cushing, Administrator v. United States* (22 Ct. Cl. 1), the Court stated at page 31:

We * * * adhere to the conclusions reached last term * * * that these claims (as a class) were valid obligations from France to the United States, that the latter surrendered them to France for a valuable consideration benefitting the nation, and that this use of the claims raised an obligation founded upon right, and upon the Constitution (which forbids the taking of private property for public use without compensation), to compensate the individual sufferers for the losses sustained by them.

Similarly, in *The Schooner Betsey* (44 Ct. Cl. 512-513), the Court of Claims stated:

Under the act of our jurisdiction citizens of the United States who, prior to the ratification of the treaty with France concluded September 30, 1800, had valid claims on the French Government for indemnity growing out of her illegal acts, are given the right to prosecute the same on the theory that when the Government relinquished the claims of her citizens to France in consideration of the relinquishment by France of her national claim against the United States, she thereby took from her citizens private property for public use, for which just compensation should be made.

The inequity of the present situation is underscored by the fact that while the right to return of American property confiscated by the Japanese in the Philippines was waived by the United States, the Japanese were required to return or compensate for the property of United States nationals confiscated in Japan itself. Failure to compensate fully these United States nationals for the value of their property is, therefore, not only a denial of just compensation but also an arbitrary discrimination by the United States in favor of one class of its nationals against another.

During the consideration by the Senate of the Japanese Peace Treaty, Secretary Dulles, who negotiated the Treaty for the United States, indicated that United States nationals having these

claims should look to the Congress for relief. In this connection he referred to the war claims fund. Secretary Dulles stated in a memorandum submitted to the Senate Foreign Relations Committee:

United States nationals whose claims are not covered by the treaty provisions or by the legislation of other Allied Powers, must look for relief to the Congress of the United States.

Congress has provided that the process of the liquidation of Japanese assets in the United States are to be paid into a trust fund in the United States Treasury known as the war claims fund which is available for the payment of war claims as provided by the War Claims Act of 1948 (Public Law 896, 80th Cong., 2d sess.), as amended.

When the question was raised in the Senate concerning the justification for the waiver of these claims, the distinguished senior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY], noted that American citizens were well taken care of. He pointed out that, in his opinion, those who had property in Japan were protected by the treaty and that those who had deposits or credits with the Philippine banks could have their claims satisfied out of enemy assets in the United States, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 98, part 2, page 2593.

This bill would carry out this plan by providing for the use of those assets to pay these claims in full. It would discharge the constitutional obligation of the United States by providing compensation to those who suffered loss by reason of the United States Government's waiver of their claims against Japan.

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

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Why were any such arrangements made in the Japanese peace treaty? Can the gentleman tell me who was responsible for that?

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. I will say this, that in the Japanese peace treaty it was worked out that they would not be responsible for it, and that was adopted by the Senate, according to the information I have. The matter came up at the time the treaty was being considered.

Mr. GROSS. Does not the gentleman think that the Japanese should have paid reparations at least to the extent of indemnifying prisoners?

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Yes, I do. I think, as a matter of law, any time that the United States Government enters into a treaty, that any American national or American citizen has a right to demand of Congress and of the Nation that he be repaid. That right has been taken away from him.

Mr. GROSS. I will say to the gentleman that in my opinion whoever worked out that agreement with the Japanese is as culpable as can be.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. I understand that the present Secretary of State was among those, together with others, that worked it out.

Mr. GROSS. Well, I am not surprised, then, if a previous Secretary of State was a party to that deal.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. I mean, the present one.

Mr. GROSS. Well, either one of them.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. O'HARA].

Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, this bill was reported out of our committee in a very abrupt fashion. Hearings had been held by a special subcommittee headed by the gentleman from California [Mr. HINSHAW], which considered several of these bills, including the one before us today. I was not a member of that subcommittee. At the time the subcommittee made the report to the entire committee I asked for an explanation of the bill, and I did not get one, so I now seek information and now inquire of the chairman of the subcommittee in reference to this bill. In the first place, I would like to know how much it will cost.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, it does not cost the United States Treasury anything. It is all taken from the so-called war claims fund, the liquidation of enemy property.

Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota. I should like to know then how much it takes of the war-claims funds?

Mr. HINSHAW. Approximately the remaining balance, \$14 million, or thereabouts.

Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota. I should like to know this. I have sat in on some of these war-claims bills. Generally I have supported them. I hope to be able to support this one. I have had considerable interest in them. I know a little bit about them. We had previous war-claims legislation which involved many millions. Many of the claims went to various persons and organizations. I do know that there are some claims concerning which appeals have been taken. Claims either have been denied by the War Claims Commission and substantial amounts were involved in those claims. I have no way of knowing the merits of those claims, but I am inquiring because of the fact that under this bill this fund would be wiped out. I should like to know what care has been taken to provide for any of these previous claims which have not yet been finally adjudicated.

Mr. HINSHAW. It is my understanding that an adequate sum is being retained in the fund under the Commission's jurisdiction to pay all claims previously authorized.

Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota. I am speaking now of an undetermined amount involved in claims not yet finally adjudicated.

Mr. HINSHAW. I think the gentleman is referring to the so-called religious claims, is he not?

Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota. Some of them are and some of them are private claims concerning which there is a dispute, and possibly no final determination.

Mr. HINSHAW. I understand with reference to the religious claims that they were appealed and that the appeals have been recalled by the present Commission, which is reconsidering them under a redefinition of the terms.

Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota. Assuming those claims are allowed in some substantial amount—and as I remember, some of those were substantial claims—will there be enough money in the fund to pay them in full?

Mr. HINSHAW. Yes, sir. They have a prior consideration, as I understand it.

Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I have given some consideration to this bill. I think it is a just bill and one that we ought to pass, and pass promptly.

Here is the situation. It arises out of the war claims which arose out of the Japanese war. In the Philippines, the Japanese seized a great many of our citizens over there. Some of them were employees of American contractors. They seized a great many bank accounts, and in some cases the banks paid the persons who had the deposits to their credit.

We set up this war fund of Japanese property. There is enough money there, approximately, to pay these debts, which are just. In some way, during the course of this legislation, there were 2 or 3 classes of people who were not included. This bill undertakes to cover those people. The question whether there is enough money to pay all of them does not particularly concern us, because the bill provides that if there is not sufficient money the amounts of the claims shall be prorated among those who are able to prove their claims. It seems to me a just bill, one that is long overdue and which we ought to pass without too much ado.

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

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCORMACK. I should like to direct this to the attention of the gentleman from California [Mr. HINSHAW], if I may. I was interested in the questions asked of the gentleman by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. O'HARA], because I introduced the bill known as the religious bill in the Philippine Islands. You remember I introduced that bill, and it is now law. I might say the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. HESELTON] is thoroughly acquainted with it, because he cooperated very effectively in connection with the bill.

I agree with what the gentleman from California said, that the present Commission has reconsidered some of the cases. On one of them I appeared before the Commission on the question of the words "affiliated with," and the present Commission acted favorably. I understand the other applications and claims will be affected by the favorable consideration given by the present Commission.

It is my understanding that the passage of this bill in no way will interfere with the processing and the payment both in connection with the religious and the other bill in which the gentleman from New Mexico and other Members were so keenly interested, as to individual prisoners. Is that correct?

Mr. HESELTON. I talked this morning with Mr. Gilliland, Chairman of the Commission. He came to see me par-

ticularly in terms of the question the gentleman has asked. He assured me that in their opinion the passage of this bill would in no way affect the bill to which the gentleman has referred. He also assured me that the change of interpretation of the language in the bill the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK] originally filed has clarified the situation so that all these claims are being considered. He did say this, and I think it should be in the Record, that they would, of course, have to pass on the merits of the claim. Each claim would have to stand on its own feet. But he was convinced that the passage of this bill would not interfere with passing on the other claims, that the funds were ample to take care of them, and that in a very real sense it was a priority because they were already filed before the Commission, and these claims covered by this particular bill, of course, cannot be filed until this becomes law.

Mr. McCORMACK. That was my understanding. The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. HESELTON] very kindly told me of the conversation he had with Chairman Gilliland. I am very glad he has expressed himself for the Record. If I might inquire one step further—and I favor this bill, I want that understood—is it the intention of the committee that in the passage of this bill if it becomes law, which I assume and hope it will, the payments that will or may accrue under this legislation shall be guaranteed, that they will not be interfered with or invaded by the passage of this bill?

Mr. HINSHAW. I understand that the reserve fund has been set up in the Commission to take care of all these claims. That is in addition to any amounts awarded under this bill.

Mr. McCORMACK. I appreciate the gentleman's remark as well as the statement made by the gentleman from Massachusetts because I think they are both important contributions for the Record.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. RAYBURN].

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, I have asked for this time because many Members are inquiring as to what the program is for the remainder of the day and for the remainder of the week, if the gentleman can answer that question, which probably might be a hard question to answer.

Mr. HALLECK. The gentleman understands it is sometimes a little difficult to know just exactly what we will be able to do.

Mr. RAYBURN. I know that, but if the gentleman from Indiana can answer the question, it would be helpful to the Members.

Mr. HALLECK. There are three more rules outstanding which we would like to dispose of either this evening or tomorrow. The gentleman from California has another bill here, and I would suggest to him, if we are going to go too late on this bill, possibly it could go over until tomorrow. Or, if the gentleman would rather dispose of it tonight, that would be all right. I just want to adjust the program to the convenience of the House.

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

Mr. RAYBURN. I yield.

Mr. HINSHAW. It is my intention to ask that this bill be considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole and to dispose of it before taking up the next bill.

Mr. HALLECK. The gentleman from Massachusetts has a bill that he has been waiting for to come up. That is House Resolution 549 having to do with studies of survivors' benefits. These other matters can go over until tomorrow. If the conference report on the atomic energy bill is filed tonight, then we will take that up tomorrow.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. The next bill that is supposed to come up, I believe, which was mentioned by the gentleman from California might be controversial and probably will be controversial. I wonder if the gentleman from Indiana would not prefer to take up this rule, which we could probably get through with this evening and let the controversial matter go over until tomorrow.

Mr. HALLECK. Some suggestion has been made to me that the bill, H. R. 2420, would be controversial and there might be some debate. Whether or not that is true, I do not know.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I have also heard that.

Mr. HALLECK. I am informed there will be controversy on it on this side. I do not know what would be the situation on the other side of the aisle.

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

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I yield.

Mr. KLEIN. May I say to the gentleman from Indiana, I do not believe there would be any more controversy about the one we are talking of than the one that is practically completed. So far as I know there is no opposition here except on the part of the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. O'HARA].

Mr. HALLECK. Let me just make a practical suggestion. It is almost 10 minutes to 5. Let us see how we come out on the passage of this bill, and if it is obvious that it is going to run late, then I am quite sure it will suit everyone's convenience if the balance of these matters could go over until tomorrow. However, if we can dispose of them expeditiously, and if the other could be disposed of expeditiously, of course, there would be no disposition as far as I am concerned to stop the consideration of it tonight.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill (S. 541) to extend detention benefits under the War Claims Act of 1948 to employees of contracts with the United States be considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole.

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

Mr. DODD. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I have an amendment which I wish to offer to this bill.

The SPEAKER. That can be done in the House just as well as in Committee of the Whole.

Mr. DODD. I thank the Speaker.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule, the Clerk will read the substitute amendment as an original bill for the purpose of amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That this act may be cited as the "War Claims Act Amendments of 1954."

TITLE I

SEC. 101. (a) Clause (2) of subsection (a) of section 5 of the War Claims Act of 1948, as amended (50 App. U. S. C., sec. 2004), is hereby amended by striking out "(A) a person within the purview of the act entitled 'An act to provide compensation for employees of the United States suffering injuries while in the performance of their duties, and for other purposes,' approved September 7, 1916, as amended, and as extended; or (B) a person within the purview of the act entitled 'An act to provide benefits for the injury, disability, death, or enemy detention of employees of contractors with the United States, and for other purposes,' approved December 2, 1942, as amended; or (C) a person within the purview of the Missing Persons Act of March 7, 1942 (56 Stat. 143), as amended; or (D)."

(b) Paragraph (3) of subsection (f) of such section is hereby amended to read as follows:

"(3) The following provisions of such act of December 2, 1942, as amended, shall not apply in the case of such civilian American citizens: The last sentence of section 101 (a), section 101 (b), section 101 (d), section 104, and section 105."

(c) Such subsection (f) is hereby further amended by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraphs:

"(10) No benefits provided by this subsection for injury, disability, or death shall accrue to any person who, without regard to this subsection, is entitled to or has received benefits for the same injury, disability, or death under such act of December 2, 1942, as amended.

"(11) No benefits provided by this subsection shall accrue to any person to whom benefits have been paid, or are payable, under the Federal Employees' Compensation Act, or any extension thereof, by reason of disability or death of an employee of the United States suffered after capture, detention, or other restraint by an enemy of the United States, when such disability or death is deemed, in the administration of the Federal Employees' Compensation Act, to have resulted from injury occurring while in the performance of duty, under subsection (b) of section 5 of the act entitled 'An act to amend the act entitled "An act to provide compensation for employees of the United States suffering injuries while in the performance of their duties, and for other purposes," as amended,' approved July 28, 1945, as amended."

