Opposite this page was a drawing entitled "A Saracen University." The words below this drawing were:

There is no enrollment, and no diploma in these seats of learning, found in the mosque; the tuition is based on a voluntary agreement between teacher and student.

WILLIAM THE CONQUEROR

In the year 1066 A. D. William of Normandy defeated the Saxon King Harold at Senlac and became the conqueror of England. People accepted his kingship as coming from God. Secure in his seagirt island, he developed a tolerancy that enabled him to organize the ancient Anglo-Saxon heritage of the "moot"—that local liberty in which the community assembled to give its assent to their leaders' deliberations. In this manner free courts, speech, and the dignity of the individual were encouraged, so that soon the peasantry came to regard themselves as allies of the Crown. Thus we see the beginning of parliamentary institutions, with the conquest becoming the starting point of English freedom, and bringing into being a constitution upon which, 700 years later, we were to form our own great written document. In the conqueror's Domesday Booke we find the basic protection of life and property.

So rises another great pillar—a symbol of law and order, an impartial third party.

A very magnificent drawing opposite this page was entitled "William the Conqueror Being Lifted Up at Westminster" with the following notation:

On Christmas Day, 1066, William was lifted upon the shoulders of his knights so that all men could see, and therefore recognize their king.

JEFFERSON AND THE RIGHTS OF MAN

In 1776, Thomas Jefferson, in company with many American businessmen and farmers, drew up a document dealing with the rights of man, and thus created the cause of the American Revolution. In this new Republic no official would ever be permitted to think, decide, act, or judge as one man; a government was devised to divide these responsibilities of man into three parts: a Congress to think and decide; a President to act; and a Supreme Court to be referee. This Government was handed, by the people, a list of particulars which it must not do. This was the first document of its kind ever written. The Government was servant, and not master, and the Constitution is designed to make it stay that way.

Here, then, is that of which the sixth great pillar of civilization is made: "We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain inalienable rights, that among these are life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness."

An inspiring drawing of the Jefferson Memorial here in the Nation's Capitol appeared opposite this "pillar" stating, "Let everyone ascribe the faith and merit he chooses."

FREEDOM OF HUMAN ENERGY

"A wise and frugal government which shall restrain men from injuring one another, shall leave them free otherwise to regulate their own pursuits of industry and improvement, and shall not take from the mouth of labor the bread it has earned. This is the sum of good government." (Excerpt from writings of Thomas Jefferson.)

Down through the ages many human beings have starved. Many were intelligent people, and with fertile lands of great extent, and yet they were unable to get enough to eat. Modern nations have not been any exception for in Jefferson's day the French people were dying of hunger, and today, even in countries rich in ancient philosophies, famines kill millions. China and India are continually ravaged and in the 1930's thousands died of starvation in the richest farmlands of the Soviet Union.

How, then, are we to account for such abundance in America that the pangs of hunger are unknown; there has never been a famine recorded in this country.

Human beings still live in hovels with no windows, floors, chimneys. We, in America, take these features for granted, and regard electricity, and all its appliances and equipment as everyday necessities, easily available for our use. The forces of nature are harnessed for the use of humblest citizens; sanitation, hygiene, and other services are accepted without questioning, and are not even regarded as luxuries today.

These are facts. Why is it so? The answer is so clear that it will stand up under any scrutiny; simply put, it is this: Possession of freedom, which in turn produces freedom of possession. Without possession one cannot improve; if one cannot improve one has no incentive—no will, or purpose, to improve. Owning something is the first requisite for creating something. The impossibility of Edisons, Fords, and men like Dr. Bell cracking such technical problems of science and engineering, and converting them to human needs, in an authoritarian form of highly centralized government becomes evident when it is realized that the station of these men in such a government would deny them the greatest of all sources of invention and research, namely: incentive.

This booklet does not propose to show Americans as inheritors of a master race, and, as such, superior beings. We only have to remember that the direct ancestors of the people who brought this Government into being were Anglo-Saxons, and they starved alongside all the other nations. One thing they did have, however, was an instinctive sense of personal freedom. What this booklet has striven to show is the truth and the rightness of all the things that have contributed to our present form of civilization; that if we are to be a productive people we must have life, and if we are to have life we must be productive, and this life must be as free as the sun and the air that go to make up our world itself. Thus our seventh great pillar is dedicated to individual man; only he can create productivity, and only man can control the productivity he creates. To destroy this pillar, simply withhold from man the fruits of his own labor.