(d) The second proviso of subsection (b) of section 5 of the act entitled "An act to amend the act entitled 'An act to provide compensation for employees of the United States suffering injuries while in the performance of their duties, and for other purposes,' as amended," approved July 28, 1945, is hereby amended by inserting immediately after "gratuity from the United States" the following: "other than detention benefits

under section 5 of the War Claims Act of 1948)."

(e) (1) Individuals entitled to benefits under subsection (b), (c), or (d) of section 5 of the War Claims Act of 1948, as amended, solely by reason of the amendments made by this act, must file claim therefor within 1 year after the date of enactment of this act.

(2) The time limitations applicable to the filing of claims for benefits extended and made applicable to any individual by subsection (f) of such section 5 shall not begin to run until the date of enactment of this act with respect to any individual who is entitled to such benefits solely by reason of the amendments made by this act. This paragraph shall not be construed to affect the right of any individual to receive such benefits with respect to any period prior to the date of enactment of this act.

SEC. 102. (a) Subsection (d) of section 5 of the War Claims Act of 1948, as amended; subsection (c) of section 6 of such act; and paragraph (4) of subsection (d) of such section 6, are each hereby amended by striking out "dependent" each time it occurs.

(b) The amendments made by this section shall not apply with respect to benefits paid prior to the date of enactment of this act.

(c) Individuals entitled to benefits solely by reason of the amendments made by this section must file claim therefor within 1 year after the date of enactment of this act.

SEC. 103. The War Claims Act of 1948, as amended, is hereby further amended by adding at the end thereof the following:

"SEC. 15. (a) The Commission is authorized to receive and to determine, according to law, the amount and validity, and provide for the payment of any claim for compensation filed by or on behalf of any individual who, being then an American citizen, served in the military or naval forces of any government allied with the United States during World War II who was held as a prisoner of war for any period of time subsequent to December 7, 1941, by any government of any nation with which such allied government has been at war subsequent to such date. Compensation shall be payable under this section in accordance with the standards established by, and at the rates prescribed in, subsection (b) of section 6 of this act, and paragraphs (2) and (3) of subsection (d) of such section 6.

"(b) The amount payable under this section shall be reduced by such sum as the individual entitled to compensation under this section has received or is entitled to receive from any government by reason of the same detention.

"(c) In the event of death of the individual entitled to compensation under this section, payment may be made to the persons specified in paragraph (4) of subsection (d) of section 6 of this act.

"(d) Claims for benefits under this section must be filed within 1 year after the date of enactment of this section.

"(e) Any claim allowed under the provisions of this section shall be certified to the Secretary of the Treasury for payment out of the War Claims Fund established by section 13 of this act.

"SEC. 16. (a) As used in this section, the term 'merchant seaman' means any individual who was employed as a seaman or crew member on any vessel registered under the laws of the United States, or under the laws of any government friendly to the United States during World War II, and who was a citizen of the United States on and after December 7, 1941, to the date of his death or the date of filing claim under this section; except any such individual who is entitled to, or who has received benefits under section 5 of this act as a 'civilian American citizen.'

"(b) The Commission is authorized to receive and determine, according to law, the amount and validity, and provide for the payment of any claim for detention benefits filed by or on behalf of any merchant seaman who, being then a merchant seaman, was captured or interned or held by the Government of Germany or the Imperial Japanese Government, its agents or instrumentalities in World War II for any period of time subsequent to December 7, 1941, during which he was held by either such government as a prisoner, internee, hostage, or in any other capacity. Detention benefits shall be paid under this section at the rates prescribed and in the manner provided in subsections (c) and (d) of section 5 of this act.

"(c) Payment of any claim filed under this section shall not be made to any merchant seaman, or to any survivor or survivors thereof, who, voluntarily, knowingly, and without duress, gave aid to or collaborated with or in any manner served any government hostile to the United States during World War II.

"(d) Claims for benefits under this section must be filed within 1 year after the date of enactment of this section.

"(e) Any claim allowed under the provisions of this section shall be certified to the Secretary of the Treasury for payment out of the War Claims Fund established by section 13 of this act.

"SEC. 17. (a) (1) The Commission is authorized to receive and to determine, according to law, the amount and validity, and provide for the payment of any claim filed by—

"(A) any individual who—

"(i) on or after December 7, 1941, was a member of the military or naval forces of the United States;

"(ii) is the survivor of any deceased individual described in subparagraph (i);

"(iii) was a national of the United States on December 7, 1941, and is a national of the United States on the date of enactment of this section; or

"(iv) is the survivor of any deceased individual who was a national of the United States on December 7, 1941, and would be a national of the United States on the date of enactment of this section if living; or

"(B) any partnership, firm, corporation, or other legal entity, in which more than 50 percent of the ownership was vested, directly or indirectly, both on December 7, 1941, and on the date of enactment of this section, in individuals referred to in subparagraph (A) of this paragraph;

for losses arising as a result of the sequestration of accounts, deposits, or other credits of such individual or legal entity in the Philippines by the Imperial Japanese Government.

"(2) The Commission is authorized to receive and to determine, according to law, the amount and validity, and provide for the payment of any claim filed by any bank or other financial institution doing business in the Philippines which reestablished sequestered accounts, deposits, or other credits of—

"(A) any individual referred to in subparagraph (A) of paragraph (1) of this subsection; or

"(B) any partnership, firm, corporation, or other legal entity, in which more than 50 percent of the ownership was vested, directly or indirectly, both on December 7, 1941, and on the date of reestablishment of such sequestered credits, in individuals referred to in such subparagraph (A);

for reimbursement of the amounts of such sequestered credits paid by such bank or financial institution.

"(b) Claims must be filed under this section within 1 year after the date of enactment of this section.

"(c) Where any individual entitled to payment under this section is under any legal

disability, payment may be made in accordance with the provisions of subsection (e) of section 5 of this act. In the case of the death of any individual entitled to payment of any claim under this section, payment of such claim shall be made to the individuals specified, and in the order provided, in subsection (d) of section 6 of this act; except that no payment shall be made under this section to any individual who voluntarily, knowingly, and without duress, gave aid to or collaborated with or in any manner served any government hostile to the United States during World War II.

"(d) Each claim allowed under this section shall be certified to the Secretary of the Treasury for payment out of the War Claims Fund established under section 13 of this act. The Secretary of the Treasury shall pay such claims as follows:

"(1) In the case of each claim allowed in an amount equal to or less than \$500, such claim shall be paid in full; and

"(2) In the case of each claim allowed in an amount greater than \$500, such claim shall be paid in two installments. The first installment shall be paid in an amount equal to \$500 plus 66⅔ percent of the amount of such claim allowed in excess of \$500. The last installment shall be computed as of September 1, 1956, under the next sentence of this paragraph, and, as so computed, shall be paid from the sums remaining in the War Claims Fund on that date. If the sums remaining in the War Claims Fund on September 1, 1956, are sufficient to satisfy all claims allowed under this section and not paid in full, the unpaid portion of each such claim shall be paid in full; if the sums remaining in the War Claims Fund on September 1, 1956, are not sufficient to satisfy all claims allowed under this section and not paid in full, the last installment payable on each such claim shall be reduced ratably, and, as so reduced, shall be paid from the War Claims Fund."

SEC. 104. (a) Section 13 of the War Claims Act of 1948, as amended (50 App. U. S. C., sec. 2012), is hereby amended by striking out subsections (b) and (c) thereof, and by inserting immediately after subsection (a) thereof the following:

"(b) Before August 1, 1956, the Secretary of Labor shall estimate and report to the President the total amount which will be required to pay all benefits payable by reason of section 5 (f) of this act. If the President approves the amount so estimated as reasonably accurate, the total amount so estimated and approved shall be certified to the Secretary of the Treasury; if the President does not so approve he shall determine such amount, and the amount so determined shall be certified to the Secretary of the Treasury. Such certification shall be made on or before September 1, 1956. The Secretary of the Treasury shall then transfer from the War Claims Fund to the general fund of the Treasury a sum equal to the total amount certified to him under this subsection.

"(c) Before August 1, 1956, the Secretary of Labor shall estimate and report to the President the total amount which will be required to pay all additional benefits payable as a result of the enactment of section 4 (c) of this act. If the President approves the amount so estimated as reasonably accurate, the total amount so estimated and approved shall be certified to the Secretary of the Treasury; if the President does not so approve, he shall determine such amount, and the amount so determined shall be certified to the Secretary of the Treasury. Such certification shall be made on or before September 1, 1956. The Secretary of the Treasury shall then transfer from the War Claims Fund to the general fund of the Treasury a sum equal to the total amount certified to him under this subsection."

(b) Subsection (d) of such section 13 is hereby amended by striking out "The Sec-

retary of State" and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "On or before August 1, 1956, the Secretary of State."

SEC. 105. Within 2 years after the date of enactment of this act, the Foreign Claims Settlement Commission of the United States shall wind up its affairs in connection with the settlement of all claims for benefits authorized by the amendments made by this act.

TITLE II

SEC. 201. As used in this title—

(a) The term "prisoner of war" has the meaning assigned to it by section 6 of the War Claims Act of 1948, as amended; and

(b) The term "civilian American citizen" has the meaning assigned to it by subsection (a) of section 5 of such act.

SEC. 202. The Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, in cooperation with, and with the assistance of, the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, the Secretary of Labor, and the Secretary of Defense, shall conduct a study of—

(1) the mortality rates among prisoners of war and civilian American citizens, with a view to determine whether their abnormally high mortality rate is directly attributable to the malnutrition and other hardships suffered by them while held as prisoners of war, hostages, internees, or in any other capacity;

(2) the mental and physical consequences of the malnutrition and other hardships suffered by prisoners of war and civilian American citizens while so held; and

(3) the procedures and standards which should be applied in the diagnosis of the mental and physical condition of prisoners of war and civilian American citizens.

SEC. 203. Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this title, the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare shall report the results of such study to the President for transmittal to the Congress.

Mr. HINSHAW (interrupting the reading of the amendment). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the further reading of the amendment may be dispensed with.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. DODD. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment, which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. DODD:

Page 5, line 12, insert "(1)" after "(a)."

Page 5, insert after line 16, the following:

"(2) Subsection (d) of section 5 of the War Claims Act of 1948, as amended, is amended by striking out 'and' at the end of clause (2), striking out the period at the end of clause (3) and inserting in lieu thereof: '; and', and by adding at the end thereof the following new clause:

"(4) Parents (in equal shares) if there is no husband or child."

Mr. DODD. Mr. Speaker, the amendment that I offer is very simple and very just, I believe. Under the War Claims Act of 1948, section 6, those who were prisoners of war, that is any regularly appointed, enrolled, enlisted, or inducted member of the military or naval forces of the United States who was held as a prisoner of war for any time subsequent to December 7, 1941, is entitled to collect claims under this act.

However, if such person should die before he can collect his claim, the compensation would go, first, to his or her widow or dependent husband, if there are no children; second, if there are children, one-half would go to the widow or

dependent husband and the other half in equal shares to his children; third, if there is no widow or husband, the compensation would go in equal shares to the children of the deceased; and fourth, if none of the aforementioned exist at time of death, the claim would go to his parents in equal shares.

There is nothing unusual about this clause. Every lawyer in this House knows well the common law with respect to this issue. This law, which is a very old one, establishes the manner for distribution of an estate of a person who dies without leaving a will. It is a fully accepted practice that the estate should be distributed to the widow or husband of the deceased, then to the children, and then to the parents.

However, under section 5 of this same act, the authors of the original bill have made a distinction, for what reason I have never been able to find out. Section 5 of the War Claims Act entitles, with certain reservations, civilian American citizens who were interred by the enemy to receive compensation for their discomforts. A large number of these civilian internees were missionaries who remained in the Pacific area to help the natives. Some of these civilians were brave men indeed. When the Japanese captured these islands, they made no distinction between civilian Americans and American military personnel; both were sent to and both endured, the horrors of a war-prisoner camp. No one has ever questioned the right of these civilian internees to compensation for these terrible discomforts. They receive benefits in the same manner as do military personnel.

However, for some reason, which is a mystery to me, the authors of the War Claims Act made a distinction between civilian internees and prisoners of war in case the victim died before he could collect compensation. In every way except one, they are treated exactly as prisoners of war who have died. The compensation goes first to the widow or husband, if there are no children; second, one-half to the widow or husband, if there are children, and then one-half in equal shares to the children; third, in equal shares to the children if there is no widow or husband. But at this point, the benefits stop. In other words, the act makes a distinction between married and unmarried persons, and penalizes the unmarried ones. For if a civilian internee should die without spouse or child, no one can collect the detention benefits. This, I think, is very unjust. Not only is it unjust, but it contradicts our age-old common law, which makes no distinction between married and unmarried people.

I am not the only one who feels that this is unjust. The War Claims Commission whose business it is to distribute these detention benefits has carefully studied the subject. In a report they made to Congress on January 16, 1953, in House Document No. 67, on page 97, the report says, and I quote:

The Commission finds no basis for the distinction between surviving parents of prisoners of war and surviving parents of civilian internees. It believes that the detention benefits due a civilian internee is in the na-

ture of a property right and that this right should devolve upon his parents and not be permitted to lapse in the event the internee is not survived by a spouse and/or children. There are approximately 200 claims (as of January 1953) in this category.

I submit that there can be no distinction made and if any Member of this House can show me the reason for one, I will be grateful. I have made many inquiries about this clause and not one person has yet come up with any reason for it. I urge my colleagues to support the amendment that I have offered so that this injustice can be corrected and surviving parents of civilian internees will be entitled to the same benefits as surviving parents of prisoners of war.

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

Mr. DODD. I yield.

Mr. HINSHAW. The only answer is that no bill was filed so that the subcommittee could consider it along with the other bills which are included in S. 541. If the matter had been brought to the attention of the committee, I am sure the committee would have included it in the amendments offered to the committee at this time.

As for myself, I can see no reason why it should not be included; and if it please the gentleman and other members of the committee—and I think it does—we should be glad to accept the amendment.

Mr. DODD. I am very grateful to the gentleman for accepting the amendment.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Connecticut.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Speaker, I should like to call the attention of the committee to another change which should be made in the War Claims Act. The members of the committee will recall that I appeared before the committee in the first session of the 83d Congress in support of a bill I introduced for the relief of the wife and children of Lieutenant Harrison, a native of my district who was killed on the day we signed the armistice with the Japanese.

Early on the morning of V-J Day the American planes off the ships in Tokyo Bay were ordered to bomb certain targets on the mainland of Japan. Before they reached their mission they were notified by radio to return to the ships, that an armistice had been arranged.

On their way back they were attacked by Japanese planes and four of the American planes were shot down, Lieutenant Harrison losing his life.

His wife attempted to process a claim before the War Claims Commission in damages against the Japanese Government for the death of her husband, and was told the War Claims Act was not sufficiently broad to permit the processing of a claim. All the proof necessary as to what had actually happened was furnished the War Claims Commission, but they insisted they were unable to act because the present War Claims Act was insufficient.

I wish to inquire of the gentleman from California if any consideration was given to that proposition of mine?

Mr. HINSHAW. We have that bill, but it was not considered by the subcommittee. The committee considered all those who had been left out of the original act whom we felt should have been included and were entitled to consideration. We have not added any new class of persons.

Mr. BAILEY. Has the gentleman from California any reasonable explanation why Mrs. Harrison should not be eligible under the circumstances to a claim against the Japanese Government, against Japanese property we have here, before it is distributed and disposed of?

Mr. HINSHAW. I think the gentleman's claim more properly belongs with the military rather than with this agency. Why they do not reimburse Mrs. Harrison, I do not know.

Mr. BAILEY. She certainly has a claim against the Japanese Government for the death of her husband after the armistice had been signed.

Mr. HINSHAW. That is correct. This boy was shot down as a military officer.

Mr. BAILEY. There were some 16 others killed at the same time; there were 4 planes shot down.

Mr. HINSHAW. And after the armistice was signed. Why it was not considered by the military I do not know. I think it should be.

Mr. BAILEY. The gentleman still thinks it should not be a matter for consideration in this bill?

Mr. HINSHAW. Not in this bill; no.

Mr. BAILEY. I disagree with the gentleman, but there is nothing, of course, that can be done about it at the present time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the committee amendment as amended.

The committee amendment as amended was agreed to.

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

The bill 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 bill.

The bill was passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "An act to extend benefits under the War Claims Act of 1943 to certain classes of persons, and for other purposes."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SELECT COMMITTEE TO INVESTIGATE AND STUDY CERTAIN BENEFITS FOR SURVIVING DEPENDENTS OF DECEASED MEMBERS AND FORMER MEMBERS OF THE ARMED SERVICES

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I call up House Resolution 549 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That there is hereby created a select committee to be composed of five Members of the House of Representatives to be appointed by the Speaker, one of whom he shall designate as chairman. Any vacancy occurring in the membership of the committee shall be filled in the same manner in which the original appointment was made.

The committee is authorized and directed (1) to conduct a full and complete investi-

gation and study of the benefits provided under Federal law for the surviving dependents of deceased members and former members of the Armed Forces, and (2) on the basis of such investigation, and study, to make such recommendations as it may deem advisable and to prepare such legislation as it may consider appropriate to carry out such recommendations.

The committee shall report to the House as soon as practicable during the present Congress the results of its investigation and study, together with its recommendations and the legislation, if any, prepared under the preceding paragraph. Any bill so reported to the House shall (notwithstanding any provision of the Rules of the House of Representatives to the contrary) be forthwith referred to the appropriate calendar under rule XIII of the Rules of the House of Representatives.

For the purpose of carrying out this resolution the committee, or any subcommittee thereof authorized by the committee to hold hearings, is authorized to sit and act during the present Congress at such times and places within the United States, its Territories, and possessions, whether the House is in session, has recessed, or has adjourned, and to hold such hearings, as it deems necessary.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 2, line 7, after the word "paragraph," strike out the balance of line 7 and all of lines 8 to 11, inclusive.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes of my time to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH], and at this time I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. BATES].

Mr. BATES. Mr. Speaker, the purpose of House Resolution 549 is to conduct a study of the benefits provided under Federal law for the surviving dependents of deceased members and former members of the armed services. I have discussed this matter with many Members of Congress who are familiar with the problems and I have not heard of any objection. May I advise the Members that the Gold Star Wives of America have expressed their interest and support of this bill.

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

Mr. BATES. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. What are some of the problems that this committee proposes to go into?

Mr. BATES. Mr. Speaker, may I say to the gentleman that this resolution which I introduced is similar to a resolution which the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. HARDY] introduced. The difficulty in the hodgepodge which exists today is that the legislation for survivors' dependents of military personnel emanates from many different sources. First of all, we have legislation from the Armed Services Committee, we have legislation from the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, we have legislation from the Ways and Means Committee, we have legislation from the Committee on the Post Office and Civil Service. There are various departments downtown that take care of these surviving dependents and, as a consequence, when someone in the service dies today dependents are at loss to know what department they should go to.

Mr. GROSS. The gentleman has satisfied me.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BATES. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. We all know that the amount paid to the widows of men in the regular services is pitifully small. That shows in the chart we have. I think this is an important committee, but here is the thing that troubles me: I want to make sure that in going into this matter there will be no power of law; it is just a suggestion, the committee will make reports and advise?

Mr. BATES. Of course, that is true. I have discussed this matter in full with the gentlewoman from Massachusetts. I know she is discussing it now not to clarify the matter in her own mind but to establish it on the Record.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. There are so many investigations going now of VA and the function and laws of the VA. There is the Trundle Engineering-Hoover Commission task force, the Hoover Commission itself, the Booz, Allen & Hamilton management survey, two surveys by the staff of the House Appropriations Committee and a study by the Curtis subcommittee in 1953 on social-security benefits, as well as by the Kaplan Commission. I think the Kaplan Commission has made some rather unfortunate suggestions in the transfer of functions from one service to another. The gentleman does not have anything of that kind in mind? It would be very unfortunate if there should be any curtailment of benefits as a result of the survey. There will be increases recommended, but I pray there will be no cuts.

Mr. BATES. No, I do not. This study does not go into the various studies the gentlewoman mentioned. It merely involves the benefits of the dependents of military personnel who die on active duty. I am pleased the gentlewoman favors the measure.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PROHIBITING SEGREGATION IN INTERSTATE TRAVEL

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. HOWELL. Mr. Speaker, I am very much interested in a bill which has been reported out of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, H. R. 7304. I know many of the Members are anxious for that bill to come to a vote. It deals with the prohibition of segregation in interstate travel. I wonder if anyone could tell me what the situation

is and what the prospects are of that bill coming to a vote.

Mr. HESELTON. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, I happen to be the author of that bill. It was reported out of my committee by a vote of 19 to 7. I am extremely anxious to have it come up for a vote, because I am convinced that an overwhelming majority of the Members of the House would like to vote on that bill. I am doing everything I can to bring that about, but I cannot give the gentleman any assurance at this time that it will be possible to do so.

Mr. HOWELL. Is there any chance of getting a rule on that bill?

Mr. HESELTON. I cannot answer that, either. We were told that the Committee on Rules has suspended meetings. I do not know whether that will be changed or not.

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

Mr. HOWELL. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. PELLY. I would like to say to the gentleman from New Jersey that I am very glad he brought up this particular subject, because, as a member of the committee, I am very much interested in it. We reported it out, and I have been very hopeful that we might get a rule on it.

Mr. HOWELL. In my opinion, it is an eminently fair bill, and I think the Members would like to have an opportunity to vote on it.

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

Mr. HOWELL. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. MCCARTHY. I understood it was to have been called up under suspension of the rules. Does the gentleman from Massachusetts know whether that plan has been changed or what will be necessary in order to bring it up?

Mr. HESELTON. I understand, in order to do that, it has to receive the approval of the leadership on both sides.

Mr. HOWELL. I hope, Mr. Speaker, that we can find a way of getting out a rule to get this legislation before the House.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. YATES (at the request of Mr. PRICE) for 3 days on account of illness in family.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

Mr. MILLER of Kansas asked and was given permission to address the House for 20 minutes on Tuesday next, following any special orders heretofore entered.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin asked and was given permission to address the House for 20 minutes on tomorrow, following any special orders heretofore entered.

AMERICA'S MOST DREADFUL FLOWER

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point and include an article from a magazine.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. Speaker, I was so highly impressed with the article of Mr. James Poling, entitled "America's Most Dreadful Flower," appearing in the August 6, 1954, edition of Collier's magazine, that I want to make it a part of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

The article deals with the deadly menace of the water hyacinth to the Gulf States from Texas to Florida, as well as other areas. I especially commend this enlightening and timely article to the Members of this body from Louisiana, North Carolina, South Carolina, Georgia, Florida, Alabama, Mississippi, Texas, Virginia, and California. I urge all Members of this body and especially my colleagues from the States I mentioned to join in a concerted movement to eradicate and remove the source of infestation of the water hyacinth once and for all.

In a letter addressed to Brig. Gen. E. C. Itschner, Assistant Chief of Engineers for Civil Works, Department of the Army, Washington, D. C., dated August 4, 1954, I reviewed the work done thus far by the Board of Engineers in cooperation with the Fish and Wildlife Service of the Department of the Interior, the Department of Agriculture, and the United States Public Health Service, pursuant to a House resolution requesting a review of reports on water-hyacinth obstructions submitted in House Document No. 91, 55th Congress, 3d session. The letter follows:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., August 4, 1954.

Brig. Gen. E. T. ITSCHNER,
Assistant Chief of Engineers for Civil
Works, Department of the Army,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR GENERAL ITSCHNER: Reference is made to my discussion today with a member of your staff concerning the problem of removal of the water hyacinths and other objectionable marine growths from certain streams in Louisiana and elsewhere.

As you well know, these aquatic growths constitute a menace to navigation, flood control, agriculture, trapping, fish and wildlife, and public health.

In that connection, I call to your attention a very enlightening article by Mr. James Poling appearing in the August 6 edition of Collier's magazine, entitled "America's Most Dreadful Flower." This timely article points up the imperative necessity to take immediate steps to eradicate and remove the source of infestation of this menace once and for all. I personally think that Mr. Poling has made a great contribution toward that end. I quote significant and pertinent portions of the article:

"The water hyacinth has caused heavy losses to commercial fishermen, put trappers out of business, greatly handicapped the oil and logging industries, suffocated game fish beyond estimate, and driven wildfowl from their winter nesting grounds. . . .

"Moving with the wind and the current like floral juggernauts, the mats have spread through all the Gulf States from Texas to Florida and have reached as far north as Virginia and as far west as California. They cover hundreds of thousands of acres of lakes, ponds, streams, ditches, bayous, canals, marshes, and swamps. . . .

"In Louisiana alone, the depredations of the water hyacinth have been estimated by the State department of wildlife and fisheries at \$55 million to \$65 million per year. This

is a high price even for a lavender symphony. In terms of human misery, moreover, the price has been even higher."

As you know, a resolution was adopted by the Congress directing the Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors to review the reports on water-hyacinth obstructions submitted in House Document No. 91, 55th Congress, 3d session.

The resolution further provided as follows: "Be it further resolved, That this action be taken with the view to determining the estimated cost of permanently eliminating the hyacinth plants and other marine vegetable growths from these streams, and that the cooperation of the Fish and Wildlife Service of the Department of the Interior, and the Department of Agriculture and the United States Public Health Service be solicited, since the aforementioned obstruction of such streams affects the fishing industry, agriculture, and health conditions."

As you will know, I have been vitally interested in the completion of these studies to the end that ways and means may be found to get rid of this monstrous pest. On July 1, 1949, I received a notice of a proposed interim report to be made pursuant to the House resolution and suggesting that all interested parties have the privilege of presenting their views to the Board on the subject matter covered in the report. Your files will show that as a result of my initiative public bodies and civic-minded citizens throughout my district presented their views and vigorously urged concerted action on this important matter.