Following this, on the opposite page, was a magnificent drawing of a stained-glass window entitled "The Fruits of Freedom," which had been dedicated to science and invention.

Mr. Speaker, while the great and continuous patriotic services and contributions made by the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States of America to the Nation's security and happiness are almost universally known and recognized by the appreciative millions of Americans, the printing and distribution of this very appropriate booklet, which was graciously presented to each one of the guests in attendance at the banquet, was only one of the occasions, I am informed, when the booklet is distributed in large and small quantities to leading citizens and public officials throughout the Nation.

In this connection I highly recommend that every thinking patriotic citizen obtain a copy thereof at the earliest possible date.

SENATE

MONDAY, FEBRUARY 15, 1954

(Legislative day of Monday, February 8, 1954)

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

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

Our Father God: Conscious of the faults and failures which mar and stain the past, we are grateful that each new week brings us to the land of beginning again. May we receive new weeks and new days as Thy gifts, bringing new vigor, new hope, new opportunities to be strong and kind, patient and understanding, faithful and true. As we here seek a solution for the Nation's baffling problems may we not be found unwilling to pay the price of better things. Teach us the vanity and futility of a quest for salvation which leaves ourselves unchanged.

Direct our steps, guard us from error, deliver us from all evil. Help us to sit where others sit, seeing life's tangled skein through the eyes of those less fortunate than ourselves. So make us faithful ministers of this fear-haunted and stricken generation. We ask it in the dear Redeemer's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. KNOWLAND, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, February 11, 1954, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT—APPROVAL OF BILLS

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries, and he announced that on today, February 15, 1954, the President had approved and signed the act (S. 15) to provide for the appointment of additional circuit and district judges, and for other purposes.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE—RETURN OF BILL

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, its reading clerk, returned to the Senate, in compliance with its request, the bill (H. R. 4254) for the relief of Aneta Popa.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

On request of Mr. KNOWLAND, and by unanimous consent, Mr. MILLIKIN was excused from attendance on the sessions of the Senate this week.

ORDER FOR TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that immediately following the quorum call there may be the customary morning hour for the transaction of routine business, under the usual 2-minute limitation on speeches.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Secretary will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded and that further proceedings under the call be dispensed with.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

REPORT OF DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA OFFICE OF CIVIL DEFENSE

A letter from the President, Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of the Office of Civil Defense of the District of Columbia, for the year 1953 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Armed Services.

ENTRY INTO THE UNITED STATES OF CERTAIN PHILIPPINE NATIONALS

A letter from the Acting Secretary of State, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to facilitate the entry of Philippine nationals for certain purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

CERTIFICATION OF SOIL SURVEY AND LAND CLASSIFICATION

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, reporting, pursuant to law, that an adequate soil survey and land classification had been made of the lands in the Corning Canal for irrigation and agricultural purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

TEMPORARY ADMISSION INTO THE UNITED STATES OF CERTAIN ALIENS

A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, transmitting, pursuant to law, copies of orders entered granting temporary admission into the United States of certain aliens (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

DISPOSITION OF EXECUTIVE PAPERS

A letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a list of papers and documents on the files of several departments and agencies of the Government which are not needed in the conduct of business and have no permanent value or historical interest, and requesting action looking to their disposition (with accompanying papers); to a Joint Select Committee on the Disposition of Papers in the Executive Departments.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore appointed Mr. CARLSON and Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina members of the committee on the part of the Senate.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the PRESIDENT pro tempore:

Resolutions of the General Court of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts; to the Committee on the Judiciary:

"Resolutions urging Congress to pass legislation to prevent the Government of the United States from engaging in any business, professional, commercial, financial, or industrial enterprise except as specified in the Constitution

"*Resolved*, That the General Court of Massachusetts hereby urges the Congress of the United States to pass legislation which will prevent the Government of the United States from engaging in any business, professional, commercial, financial, or industrial enterprise, except as specified in the Constitution of the United States; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That copies of these resolutions be sent forthwith by the secretary of state to the President of the United States, to the presiding officer of each branch of Congress, and to the Members thereof from this Commonwealth."

Resolutions of the General Court of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service:

"Resolutions memorializing the Congress of the United States to enact legislation providing for two daily deliveries of mail to residences

"Whereas the prompt delivery of mail is most desirable; and

"Whereas the public has been seriously inconvenienced by a reduction in the number of daily deliveries of mail to residences: Therefore be it

"*Resolved*, That the General Court of Massachusetts memorializes the Congress of the United States to enact legislation providing for two daily deliveries of mail to residences; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That copies of these resolutions be transmitted forthwith by the State secretary to the President of the United States, to the presiding officer of each branch of Congress, to the Members thereof from this Commonwealth."

Resolutions of the General Court of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts; to the Committee on Finance:

"Resolutions memorializing the Congress of the United States to reduce the age requirements of recipients of old-age assistance

"*Resolved*, That the General Court of Massachusetts hereby urges the Congress of the United States to pass legislation reducing the age requirements of recipients of old-age assistance to 60 years; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That copies of these resolutions be sent forthwith by the secretary of the Commonwealth to the President of the United States, to the presiding officer of each branch of Congress, and to the Members thereof from this Commonwealth."

Two resolutions of the General Court of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts; to the Committee on Banking and Currency:

"Resolutions memorializing the Congress of the United States to urge the Federal Housing Authority to continue the operation of the Lucy Mallary Village in Springfield

"*Resolved*, That the House of Representatives of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts memorializes the Congress of the United States to urge the Federal Housing Authority to extend the time for the operation by it of the Lucy Mallary Village in Springfield and to take such other action as may be necessary to prevent the sale of said Lucy Mallary Village at this time; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That copies of these resolutions be transmitted forthwith by the State secretary to the President of the United States, to the presiding officer of each branch of Congress, and to the Members thereof from this Commonwealth."

"Resolutions memorializing Congress to provide for Federal housing projects in the west, south, and north ends of Boston

"*Resolved*, That the General Court of Massachusetts hereby memorializes the Congress of the United States to provide for Federal housing projects in the west, south, and north end sections of the city of Boston, said projects to be commenced immediately; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That copies of these resolutions be sent forthwith by the secretary of the Commonwealth to the President of the United States, the United States Housing Authority, to the presiding officer of each branch of Congress and to the Members thereof from this Commonwealth."

A resolution of the House of Delegates of the State of Maryland; ordered to lie on the table:

"House Resolution 1

"Resolution opposing the construction of the St. Lawrence seaway

"Whereas the Congress of the United States is again considering the proposal for the construction and development of the St. Lawrence seaway project; and

"Whereas it is apparent for many reasons this project is of dubious value; and

"Whereas it would require the expenditure of hundreds of millions and perhaps a billion dollars or more at a time when the full resources and energies of the Federal Government are needed for the continuing fight to guarantee the American way of life against communism; and

"Whereas it is probable that this seaway would be closed because of ice conditions for at least 5 months out of every calendar year, thus reducing sharply any potential benefits which might be expected from this project; and

"Whereas the completion of such a project would divert much oceangoing traffic from the port of Baltimore and would be a serious threat to the economy of the Baltimore area and of the entire State of Maryland; and

"Whereas it is a matter of doubtful statesmanship to expend untold sums of money on a project of doubtful value, while at the same time perhaps injuring irreparably the industries and the economies of the great seaports and industrial cities along the eastern seaboard: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved by the House of Delegates of Maryland*, That this body expresses its firm opposition to the projected St. Lawrence seaway and particularly to any cooperation in this venture on the part of the United States; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That the chief clerk of the house be instructed to send copies of this resolution to the President of the United States Senate, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States, and to each of the Members of the Maryland delegation in the Congress of the United States.

"By the house of delegates, February 3, 1954.

"Rules suspended and adopted.

"JOHN C. LUBER,
"Speaker of the House of Delegates.
"CLEMENT R. MERCALDER,
"Chief Clerk of the House of Delegates."

A resolution adopted by the Roseburg (Oreg.) Central Labor Council, protesting against any special exemption on income derived from dividends; to the Committee on Finance.

A resolution adopted by the San Francisco District, California Federation of Women's Clubs, relating to tax deductions for the costs of child care; to the Committee on Finance.