The proposed interim report expressed the unanimous views of the Corps of Engineers, the Fish and Wildlife Service of the Department of the Interior, the Department of Agriculture, and Public Health Service. It proposed a vigorous and concerted plan of attack in the States of Louisiana, North Carolina, South Carolina, Georgia, Florida, Alabama, and Mississippi, over a 5-year period, at an estimated cost to the United States of \$1,520,000 per year. The proposal was enthusiastically received because it contained the collaborated views not only of top Government engineers and scientists in the four agencies designated in the House resolution, but the result of preliminary research of universities, including the work of Mr. F. W. zur Burg of Southwestern Louisiana Institute of Lafayette, in my own district, as well as Tulane University.

But we suffered two setbacks. First came the Korean conflict, which caused work on worthy projects of this kind to be deferred or suspended. And second a pennywise and pound-foolish policy has developed to curtail expenditures on domestic public works, while giving away our substance for the development of similar projects abroad.

In that connection, I quote further from Mr. Poling's splendid article:

"Consider the problem of the Federal Fish and Wildlife Service. It is charged with the task of providing food and winter nesting grounds for the millions of wild ducks and geese that migrate south each winter. In Louisiana alone, its Sabine, Delta, and Lacassine wildlife refuges total more than a quarter of a million hyacinth-harassed acres. Yet last year, the Service was able to spend only \$30,000 for plant control on all of its two-hundred-odd wildlife refuges throughout the country.

"Louisiana's Legislature, while loudly bemoaning the hyacinth's cost to the State, gave its water hyacinth control program \$70,000 last year. Florida, suffering equally heavy losses, spent around \$140,000.

"Financially speaking, the Corps of Engineers has fared best. No conservation agency, the corps' assignment is to keep navigable inland waterways open to shipping—and it has been spending around \$250,000 annually for many years to curb the hyacinth. The cry of many 24-D enthusiasts in the various conservation agencies is,

"Give us that much money for just 8 or 10 years and we could lick the hyacinth menace."

From the above quotation I am not inferring that any agency is doing less than its share. On the contrary, I think it is a healthy sign that all agencies are anxious to put their best foot forward. That, after all, is exactly what Congress had in mind when it required the cooperation of the four agencies, and in view of this, I am sending a copy of this letter to all of them and respectfully solicit their considered views. Accordingly, in the interest of the areas so drastically affected by the water hyacinth problem, I urge that every consideration be given to the allocation of funds necessary for the completion of your report just as soon as practicable.

With assurance of my high esteem, I remain,

Very sincerely,

EDWIN E. WILLIS,
Member of Congress.

And now, Mr. Speaker, I insert Mr. Poling's article, as follows:

AMERICA'S MOST DREADFUL FLOWER

(By James Poling)

Along streams and irrigation ditches in the Houston-Galveston section of Texas a few years ago, a number of signs were erected reading "25 Fine for Molesting Flowers." They were put up to protect newly planted beds of a beautiful aquatic flower—the water hyacinth. But the signs didn't remain long. East Texans soon discovered what the rest of the gulf coast had long known—that the water hyacinth is a floral version of Frankenstein's destructive monster. With one leaf tied behind its stem, it can outmolest, outmaneuver, and outlast an army of men.

The water hyacinth—kissing kin to the water lily and the water lotus—consists of a set of broad, floating leaves, roots that draw nourishment from fresh water, and an orchidlike lavender flower, one of whose petals bears an orange dot framed in deep blue. The flowers unmatched beauty is as striking as its ugly behavior.

Directly or indirectly, the water hyacinth has been responsible for death, blocked navigation, lowered real-estate values, ruined reservoirs, and blocked sewage systems. It has caused heavy losses to commercial fishermen, put trappers out of business, greatly handicapped the oil and logging industries, suffocated game fish beyond estimate and driven wild fowl from their winter nesting grounds.

Enraptured tourists call the flower a lavender symphony that wreathes the South in beauty. A lavender octopus would be a more exact description. Extending their tentacle-like roots in all directions, 10 of these exotically beautiful plants can increase to 655,360—or 1 solid acre of water hyacinths—during their 8-month growing season.

The plants grow together in a floating mat so dense that its wet weight per acre reaches 180 tons and so buoyant that some can support a man's weight. Moving with the wind and the current like floral juggernauts, the mats have spread through all the Gulf States from Texas to Florida and have reached as far north as Virginia and as far west as California. They now cover hundreds of thousands of acres of lakes, ponds, streams, ditches, bayous, canals, marshes, and swamps.

A hyacinth mat is, in a sense, an animate thing, growing and spreading from its outer boundaries. It can cover a body of water like a crust covers a pie, sealing it so hermetically that fish and other marine life die for lack of oxygen, clogging it so effectively that a 250-horsepower tug can't fight its way through.

Amateur pilots have mistaken a water hyacinth mat for a landing strip—to their chagrin. Drivers have pulled off the highway onto what appeared to be a solid should-

der, only to find themselves, or be found, at the bottom of a hyacinth-covered stream or irrigation ditch. High waters and winds have rolled hyacinth mats into 20-foot-high dams, causing floods. Mats have blocked the pumps of rural firefighters trying to draw water from a pond, routed fishing and hunting clubs from their sites by killing or driving off wildlife, even toppled bridges by sweeping away their supports.

In Louisiana alone, the depredations of the water hyacinth have been estimated by the State Department of Wildlife and Fisheries at \$55 million to \$65 million a year. This is a high price, even for a lavender symphony. In terms of human misery, moreover, the price has been even higher.

At a public hearing held not long ago by the United States Army's Corps of Engineers, New Orleans district, a man got up and said:

"My name is Sevin, and I represent about 200 families up back of Choctaw. We're being drowned out up there like rats. Hyacinths have everything clogged up. There's no chance for the water to get out, the land just can't drain. Trucks carrying food can't get in, and doctors can't get back in there. A boy was sick back there for a week; his papa had to carry him 5 miles on his shoulders to a doctor. A lady died up there last week for lack of medical care. Her own people couldn't even come to see her, and we had to bury her as best we could.

"Seems to me something ought to be done. We've got families won't make a nickel's worth of crop this year; the sugar cane and corn's lost, and the potatoes can't be dug. And several of our ladies will need medical care any moment now, and we can't get them out. I'm not much of a talker, but I guess you understand what I mean."

What is the story behind this Jekyll and Hyde of the flower world? Where did the water hyacinth come from? What turned the water orchid into a profligate weed that threatens the economy of the South? What can be done to end its reign of terror?

Dr. Warren Bourn, aquatic biologist for the Federal Fish and Wildlife Service, thinks man himself may be partly to blame for the hyacinth's widespread destruction. Certainly the plant, a relatively recent botanical immigrant, wasn't brought into this country as a weed.

It was sent here from South America as part of a horticultural exhibit at the New Orleans Cotton Exposition in 1884. The flower's delicate beauty made it a hit of the exposition. Homeowners took samples home to plant. Local florists, seeking to capitalize on the plant's popularity, set out to develop it commercially, but almost immediately hit a formidable snag. They discovered that sexually the plant was almost barren.

With all its luring beauty, the hyacinth is as unloved by the creatures of nature as it is by mankind. Even the birds and the bees shun it. Ignored and unwanted, the flower is forced to engage in lonely self-pollination. Its attempts to create its own sex life result in a pretty weird performance.

After the bud breaks, the flower grows heavenward for the first 12 hours; at times an 8-inch stalk bears as many as 32 blossoms. But once it becomes aware that it's being ignored by all the abundant winged life about it, the hyacinth has the natural reaction of any wallflower. It wants to hide its head in shame—and the stalk starts to bend down toward the water. Twenty-four hours after it opens, the flower is growing in a horizontal rather than upright position. During the next 12 hours, as it bends lower and lower, its motion, aided by gravity, frees the pollen on its stamen, and the loosened pollen in turn fertilizes the ovary-bearing pistil. At the end of a 36-hour cycle the flower thrusts its head beneath the water and its seed capsules begin to mature. After about 20 days the ripened capsules burst and discharge the seeds.

Why the hyacinth goes to all this trouble to impregnate itself is a mystery. The end result of all its contortions is that it releases its seeds beneath the surface—and they can't germinate under water. An acre of hyacinths wastes a lot of energy producing 45 million seeds when you consider that only those accidentally exposed to the air—cast up on the surface of a mat or on the shoreline—ever sprout.

But in the plant world there is another means of propagation. Greenhouse operators found that the water hyacinth, like many creeping, crawling land weeds, also can reproduce by putting out new shoots at each new node in its spreading roots. Using all the skill and chemicals at their command, the commercial botanists educated and strengthened the plant's vegetative reproductive system at the expense of its already inept sexual system.

GREENHOUSE SVENGALIS UNDER SUSPICION

Today, according to Dr. Bourne, hyacinth roots are so fertile that a single broken cylinder from a plant, if tossed into the water, may develop into a 10- to 100-acre mat. Some greenhouse Svengalis, Dr. Bourne suspects, helped convert the exotic wild flower into an aquatic menace.

As a matter of fact, the hyacinth isn't even a true aquatic plant. If it had any guts, it would still be growing in sedentary beauty on the land, where it belongs. If you dissect it, you can still find traces of the elaborate vascular tissue it used for pumping water through its system when it grew on land. Fierce competition from other, more rugged, terrestrial plants drove it into the water. Its retreat probably took a few million years, and it's still capable of sinking its roots eight inches into the soil if left stranded on moist land. However, it never survives on land for more than a few months.

Once it took the plunge, the hyacinth made itself completely at home in the water. It even built its own water wings. Each plant formed several bladders at its base and pumped them full of air. The plant became as buoyant as a cork and as mobile as a piece of driftwood.

With this buoyancy and mobility—and another assist from man and nature—the hyacinth easily established itself along most of the Gulf Coast within 6 years of its arrival in the United States. In Louisiana, unknown gardeners tossed surplus cultivated plants from their fountains or fishponds into nearby streams or rivers. In Florida, Jacksonville's city fathers place a clump of plants in the St. Johns River to enhance its beauty. Hurricanes, floods and currents did the rest. By now the plant has slipped across so many borders that it might be called the original wetback.

MATS FORM FLOATING ISLANDS

Yet the hyacinth apparently still dreams wistfully of its good old days on land. Certainly, in forming its mat, it does its best to build up a reasonable facsimile of soil—and with considerable success. The hyacinth is one of the few plants in the nursery business. At least 63 different types of vegetation, 30 of them land or swamp plants, have been found growing on a hyacinth mat. In the Spanish Pass section of the Mississippi Delta country, there are 2- to 10-acre mats that are truly floating islands, supporting such other growths as buttonbush, blackberry, goldenrod, iris and thistle—not to mention water moccasins, alligators, and other unattractive fauna.

These islands are virtually impervious to assault. When some of them choked the water trails leading to the duck blinds of the swanky Delta Club, its members tried every means the mind could devise to clear them. None succeeded.

Finally, the club's desperate duck hunters decided to buy a hippopotamus—an animal with a notoriously gluttonous appetite for aquatic vegetation—and put it out to graze. But when they discovered that the asking price for a hippopotamus was \$5,000 (F. O. B. New Orleans), they struck their colors to the water hyacinth and sold their property.

The Corps of Engineers can sympathize with the Delta Duck Club. It has been waging a ceaseless and often discouraging war on the flower for more than a half century.

Congress ordered the corps to the attack in 1897, for even then the hyacinth was threatening the waterways of the Gulf States.

The first weapon the engineers employed was the pitchfork, but the flowers grew faster than men could fork them up on the land to rot.

In 1900, the *Ramos*, a stern-wheeler with a 4-foot conveyor belt that picked up hyacinths and ran them through a pair of crushers, was put in use—and quickly abandoned. Again, the plants grew faster than the *Ramos* could chew them up. Dynamite also was quickly proved useless; it was far more disturbing to the countryside's setting hens than to the hyacinth mats. A scientist even tried a flamethrower. He poured a full cone of fire, hot enough to melt the engine block of a car, on a selected patch of a hyacinth mat. After the flamethrowers' fuel was exhausted, an unharmed frog blithely emerged from the center of the scorched area and began sunning himself. The engineer was slightly taken aback. He was even more astounded when, next growing season, the burnt plants not only were the first to sprout, but averaged 9 inches taller than the surrounding plants.

For a number of years, the corps relied on an arsenic compound. The herbicide killed cattle, crops, and water hyacinths with equal success. Its use was abandoned after it also caused the death of one man and the serious illness of 13 others assigned to spread it. (Loose arsenic powder accidentally got into the men's food.)

In 1937 the *Kenny*—a modernized twin-screw, 80-foot version of the *Ramos*—was launched. It was designed by Bill Wunderlich, head of the Marine Growth Control Section of the New Orleans District Corps of Engineers. The *Kenny's* conveyor belt carried the hyacinths through a pair of rollers set to crush them under 40,000 pounds pressure, then spewed them off to the side. Some of the mangled plants thereupon blossomed out into 2 or 3 new stalks where previously there had been but one. The *Kenny* did, however, chew the dense mats into bits and leave the waters open temporarily to shipping.

The *Kenny* was retired in 1951 after Wunderlich assembled a contraption that resembles a seagoing lawn mower. Its rotating saw blades, attached to a prow of a boat, cut a 40-foot swath through a mat, chewing it into small bits and leaving a clear channel.

Even more significant for the future than this effective aquatic lawn mower is the development of a solution known as 2,4-D. It not only kills the plant but sinks the mat so that it no longer obstructs navigation. This spray may well mark the turning point in the war against the hyacinth. It is now being used by everyone engaged in the battle, and a new but more costly herbicide known as 2,4,5-T is also showing promise. The Corps of Engineers backs up its flotilla of five mowing machines with five spray boats and, occasionally, a spray-equipped helicopter.

While the corps wrestles with the problem of keeping the waterways open to shipping, other agencies—Federal, State, and local—are faced with a subtler phase of the hyacinth's destructive nature.

When water hyacinths blanket a body of water, they deprive all its aquatic vegetation

of sunlight and this, in turn, stops the vegetation's photosynthetic activity. While engaged in photosynthesis—the process by which plants use sunlight to convert nonliving chemicals into living edible tissue—all plants “breathe.” They extract carbon dioxide from the air or water and give off the oxygen on which all animate aquatic life depends.

IN THE HYACINTH'S DEATH GRIP

The hyacinth mat suffocates all aquatic vegetation it sweeps over. When the vegetation dies, it no longer discharges oxygen into the water and all the animate life in that water begins to suffocate in turn. The hyacinth itself speeds up the suffocation process by literally pumping oxygen out of the water. Its leaves, which can reach 50 inches, are covered with about 75,000 pores, or stomata, per square inch. These pores work like bellows, from sunup to sundown, sucking in water, extracting the carbon dioxide for the hyacinth's own use and discharging the oxygen into the air. These constantly pumping, microscopic bellows can lower the water line of a pond an inch a day.

The end effect of a mat's occupancy of a body of water is to destroy the plant food on which the wild ducks and geese that winter in the South rely, and to lower the oxygen content of the water to a point where no fish, mollusks, turtles or any other form of animate life can survive. In Louisiana, the water hyacinth causes an annual depletion in the State's wildlife crop estimated at more than \$15,000,000, jeopardizing the livelihood or recreation of 150,000 wild-fowl hunters, 20,000 trappers, 150,000 sport fishermen; 7,500 commercial fishermen, and 225,000 cane-pole fishermen. (To the cane-pole fishermen sitting on the levee, fish rather than bread is usually the staff of life.)

HARSH CRITICISM OF GADGETS

The hyacinth's depredations on fish and wild fowl have brought Federal and State conservation authorities into the battle. From their viewpoint, eradication of the weed is the only solution. They are, therefore, completely 2,4-D-minded and take a jaundiced view of the Corps of Engineers' mechanized gadgets, like the seagoing lawn mower. They point out that the machines don't kill all the hyacinths but only clear a path through them and leave behind many roots that may sprout again.

However, spraying 2,4-D on hyacinths—whether by boat, plane, marsh buggy or helicopter—costs money, and conservationist agencies are very seldom overburdened with funds. Legislative bodies seem to be particularly reluctant to hand over large sums of money to finance a war between grown men and a flower, even though the ploy is one of the world's costliest ornaments.

Consider the problem of the Federal Fish and Wildlife Service. It is charged with the task of providing food and winter nesting grounds for the millions of wild ducks and geese that migrate south each winter. In Louisiana alone, its Sabine, Delta, and Lacassine Wildlife Refuges total more than a quarter of a million hyacinth-harassed acres. Yet last year the service was able to spend only \$30,000 for plant control on all of its two-hundred-odd wildlife refuges throughout the country.

Louisiana's Legislature, while loudly bemoaning the hyacinth's cost to the State, gave its water-hyacinth-control program \$70,000 last year. Florida, suffering equally heavy losses, spent around \$140,000.

YEARS OF EXPENSIVE WARFARE

Financially speaking, the Corps of Engineers has fared best. No conservation agency, the corps' assignment is to keep navigable inland waterways open to shipping, and it has been spending around \$250,000 annually for many years to curb the

hyacinth. The cry of many 2,4-D enthusiasts in the various conservation agencies is, "Give us that much money for just 8 or 10 years, and we could lick the hyacinth menace."

There is, of course, another dimension to the picture. Johnny Lynch, a Federal biologist for the Mississippi wildfowl flyway, is a conservationist and a staunch 2,4-D man, but he's also a realist. He says, "When a tug and some barges get stalled in a mat, the Corps of Engineers can't wait. They've got to go out and chaw a hole through the mat; that's their operational assignment. Of course, it's too bad that someone hasn't got the wits to see that giving us the money to exterminate the plant would also reduce a huge operational expense that otherwise will go on forever."

Some people approach the hyacinth problem from an entirely different angle. M. T. H. Relf, in a letter to the editor of the New Orleans Times-Picayune, suggests, "The water hyacinth could make our State one of the richest in the Union. We should import a few water buffalo from the Far East, turn them loose to feed on it and let them breed, and sooner or later we would have plenty of meat for our own tables and for the market, and the finest meat one ever tasted."

Cattle do eat water hyacinths—doggedly, persistently, and wholly unaware of the fact that their beautiful green leaves are 95 percent water and totally lacking in nutritive values. Some of the animals meet the fate described to me by a Cajun farmer, "My old cow she stand out there an' eat those hyacinths 365 days and drop dead the next. She starve herself eating."

The water buffalo may not be the answer.

Other people have tried to adapt the hyacinth to commercial uses. Bill Wunderlich delivered 4 tons of the plants to 2 men who wanted to see if it could be made into wallboard. He says, tongue in cheek, "They ground it up, pressed it, and out came a mighty handsome shiny board. I thought they had something. But a couple of months later they told me they'd given up the idea. We'd had a spell of wet weather and the damned wallboard had sprouted on them."

So far the best answer to the hyacinth appears to be this: 2,4-D—and money. But the prediction made by Pete Dutton, the jovial giant in charge of the Louisiana Conservation Department's control program, may still come to pass. "I followed the ancient and honored profession of teaching the youth of America before I became a hyacinth fighter a few years back," Pete says. "The way things are going, I wouldn't be surprised if my present profession became an ancient and honored one in a few centuries—if the hyacinth doesn't take over first."

EIGHTY-THIRD CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION—FINAL REPORT

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. JAVITS] is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, the occasion for this special order is to report to the people of my district. My remarks will be hereafter submitted.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JAVITS. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. I am very glad that the gentleman is making this report. I know that his constituents will be very happy about it.

Mr. JAVITS. I thank the gentleman very much.

POSTPONEMENT OF SPECIAL ORDER

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the special order I have for today be vacated and that I may address the House tomorrow for 10 minutes after the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered.

The SPEAKER. Without objection it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

FAMILY-SIZE FARM SHOULD BE ENCOURAGED

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, in an address to the House June 23, proposing a limitation on benefits under farm price-support programs which would hold them to an amount of production for each farmer sufficient to provide a good family income but no more, I outlined the history of the development of family-type agriculture in the United States as contrasted with big land ownership in Europe and other foreign lands. On yesterday, August 2, I made some further comments on this subject. The remarks may be found at page 13175 of yesterday's proceedings.

I mentioned the unrest in nations around the world where the people do not have ownership, favorable tenure, or security on the land.

I reviewed the evidence that the rise of large commercial farming in this

country means a deterioration in community life, in religious and social life, and a decline in business activity.

The evidence is unmistakable that with the trend toward large, commercial farms with few owners and many laborers, business in rural communities declines, small business opportunities disappear, and the whole economy suffers.

Today I want to go into some of the statistical evidences that this undesirable trend toward big farms is occurring at a very rapid rate, and offer a House resolution directing the Secretaries of Agriculture and Interior to prepare studies, to be filed next January, which would assist us in dealing with the problem.

BIG FARMS GAIN 125 PERCENT IN 20 YEARS

The agricultural census for 1950 shows that land in farms of 1,000 acres or more has jumped from 220 million acres in 1920 to 494 million acres in 1950. This is a gain of 125 percent in total acreage in the largest size of farms under census classification.

The 1920 census showed that we had 995 million acres of land in farms and that those of 1,000 acres and up contained 23.1 percent of this total. Thirty years later, the 1950 census reveals 1,160 million acres in farms and 42.6 percent of this larger total in farms of 1,000 acres and up.

Under unanimous consent I include in the RECORD at this point a table showing land in farms by size of farm, taken from the 1950 Census of Agriculture. It traces total farm acreage, by size of farms, since 1920:

TABLE I.—Land in farms by size of farm

Size of farm	1950	1940	1930	1920
10 acres and under.....	2,429,505	2,667,754	1,808,370	1,600,287
10 to 49 acres.....	39,335,719	47,498,761	54,040,975	55,132,942
50 to 99 acres.....	75,627,697	93,316,691	98,684,750	105,630,795
100 to 259 acres.....	255,330,469	281,797,154	290,498,257	307,243,855
260 to 499 acres.....	166,583,952	159,568,522	156,521,810	164,244,399
500 to 999 acres.....	125,981,122	111,934,589	108,924,022	100,975,916
1,000 and more ¹	494,500,556	364,068,903	276,212,832	220,653,519
Percent.....	(42.6)	(34.3)	(28.0)	(23.1)
United States total ²	1,159,789,020	1,060,852,374	986,771,016	955,883,715

¹ Acres per farm: 3,273 in 1920; 4,074 in 1950.

² Land in farms: 1900 there was 838 million acres; in 1910 there was 878 million acres.

Next, I offer a table showing the number of farms in the Nation from 1920 forward by size of farms. This table reveals a decline in number of farmers, a steady gain in the average size of farms, and a steady gain in the number of farms of 500 acres and up.

The biggest percentage gain is in number of farms of 1,000 acres and more. They have risen from 67,405 in 1920 to nearly twice that number in 1950—a total of 121,362 was reported in the 1950 agricultural census.

This increase in number of big farms only partially explains the great increase in total acreage in this largest class. Farms of 1,000 acres and more have not only increased in number, the census shows that there are more acres per unit. They averaged 3,273 acres per unit in 1920. They averaged 4,074 acres in the 1950 enumeration.

Under unanimous consent, I include a table on number of farms by size to appear in the RECORD at this point:

TABLE II.—Number of farms by size

	1950	1940	1930	1920
Under 10 acres.....	484,914	506,402	358,504	288,772
10 to 49 acres.....	1,477,850	1,780,260	2,000,065	2,011,495
50 to 99 acres.....	1,047,801	1,291,048	1,374,965	1,474,745
100 to 259 acres.....	1,589,887	1,786,077	1,863,520	1,979,430
260 to 499 acres.....	478,084	458,787	451,338	475,677
500 to 999 acres.....	182,264	163,694	159,696	149,819
1,000 acres and more.....	121,362	100,531	80,620	67,405
United States total.....	15,382,162	16,096,799	16,288,648	16,448,343
Average size of farm in United States.....	215.3	194.0	156.9	148.2

¹ Census attributes decline of 150,000 to 170,000 farms attributable to change in definitions which eliminated 247,038 "places" from the count, chiefly places over 3 acres with inconsequential agricultural production.

Mr. Speaker, I have separated out of the census tables figures on the growth of farms of 500 to 999 acres, and of 1,000 acres and more, since 1880, together with total acreage in such farms since 1900 when that figure was first obtained in connection with the enumeration.

This table again shows the steady growth of larger farms and under unanimous consent I place it in the RECORD:

TABLE III.—Growth of large-sized farms

	500 to 999 acres	Total acres (in millions)	1 000 acres or more	Total acres (in millions)
1880.....	75,972	-----	28,578	-----
1890.....	84,395	-----	31,546	-----
1900.....	102,526	67.8	47,169	197.8
1910.....	125,295	83.7	50,135	167.1
1920.....	149,819	101.0	67,405	220.6
1930.....	159,696	108.9	80,620	276.2
1940.....	163,694	111.9	100,531	364.1
1950.....	182,264	125.9	121,362	494.5

The significance of all these figures is, of course, difficult to interpret fully in relation to our farm program problems without a picture of what the farms of 1,000 acres and more produce.

A statistical picture of them is available in the census.

As I have indicated, there are now 121,063 farms of 1,000 acres and more. Numerically they amount to 2.3 percent of the national total of 5,379,250 farms.

As I have indicated, this 2.3 percent of all farms includes 42.6 percent of all farm land, including 15.7 percent of the cropland harvested in 1949, 18.5 percent of all cropland, 63.6 percent of pasture land and 33.8 percent of irrigated lands in the Nation. This last figure may be of interest to those who are dealing with the efforts to set aside the 160-acre limit on benefits from Federal irrigation projects.

The farms of 1,000 acres and more, totalling 2.3 percent of all farms, marketed 14.6 percent of all products sold by farmers. This was divided into 15.7 percent of all field crops and 13.6 of all livestock.

In the field crop classification, it is interesting that the farms of 1,000 acres up marketed 26.4 percent of vegetables, 14.8 percent of fruits and nuts, 25.2 percent of cattle and calves; that they threshed 29.7 percent of all the wheat, and harvested 13.9 percent of all cotton. The large farms did not go in heavily for dairying—3.5 percent of all dairy products sold—or poultry—1.9 percent—or for corn, tobacco, and peanuts.

The very large production by these large farms of two of our crops with most troublesome surpluses—wheat and cotton—is worth noting in respect to the effect a family farm limitation might have. Nearly 30 percent of all wheat harvested in 1949 came from these giant farms and nearly 14 percent of cotton. If support was denied these farms for production above a reasonable level, it might very well speed a shift out of these commodities which are in surplus and have a beneficial effect on our production balance.

Under unanimous consent, I place in the RECORD at this point a table taken from the Agricultural Census of 1950 on characteristics of farms of 1,000 acres and more:

TABLE IV.—Characteristics of farms of 1,000 acres and more

	All farms	1,000 acres and more	Percent of total
Number.....	5,379,250	121,063	2.3
Land in farms.....	1,159,789,020	494,500,556	42.6
Cropland harvested.....	345,528,410	54,215,780	15.7
All cropland.....	479,371,116	88,450,088	18.5
Land pastured.....	619,691,813	394,236,380	63.6
Irrigated land.....	25,832,480	8,727,944	33.8
All products sold.....	22,279,562,599	3,262,027,555	14.6
All crops.....	9,819,185,008	1,561,412,456	15.9
Field, other than vegetable ¹	8,032,079,094	1,259,319,313	15.7
Vegetables.....	620,397,332	164,047,128	26.4
Fruits and nuts.....	292,814,981	117,654,938	14.8
All livestock and products.....	12,325,622,579	1,675,350,648	13.6
Dairy products.....	3,139,529,000	110,774,358	3.5
Poultry and poultry products.....	1,888,201,872	36,685,229	1.9
Other livestock and products.....	7,297,891,707	1,527,891,061	20.9
Cattle and calves (sold alive).....	-----	-----	25.2
Hogs and pigs (sold alive).....	-----	-----	3.5

¹ See the following:

	All farms	1,000 acres and more	Percent of total
Corn harvested.....	2,783,502,060	70,148,143	2.5
Wheat threshed.....	1,008,544,957	299,683,530	29.7
Cotton harvested.....	15,422,092	2,144,584	13.9
Tobacco harvested.....	1,765,743,148	18,730,872	1.1
Peanuts harvested.....	1,720,699,037	87,390,658	5.1

Those who directed the agricultural census of 1950 have done a great service to research in the field of large farms

by making a special separation of what are designated as "Large farms." The Census Bureau uses several criteria to determine if a farm should be classed as large.

I have just been discussing farms of 1,000 acres and more. The only criteria in selecting that group was acreage.

As we all know, 1,000 acres of arid land in the West is frequently of less value than 160 acres around Texarkana, or out in Iowa, in terms of productive capacity. Acreage alone is not always a good criteria. The Census consequently used a number of criteria to establish a class of what it designated as "Large farms." In its classification the Census includes:

First. Farms of 5,000 acres or more in the Western States, which are roughly the Dakotas, Nebraska, Kansas, Oklahoma, Texas, and others to the west, and farms of 1,000 acres or more in any other State.

Second. Farms with more than 999 acres of cropland in the West or more than 749 acres of cropland in the other States.

Third. Farms with 500 or more head of cattle in the West and 200 or more elsewhere.

Fourth. Farmers with 4,000 or more sheep in the West and 5,000 or more elsewhere.

Fifth. Farms which sold more than \$70,000 worth of products in the year.

The definitions are given at page xxxii in the introduction to the 1950 Census of Agriculture.

The census enumerators found that there were 71,328 farms which met their criteria for large farms—only 1.3 percent of all the farms in the United States.

In a table at page xxi in the introduction to the 1950 Census of Agriculture it is shown that this 1.3 percent of farmers have 383 million acres of land, or 33.1 percent of all farmland in the United States. They market 17.3 percent of all farm commodities, including 42.6 percent of all vegetables, 15.7 percent of other field crops, 27.9 percent of fruits and vegetables, 20.8 percent of livestock other than poultry and dairy products, 30.3 percent of cattle, excluding calves, measured in dollar value, and 42 percent of sheep, measured in dollar value.

Under permission to extend my remarks, I insert in the RECORD at this point a portion of this census table showing the characteristics of these farms in the census classification of "Large farms":

TABLE V.—Farms, farm characteristics and value of products sold, for specified large farms, by regions

Item	The United States		The North		The South		The West	
	Total	Percent of total for all farms	Total	Percent of total for all farms	Total	Percent of total for all farms	Total	Percent of total for all farms
Farms, acreage, and value:								
Farms.....number.....	71,328	1.3	19,218	0.8	28,021	1.1	24,089	5.2
Land in farms.....acres.....	382,902,594	33.1	50,056,337	11.4	118,830,537	30.2	214,105,720	66.0
Value of land and buildings:								
Average per farm.....dollars.....	142,383	-----	106,079	-----	146,014	-----	168,789	-----
Average per acre.....do.....	26.28	-----	33.64	-----	30.40	-----	21.29	-----
Land in farms according to use, 1949:								
Cropland harvested:								
Farms reporting.....	61,696	1.3	18,576	.9	22,631	1.0	20,489	5.4
Acres.....	39,427,906	11.4	13,972,397	6.7	10,861,489	11.2	14,594,020	36.6

TABLE V.—Farms, farm characteristics and value of products sold, for specified large farms, by regions—Continued

Item	The United States		The North		The South		The West	
	Total	Percent of total for all farms	Total	Percent of total for all farms	Total	Percent of total for all farms	Total	Percent of total for all farms
Farms, acreage, and value—Continued								
Land in farms according to use, 1949—Continued								
Cropland used only for pasture:								
Farms reporting.....	27,110	1.3	7,483	.7	13,192	1.4	6,435	4.4
Acres.....	11,470,161	16.5	1,876,932	6.5	5,056,908	16.4	4,536,321	48.1
Woodland pastured:								
Farms reporting.....	23,165	1.4	3,664	.5	16,507	1.8	2,994	4.1
Acres.....	47,210,883	35.0	1,256,013	4.3	22,629,458	32.6	23,325,412	64.8
Other pastures (not cropland and not woodland):								
Farms reporting.....	39,792	1.9	11,702	1.1	12,700	1.5	15,391	9.5
Acres.....	247,031,425	59.4	25,779,303	25.6	63,224,990	59.5	158,027,132	75.7
Irrigated land in farms:								
Farms reporting.....	13,788	4.5	1,000	5.5	2,572	6.6	10,216	4.1
Acres.....	7,956,707	30.9	176,261	14.0	1,340,758	29.5	39,688	32.2
Farms by size:								
Under 30 acres..... number.....	1,256	.1	483	.1	217	(1)	556	.3
30 to 259 acres..... do.....	2,579	.1	992	.1	735	(1)	1,102	.6
260 to 499 acres..... do.....	2,892	.6	1,037	.4	941	.6	914	2.5
500 to 999 acres..... do.....	7,508	4.1	1,869	2.1	4,435	7.3	1,204	3.9
1,000 acres and over..... do.....	56,793	46.8	14,837	40.6	21,643	59.6	20,313	41.9
Farms by economic class:								
Commercial farms..... number.....	68,399	1.8	18,808	1.1	25,812	1.6	23,779	7.4
Class I (value of products sold, \$25,000 or more)..... do.....	34,129	33.1	9,425	21.5	10,989	39.0	13,715	43.9
Class II (value of products sold, \$10,000 to \$24,999)..... do.....	19,095	5.0	6,334	2.6	6,256	8.0	6,505	11.1
Class III-VI (value of products sold, \$250 to \$9,999)..... do.....	15,175	.5	3,049	.2	8,567	.6	3,559	1.5
Other farms..... do.....	2,929	.2	410	.1	2,209	.2	310	.2
Value of farm products sold, by source:								
All farm products sold..... dollars.....	3,805,146,050	17.3	1,020,652,165	8.8	1,094,815,687	17.2	1,689,678,198	41.9
Field crops, other than vegetables, fruits and nuts sold..... do.....	1,260,540,331	15.7	259,187,142	8.4	414,157,039	11.6	587,196,150	42.9
Vegetables sold..... do.....	258,870,827	42.6	30,696,718	16.9	58,745,240	36.6	169,428,869	63.8
Fruits and nuts sold..... do.....	221,205,713	27.9	17,334,656	13.1	91,467,722	44.0	112,403,335	24.9
Horticultural specialties sold..... do.....	178,062,748	45.4	105,495,667	44.1	36,437,968	47.9	36,129,113	47.1
Dairy products sold..... do.....	206,731,354	6.7	44,670,060	2.1	62,443,656	12.5	99,617,638	24.3
Poultry and poultry products sold..... do.....	156,376,942	8.6	61,128,769	5.5	47,909,743	11.2	47,338,430	16.7
Livestock and livestock products, other than poultry and dairy, sold..... do.....	1,499,080,452	20.8	500,594,215	10.6	363,080,340	27.1	635,405,897	54.4
Forest products sold..... do.....	24,277,683	18.0	1,544,938	4.3	20,573,979	24.5	2,158,766	14.8
Cattle and dairy products:								
Cattle and calves:								
Farms reporting.....	57,305	1.4	15,622	.8	23,415	1.2	18,268	6.1
Number.....	13,985,767	18.2	2,801,404	7.1	5,586,341	22.9	5,598,022	43.0
Cows, including heifers that have calved:								
Farms reporting.....	55,411	1.4	14,940	.8	22,833	1.2	17,638	6.2
Number.....	6,283,798	16.9	976,577	5.3	2,758,422	21.7	2,548,799	41.2
Milk cows:								
Farms reporting.....	43,809	1.2	12,956	.8	16,756	1.0	14,097	5.5
Number.....	667,385	3.1	170,786	1.3	232,754	4.2	243,845	12.9
Whole milk sold:								
Farms reporting.....	6,849	.6	2,430	.3	2,704	1.1	1,715	1.9
Pounds.....	3,670,560,223	5.4	783,464,662	1.6	971,873,135	10.4	1,915,222,426	20.4
Dollars.....	201,359,160	7.4	41,681,077	2.2	61,178,553	13.3	98,499,630	25.4
Cream sold:								
Farms reporting.....	8,614	1.0	4,945	.8	881	.4	2,788	4.6
Pounds of butterfat.....	7,325,869	1.3	4,437,128	.9	1,420,908	2.3	1,467,883	4.0
Dollars.....	4,649,737	1.3	2,807,429	.9	863,580	2.6	978,728	4.4
Butter, buttermilk, skim milk, and cheese sold:								
Farms reporting.....	664	.6	96	.5	512	.5	56	3.2
Dollars.....	643,009	6.2	181,554	5.6	322,075	4.7	139,380	41.2
Hogs:								
Hogs and pigs:								
Farms reporting.....	30,942	1.0	9,777	.8	14,439	.9	6,726	5.6
Number.....	2,110,485	3.8	1,039,043	2.6	744,208	5.6	327,234	20.3
Sows and gilts for spring farrowing:								
Farms reporting.....	20,038	1.2	7,170	.7	9,474	1.4	3,394	6.3
Number.....	283,573	3.0	156,953	2.0	88,857	5.4	37,763	16.8
Sheep and wool:								
Sheep and lambs:								
Farms reporting.....	10,119	3.2	2,207	1.1	3,671	4.7	4,241	10.4
Number.....	13,530,050	43.1	752,998	9.2	4,749,950	45.3	8,027,102	62.9
Sheep and lambs born before Oct. 1, 1949:								
Farms reporting.....	9,924	3.2	2,150	1.1	3,640	4.9	4,134	11.1
Number.....	10,076,497	46.2	588,960	10.8	3,263,693	47.5	6,223,844	65.7
Ewes:								
Farms reporting.....	9,696	3.2	2,092	1.1	3,560	4.8	4,044	11.2
Number.....	9,280,515	46.8	465,817	9.6	2,831,181	47.8	5,983,517	66.3
Sheep and lambs shorn:								
Farms reporting.....	9,042	3.2	2,042	1.1	3,241	4.8	3,759	12.3
Number.....	10,548,483	47.0	660,041	11.6	3,298,649	48.0	6,589,793	66.7
Wool shorn..... pounds.....	87,396,859	48.9	4,987,284	11.2	24,345,196	49.5	58,064,379	68.3
Poultry and poultry products:								
Chickens, 4 months old and over, on hand:								
Farms reporting.....	42,828	1.0	11,895	.7	16,766	.8	14,173	4.8
Number.....	7,273,669	2.1	3,305,040	1.6	1,583,429	1.7	2,385,200	6.9
Chickens sold:								
Farms reporting.....	12,145	.7	5,568	.5	3,735	.6	2,845	3.2
Number.....	67,351,745	11.5	16,386,548	7.0	42,417,487	14.6	7,947,910	14.2
Dollars.....	64,325,470	11.3	20,066,508	7.5	36,279,950	15.0	7,779,012	13.8
Chicken eggs sold:								
Farms reporting.....	20,579	.9	8,080	.6	6,522	.7	5,974	4.4
Dozens.....	64,980,784	2.7	34,281,260	1.9	8,967,105	2.6	21,732,419	7.4
Dollars.....	32,005,970	3.2	17,175,270	2.4	4,284,871	3.0	11,145,829	7.9
Animals sold alive:								
Cattle, hogs, sheep, horses, or mules sold alive:								
Farms reporting.....	56,518	1.6	15,627	.9	23,000	1.5	17,891	7.2
Dollars.....	1,445,880,474	20.5	495,507,136	10.6	345,091,543	26.6	605,281,795	54.4
Cattle and/or calves sold alive, farms reporting.....	51,991	1.7	14,838	.9	20,848	1.8	16,305	7.5
Cattle sold alive, excluding calves:								
Farms reporting.....	44,981	2.4	13,635	1.2	16,424	3.0	14,922	8.9
Number.....	5,817,413	28.1	1,859,840	15.9	1,439,095	33.5	2,517,968	53.9
Dollars.....	1,021,645,361	30.3	375,865,437	18.2	208,204,455	36.8	437,575,469	58.6

1 0.05 percent or less.

TABLE V.—Farms, farm characteristics and value of products sold, for specified large farms, by regions—Continued

Item	The United States		The North		The South		The West	
	Total	Percent of total for all farms	Total	Percent of total for all farms	Total	Percent of total for all farms	Total	Percent of total for all farms
Animals sold alive—Continued								
Calves sold alive:								
Farms reporting.....	32,574	1.4	7,296	.6	15,543	1.6	9,735	6.9
Number.....	2,180,217	14.0	281,382	3.5	1,134,012	20.4	764,823	36.6
Dollars.....	163,960,236	17.8	22,596,254	5.4	83,613,898	23.1	57,750,084	41.3
Hogs and pigs sold alive:								
Farms reporting.....	25,672	1.2	9,458	.8	11,515	1.4	4,699	5.2
Number.....	2,742,136	4.2	1,606,291	3.1	708,907	6.3	426,938	19.5
Dollars.....	106,204,230	4.5	67,526,862	3.3	21,715,266	7.6	16,962,102	22.9
Sheep and lambs sold alive:								
Farms reporting.....	8,906	3.3	2,207	1.2	3,089	4.8	3,610	12.6
Number.....	8,749,298	43.7	1,451,981	21.5	1,958,363	41.8	5,338,954	62.3
Dollars.....	146,765,670	43.0	27,893,830	22.3	26,972,577	39.2	91,899,263	62.3
Horses and mules sold alive:								
Farms reporting.....	6,569	2.6	1,838	1.4	2,404	2.4	2,327	9.8
Number.....	56,468	9.1	14,028	4.2	15,685	8.0	26,755	30.1
Dollars.....	8,441,717	21.1	1,624,753	9.6	5,722,086	30.5	1,094,878	25.5
Specified crops harvested:								
Corn for all purposes:								
Farms reporting.....	24,729	.7	9,605	.6	13,231	.7	1,893	4.0
Acres.....	2,850,603	3.4	1,511,663	2.5	1,162,408	5.1	176,532	16.5
Harvested for grain:								
Farms reporting.....	20,660	.6	7,285	.5	12,570	.7	805	2.9
Acres.....	2,262,843	3.0	1,157,637	2.2	1,008,055	4.7	97,151	14.8
Bushels.....	79,974,244	2.9	48,082,479	2.1	29,619,350	6.0	2,272,415	13.7
Corn sold, bushels.....	22,500,770	2.6	16,557,197	2.1	4,693,132	7.0	1,250,441	15.5
Wheat threshed or combined: ²								
Farms reporting.....	25,186	2.2	11,156	1.4	4,223	1.7	9,807	8.1
Acres.....	15,181,200	21.3	5,610,020	13.0	2,654,658	19.2	6,916,522	48.7
Bushels harvested.....	217,725,367	21.6	68,309,874	11.7	38,169,100	20.6	111,246,393	46.7
Bushels sold.....	199,819,011	23.6	61,321,630	12.9	35,412,980	22.4	103,084,401	48.7
Oats threshed or combined: ²								
Farms reporting.....	17,203	1.2	8,810	.8	5,263	3.2	3,130	5.3
Acres.....	1,366,413	3.9	728,085	2.3	430,612	14.1	207,716	17.2
Bushels harvested.....	38,857,197	3.4	21,631,163	2.1	11,196,847	15.2	6,029,187	14.3
Bushels sold.....	12,489,043	5.2	6,262,166	3.2	3,623,724	16.1	2,603,153	14.7
Peanuts harvested for picking or threshing: ²								
Farms reporting.....	1,791	1.0	(³)	(³)	1,791	1.0	—	—
Acres grown alone.....	108,518	5.1	(³)	(³)	108,518	5.1	—	—
Acres grown with other crops.....	190	5.0	(³)	(³)	190	5.0	—	—
Pounds harvested.....	85,735,822	5.0	(³)	(³)	85,735,822	5.0	—	—
Land from which hay was cut:								
Farms reporting.....	36,951	1.4	13,506	.9	11,103	1.2	12,342	5.5
Acres.....	7,787,935	11.9	3,633,449	8.3	1,123,875	9.5	3,030,611	30.4
Irish potatoes harvested for home or for sale:								
Farms reporting.....	9,744	.6	3,644	.6	4,034	.4	2,066	3.8
Acres.....	240,318	15.9	108,736	12.7	35,542	13.0	98,040	24.3
Bushels harvested.....	76,156,852	20.8	30,971,121	14.9	5,775,978	16.2	39,409,753	32.2
Sold, dollars.....	88,362,644	24.9	32,152,320	16.9	9,010,058	26.6	47,200,266	36.2
Cotton harvested: ²								
Farms reporting.....	9,889	.9	110	.7	8,433	.8	1,346	10.0
Acres.....	2,930,546	11.0	36,611	6.2	2,105,951	8.6	787,984	51.8
Bales harvested.....	2,581,360	16.7	29,629	6.2	1,361,795	10.5	1,189,936	58.8
Lint cotton and cottonseed sold, dollars.....	372,433,387	17.0	3,986,164	6.0	198,648,365	10.8	109,798,858	58.4
Tobacco harvested:								
Farms reporting.....	1,507	.3	123	.4	1,384	.3	—	—
Acres.....	27,862	1.8	11,605	10.1	16,257	1.1	—	—
Pounds harvested.....	33,615,448	1.9	14,049,634	8.7	19,565,814	1.2	—	—
Sold, dollars.....	42,614,916	5.2	28,488,033	36.0	14,126,883	1.9	—	—
Sugarcane harvested for sugar or sale to mills:								
Farms reporting.....	241	4.8	—	—	241	4.8	—	—
Acres.....	173,375	54.3	—	—	173,375	54.3	—	—
Pounds harvested.....	3,618,227	57.4	—	—	3,618,227	57.4	—	—
Sold, dollars.....	23,214,743	58.2	—	—	23,214,743	58.2	—	—
Sugar beets harvested for sugar: ²								
Farms reporting.....	909	3.3	9.5	.9	—	—	814	4.9
Acres.....	104,028	15.7	11,003	5.1	—	—	93,025	21.0
Tons harvested.....	1,886,989	19.0	122,112	5.1	—	—	1,764,877	23.4
Sold, dollars.....	22,592,899	20.3	1,373,989	5.2	—	—	21,218,910	25.0
Land in bearing and nonbearing orchards, groves, vineyards, and planted nut trees:								
Farms reporting.....	19,241	.9	3,862	.4	10,509	1.0	4,870	2.2
Acres.....	880,939	18.7	53,788	5.1	523,482	28.5	303,669	16.6

² Totals for States for which data were tabulated for large farms. The totals for States for which data were not tabulated for large farms represented the following proportions of the totals for all farms for the United States:

	Percent		Percent
Wheat:		Oats:	
Acres.....	0.4	Acres.....	0.1
Bushels harvested.....	.3	Bushels harvested.....	.1
Bushels sold.....	.2	Bushels sold.....	.1
Peanuts:		Cotton:	
Acres, less than.....	.05	Acres, less than.....	.05
Pounds harvested, less than.....	.05	Bales harvested, less than.....	.05
Tobacco:		Sugar beets for sugar:	
Acres.....	.4	Acres.....	14.4
Pounds harvested.....	.4	Tons harvested.....	11.9

³ Not available.

Next, I want to take up another classification of farms which also gives us some indication of the possible effect of a limitation of benefits of farm price-support programs to a good family income and no more.

The Agricultural Census has divided farms into six economic groups.

Class I in this analysis includes farms with gross income of \$25,000 and more.

Class II includes farms of \$10,000 to \$24,999.

Class III includes farms of \$5,000 to \$9,999 gross income.

Class IV includes farms of \$2,500 to \$4,999 gross income.

Class V includes farms of \$1,200 to \$2,499 gross income.

Class VI includes farms with gross income of \$250 to \$1,199.

There is also a final classification "Other farms" which includes 1,672,000 subsistence and other noncommercial types.

A total of \$22.3 billion gross farm sales were reported to the Census enumerators. Twenty-six percent of this total went to just 103,231 farms in class I—only 1.9 percent of all farms—which sold \$25,000 and more of products. They sold

a total of \$5.786 billion of products out of the national total of \$22.3 billion. This amounts to approximately \$56,000 per farm.

In class II, farms with gross income of \$10,000 to \$24,999, there were 381,151

farms—7.1 percent of all farms. These farms sold 24.8 percent of all marketed farm products, or about \$14,500 each.

Under unanimous consent I insert in the RECORD at this point a table based on the census data showing the number of

farms by economic classes, value of products sold, and the value of products sold by the various classes expressed in percentage of national totals.

TABLE VI.—Value of products of farms by economic classes

	Number of farms	Percent of all farms	Products sold	Percent of United States total	Farm products sold per farm	Value of products sold, percent of total of all farms					
						Field crop	Vegetable	Dairy	Poultry eggs	Cattle calves	Hogs and pigs
Class I—\$25,000 and more.....	103,231	1.9	\$5,786,964,265	26.0	\$56,058	22.5	55.1	13.7	22.9	37.2	11.4
Class II—\$10,000 to \$24,999.....	381,151	7.1	5,517,034,144	24.8	14,479	24.5	15.7	25.4	24.8	24.8	31.2
Class III—\$5,000 to \$9,999.....	721,211	13.4	5,060,528,547	22.7	7,017	21.9	11.5	31.5	23.2	18.3	31.8
Class IV—\$2,500 to \$4,999.....	882,302	16.4	3,198,160,839	14.4	3,625	15.9	8.1	18.9	14.9	10.6	15.2
Class V—\$1,200 to \$2,499.....	901,316	16.8	1,634,395,317	7.3	1,813	9.7	4.8	7.0	7.6	5.1	6.0
Class VI—\$250 to \$1,199.....	717,201	13.3	516,135,480	2.3	720						
Other.....	1,672,538		566,345,997	2.5	612						
Total.....	5,370,250	92.2	22,279,562,599	100.0							

This table is particularly interesting since it gives us some clue to what a family farm limitation on benefits from price supports would do in terms of withdrawing support from excess production.

I have not determined in my own mind where such a limitation should be set, in dollars.

But let us assume that we set it at \$10,000 gross income.

This table indicates that products worth \$11,304,000,000—more than 50 percent of all farm products marketed—comes off 484,000 farms in classes I and II where 1950 incomes exceeded \$10,000. This is less than 10 percent of all farms. If these farmers received support only on their first \$10,000 of production the supported production would aggregate \$4,840,000,000. That would leave \$6,464,000,000 of their production beyond the support bracket to be sold in the market place without Government aids. The total unaided—over and above price-supported quantities—would be 29 percent of the national total of all farm products marketed.

If the support level were reduced to \$7,000—a figure which Mr. E. G. Shinner, of the Shinner Foundation, once used in a discussion of this subject, another 5 to 7 percent of farm production would go into the unsupported class.

Regardless of where we may ultimately set a limitation on the benefit from supports, I believe that a great majority of the Members of the Congress will agree that at some point the United States Government should cease to underwrite the profitability of great industrialized farm operations which are displacing family farmers and thereby bringing on a deterioration in our American way of life and in our economic strength.

The argument in favor of large farms is greater efficiency—an argument that does not stand up under examination—particularly if social, human, and political values are given any weight whatever.

It is not real efficiency to reduce the cost of producing commodities by eliminating family farmers and replacing with low-paid migrants who become a community problem, a drain on tax-supported relief agencies, a source of

juvenile delinquency, of unhappiness and human misery.

It is not efficiency to destroy the foundation of hundreds of thousands of small-town business establishments, and the ultimate foundations of great industries and of our whole national economy.

Our ability to produce is currently outrunning our ability to consume. Increased efficiency is displacing more than a million industrial workers every year, and we are not currently providing new jobs for them. Rising unemployment, growing poverty, and suffering are the result.

Mechanization and increased efficiency in production, even on family farms, has already displaced millions in agriculture.

Under unanimous consent, I place in the RECORD table No. VII which shows from census data how our population has grown since 1900, while farm population has declined. People on farms made up 29.9 percent of our total population in 1920 but only 15.5 percent in 1950. The actual number of people on farms declined from 31.6 million in 1920 to 23.3 million in 1950, according to the census data.

TABLE VIII.—Total, rural and farm population (census data)

Year	Total	Farm	Percent of total
1900.....	75,994,575		
1910.....	91,972,266		
1920.....	105,710,620	31,614,269	29.9
1930.....	122,775,046	30,445,350	24.8
1940.....	131,669,275	30,546,911	23.2
1950.....	150,697,361	23,331,738	15.5

The Bureau of Agricultural Economics and the Census Bureau have published adjusted data on farm population, allowing for census changes in definition of farms and some other factors, which indicates a slightly higher total on farms today—24.8 million instead of the 23.3 million shown in the raw census data.

These adjusted figures show a downward trend in farm population between 1916 and 1952 of three-fourths of 1 percent per year. But that downward trend has been much greater since 1932—at a rate of about 1½ percent loss each year.

If the accelerated trend continues, farm population will drop under 20 million in about 1967. During a half century of national growth, we will have actually eliminated the places of more than 11 million citizens on the farms of the Nation.

There are those, with an eye on book-keeping only, who think that we have an excess of farmers yet today; that the solution to the farm problem is to consolidate farms and drive more people from the land.

They attribute no value to farming as a way of life. They allow nothing for the great social worth of the rural home. They disregard the consequences which will appear in the rural communities—less business activity, displaced professional and skilled workers.

They have apparently forgotten that the objective of our society is not just the creation of gadgets but is the creation of political and economic freedom and security for the people of our Nation; and that increased efficiency is of negative worth when it is achieved at the expense of human well-being.

With millions again unemployed in this Nation, it is time that we looked at the forces which are adding displaced farm people to the rolls of those without means of earning a living. It is time that we looked to see the extent to which unlimited price supports are responsible for the accelerated decline in farm population; and how such programs can be limited to underwrite a good family income only.

Mr. Speaker, I am inserting a proposed House resolution.

It does not attempt to impose a limitation on benefits from the farm price support programs. It simply directs the Secretary of Agriculture to make a study and report back to us next January on methods by which such a limitation might be imposed. It does affirm that it is the basic policy of this House of Representatives to preserve, improve, and foster family-type agriculture.

I feel sure that this resolution will be welcomed by the Department of Agriculture. The National Agricultural Advisory Committee is studying family farm problems this year. The Secretary of Agriculture has recently given a great

deal of publicity to big price support loans on cotton, wheat, and corn, himself criticizing our farm price supports because of the disproportionately large benefits of the few. I am sure that if he does not already have a staff working on a limitation that will correct the situation about which he has himself been very critical that he will be happy to institute such a study and share it with us.

The resolution additionally asks the Secretary of Interior to report to us on the workings of the 160-acre limitation in our land and reclamation laws so we may review them if need be.

These studies should not entail additional expense to the departments. Both have research staffs. Both will benefit, in administrative actions, from the availability of the material which is requested.

I am inviting the attention of both the Committee on Agriculture and the Committee on Interior to this proposed resolution in the hope that it will be given consideration. In view of the lateness in the session of the Congress, let me say to the chairmen of those committees that I would be most happy if arrangements can be made with the Departments for the studies without the necessity of formal action by the House.

I might myself have taken up the studies with the appropriate officials but I felt it would be better in line with proper procedures if handled by the appropriate committees.

The resolution follows:

RESOLUTION

Family farms, which pressed America's frontiers from the Atlantic to the Pacific, today remain essential to a good American economy and society.

Displacement of family farms by large commercial farms employing low-pay and migrant workers results in the decline and failure of businesses in rural communities, a decline in religious, social, and political participation of citizens—a deterioration from the American standard of many economically independent citizens to a pattern of a few rich and many very poor.

Continued widespread disappearance of the family farm will seriously affect major businesses, industry, and employment as well as those enterprises which deal directly with farmers.

Because of this importance of family farming to our economy and way of life, it is hereby declared the policy of the House of Representatives to preserve, improve, and foster family-type agriculture.

As a step toward congressional implementation of such policy, the Secretary of Agriculture is directed to have made a study of means by which the benefits of farm price support programs may be limited to an amount of farm production as will provide a good family income and no more, reviewing past limitations of a similar nature or proposals of such limitations in connection with farm programs and reporting on other suggestions or plans. Such study shall be professional in nature, indicating advantages or disadvantages of various means of applying such a limitation, and the report shall not be deemed to represent a recommendation or proposal of the authors. A report shall be filed with the House of Representatives or the Departments during January 1955.

As a further step toward implementation of such policy, the Secretary of the Interior is directed to make a report to the House of Representatives during January 1954, on

compliance with the 160-acre limitation in homestead and reclamation matters, any regulations which permit families to exceed the 160-acre limitation and extent of such excess holding, Federal contracts or arrangements with local water districts which bypass the limitation provisions of the Federal law, statutory exemptions from the limitation enacted or proposed since enactment of the reclamation law, applicability of the limitation to land or water programs of other departments of Government, or any other circumstances whereby the Federal family-farm policy implicit in the 160-acre limitation of the reclamation law is modified, avoided, or made inapplicable.

DIRECT LOANS TO VETERANS

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Massachusetts [Mrs. ROGERS] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, the hour is late, and I shall take only a minute or two. I should like to remind the House that the Senate passed H. R. 8152, the bill which provides for direct loans for homes and farmhouses to veterans under the GI bill of rights. The House passed a bill providing for an appropriation of \$100 million. The Senate increased it to \$200 million, just as it did a similar bill last year. We appreciate the fact that the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN] and others in the other body have been very helpful. It is already on the Speaker's table.

I hope tomorrow that the bill will be taken up if it comes over from the Senate. I shall move, if the author, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. AYRES], does not, to take up the bill and concur in the Senate amendment raising the amount to \$200 million. If that does not happen, I shall take the bill up and send it to conference. It was unanimously voted out of our committee to accept the Senate figure of \$200 million. The House may be interested to know that the committee has been deluged with requests that it pass.

I should like to remind the House that there are a number of very fine bills at small cost before the Committee on Rules. I have almost forgotten how the Committee on Rules looks, it has been so difficult for our committee to get in there.

There is still time to pass those bills.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. VURSELL.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN.

Mr. SADLAK and to include an editorial.

Mr. RODINO.

Mr. REED of New York in three instances.

Mr. ALLEN of California and to include additional matter.

Mr. WAMPLER.

Mr. SHORT.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Mr. LECOMPTE, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled a bill of the House of the

following title, which was thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H. R. 2098. An act to provide for the compensation of certain persons whose lands have been flooded and damaged by reason of fluctuations in the water level of the Lake of the Woods.

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

S. 1244. An act relating to the renewal of star-route and screen vehicle service contracts;

S. 2027. An act authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to issue quitclaim deeds to the States for certain lands;

S. 2389. An act to amend the act of December 3, 1942;

S. 2408. An act to amend the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, to provide a national defense reserve of tankers and to promote the construction of new tankers, and for other purposes;

S. 2453. An act to amend the Communications Act of 1934, as amended, with respect to implementing the International Convention for the Safety of Life at Sea relating to radio equipment and radio operators on board ship;

S. 2864. An act to approve an amendatory repayment contract negotiated with the North Unit irrigation district, to authorize construction of Haystack Reservoir on the Deschutes Federal reclamation project, and for other purposes;

S. 3137. An act to amend the provisions of the act of August 28, 1937, relating to the conservation of water resources in the arid and semiarid areas of the United States, applicable to the entire United States, and to increase and revise the limitation on aid available under the provisions of the said act, and for other purposes;

S. 3464. An act to amend the Communications Act of 1934, in order to make certain provision for the carrying out of the Agreement for the Promotion of Safety on the Great Lakes by Means of Radio;

S. 3681. An act to authorize the Civil Service Commission to make available group life insurance for civilian officers and employees in the Federal service, and for other purposes;

S. 3697. An act to amend the act of April 6, 1937, as amended, to include cooperation with the Governments of Canada and Mexico or local Canadian or Mexican authorities for the control of incipient or emergency outbreaks of insect pests or plant diseases;

S. 3699. An act granting the consent of Congress to a compact entered into by the States of Louisiana and Texas and relating to the waters of the Sabine River;

S. J. Res. 67. Joint resolution to repeal certain World War II laws relating to return of fishing vessels, and for other purposes; and

S. J. Res. 149. Joint resolution designating the month of September 1955 as John Marshall Bicentennial Month, and creating a commission to supervise and direct the observance of such month.

ADJOURNMENT

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

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 12 minutes p. m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, August 5, 1954, 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:

1805. A letter from the Acting Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting the report on

cooperation of the United States with Mexico in the control and eradication of foot-and-mouth disease for the month of June 1954, pursuant to Public Law 8, 80th Congress; to the Committee on Agriculture.

1806. A letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting a report on records proposed for disposal and lists or schedules covering records proposed for disposal by certain Government agencies; to the Committee on House Administration.

1807. A letter from the Secretary of State, transmitting the second semiannual report of the Administrator of the Refugee Relief Act of 1953, pursuant to section 19 of Public Law 203, 83d Congress; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

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. SCHENCK: Committee on House Administration. House Resolution 695. Resolution authorizing the printing of additional copies of the report of the Committee on Public Works on the St. Lawrence Seaway; without amendment (Rept. No. 2613). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. SCHENCK: Committee on House Administration. House Concurrent Resolution 267. Concurrent resolution authorizing the printing of additional copies of the hearings held by the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy relative to the contribution of atomic energy to medicine; without amendment (Rept. No. 2614). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. SCHENCK: Committee on House Administration. Senate Concurrent Resolution 97. Concurrent resolution to print additional copies of part 6 of the hearings held before a subcommittee of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs relative to stockpile and accessibility of strategic and critical materials to the United States in time of war; without amendment (Rept. No. 2615). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. SCHENCK: Committee on House Administration. Senate Concurrent Resolution 98. Concurrent resolution to print additional copies of an interim report entitled "Activities of United States Citizens Employed by the United Nations"; without amendment (Rept. No. 2616). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. SCHENCK: Committee on House Administration. Senate Concurrent Resolution 99. Concurrent resolution to print additional copies of hearings entitled "Strategy and Tactics of World Communism"; without amendment (Rept. No. 2617). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan: Committee on Government Operations. Twenty-fourth re-

port pertaining to organization and administration of the military research and development programs (Rept. No. 2618). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. REES of Kansas: Committee on Post Office and Civil Service. Third intermediate report pertaining to a survey and study of post office operations (Rept. No. 2619). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H. R. 10074. A bill to authorize the replacement of certain Government-owned utility facilities at Glacier National Park, Mont., and Grand Canyon National Park, Ariz.; without amendment (Rept. 2620). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. S. 118. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain the Washita River Basin reclamation project, Oklahoma; with amendment (Rept. No. 2621). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. GRAHAM: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 2308. An act to authorize and direct the investigation by the Attorney General of certain offenses, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 2622). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BOYKIN:

H. R. 10170. A bill to provide for an ad valorem duty on the importation of shrimp; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GRANT:

H. R. 10171. A bill to provide for an ad valorem duty on the importation of shrimp; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HAGEN of California:

H. R. 10172. A bill to amend section 46 of the act of May 25, 1926, and thereby modify the excess land and repayment provisions of the Federal reclamation laws; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. HEBERT:

H. R. 10173. A bill to provide for an ad valorem duty on the importation of shrimp; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LONG:

H. R. 10174. A bill to provide for an ad valorem duty on the importation of shrimp; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LYLE:

H. R. 10175. A bill to provide for an ad valorem duty on the importation of shrimp; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MORRISON:

H. R. 10176. A bill to provide for an ad valorem duty on the importation of shrimp; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PASSMAN:

H. R. 10177. A bill to provide for an ad valorem duty on the importation of shrimp; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania:

H. R. 10178. 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; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. THOMPSON of Louisiana:

H. R. 10179. A bill to provide for an ad valorem duty on the importation of shrimp; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. THOMPSON of Texas:

H. R. 10180. A bill to provide for an ad valorem duty on the importation of shrimp; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. UTT:

H. R. 10181. A bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, as amended; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. CRUMPACKER:

H. J. Res. 581. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to the procedure for amending the Constitution; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. HUNTER:

H. R. 10182. A bill for the relief of Adalberto Jimenez-Solorio; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JAVITS:

H. R. 10183. A bill for the relief of Oswald E. Kohlruss, Antonie Kohlruss, and Evelyn Hedy Kohlruss; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. NORBLAD:

H. R. 10184. A bill for the relief of Tomas Gumtang Subia; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RAY:

H. R. 10185. A bill for the relief of Anthony J. Varca, Jr.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII.

1132. Mr. PHILBIN presented a petition of Paul Smith, of South Lancaster, Mass., and others in favor of legislation to prohibit alcoholic beverage advertising on the radio and television and in magazines and newspapers, which was referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Suggested Statement on Tax-Practice Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL A. REED

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 4, 1954

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced H. R. 9922 to clarify and extend the authority of the Treasury Department to regulate the practice of

lawyers, certified public accountants, and others who assist the public in the determination of Federal-tax liabilities, preparation of tax returns, and in the settlement of cases in dispute with the Internal Revenue Service. This bill has three purposes:

First, to clarify the responsibility and authority of the Treasury Department to protect the Government and the public from incompetent or unethical tax practitioners;

Second, to establish the fact that control of Federal tax practice must lie with

the Congress and the Federal Government;

Third, to guard against the danger that qualified professional assistance may not be available to all taxpayers at reasonable cost.

After extensive hearings, two subcommittees of the Ways and Means Committee have recently recommended that the Treasury Department should be authorized by the Congress to exercise stricter control over individuals who assist others in income tax matters for a fee. The present authority of the