A resolution adopted by the San Francisco (Calif.) Council of Republican Women, relating to a revision of the Status of Armed Forces Treaty; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

A resolution adopted by the San Francisco District, California Federation of Women's Clubs, relating to the amendment of the Food, Drugs, and Cosmetic Act; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

A resolution adopted by the Scioto County (Ohio) Democratic Central-Executive Committee, Portsmouth, Ohio, favoring the enactment of legislation to provide increased compensation for postal employees; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

A resolution adopted by the City Council of Baltimore, Md., protesting against the construction of the St. Lawrence seaway; ordered to lie on the table.

By Mr. EASTLAND:

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of Mississippi; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs:

"House Concurrent Resolution 21

"Concurrent resolution memorializing Congress not to admit Alaska to statehood

"Be it resolved by the house of representatives (the senate concurring therein), That the Legislature of the State of Mississippi does hereby express its opposition to the admission of the Territory of Alaska to statehood, and does hereby memorialize and urge the Congress of the United States not to authorize or provide therefor; be it further

"Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be sent to each Senator and Member of the House of Representatives of the United States from Mississippi.

"Adopted by the house of representatives January 18, 1954.

"WALTER SILLERS,
"Speaker of the House of Representatives.

"Adopted by the senate February 1, 1954.

"CARROLL GARTIN,
"President of the Senate."

By Mr. EASTLAND:

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of Mississippi; ordered to lie on the table:

"House Concurrent Resolution 20

"Concurrent resolution memorializing Congress to act adversely on the petition requesting statehood for the Territory of Hawaii

"Whereas the Congress of the United States has been petitioned to admit to statehood the Territory of Hawaii; and

"Whereas the islands are known to be a hotbed of communism, with the biggest labor union, which dominates economic life, controlled by avowed Communists; and

"Whereas the allegiance of Communists is to Moscow rather than to the United States, and their power is likely to be used for political ends rather than for the attainment of economic goals; and

"Whereas Hawaii, unlike any of the present 48 States, is noncontiguous to the mainland, being over 2,000 miles distant therefrom; and

"Whereas the inhabitants of Hawaii have not been born and bred in American traditions and American customs, thus creating within the average Hawaiian an insular outlook; and

"Whereas the whole economy of the islands is ruthlessly dictated by a group of firms, known as the Big Five, controlled by a handful of men bound by inheritance, intermarriage, and a web of interlocked directorates; and

"Whereas investigation has proved that many Hawaiians are, in fact, violently opposed to statehood: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the House of Representatives of the State of Mississippi (the Senate concurring therein), That the Congress of the United States is hereby respectfully memorialized and earnestly petitioned to take adverse action on the petition requesting that the Territory of Hawaii be admitted to statehood; be it further

"Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be sent to each Senator and Member of the House of Representatives from Mississippi, in the National Congress, and to the national commander of the American Legion, the national adjutant of Disabled American Veterans, commander in chief of Veterans of Foreign Wars, and national executive director of AMVETS (American Veterans of World War II).

"Adopted by the house of representatives, January 18, 1954.

"WALTER SILLERS,
"Speaker of the House of Representatives.

"Adopted by the senate, February 1, 1954.

"CARROLL GARTIN,
"President of the Senate."

By Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina:

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of South Carolina; to the Committee on Finance:

"Concurrent resolution memorializing Congress to exempt milk and other farm products from the Federal tax on the transportation of property

"Whereas the return from the Federal tax on the transportation of property is small; and

"Whereas said tax has proved burdensome to the farmers of the States and further reduces their income which cannot stand much reduction: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the senate (the house of representatives concurring), That the Congress of the United States is memorialized to enact such legislation as will exempt from the tax on transportation of property milk and other farm products being transported from the farm or place of production to market when both are in the same State; be it further

"Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be forwarded to the President of the United States, to the two Members of the United States Senate and to each of the Members of the House of Representatives from this State."

REDUCTION OF VOTING AGE—RESOLUTION OF CITY COUNCIL, REVERE, MASS.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, on behalf of myself and my colleague, the junior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY], I present for appropriate reference, and ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, a resolution adopted by the City Council of the City of Revere, Mass., favoring the enactment of legislation to provide a reduction of the voting age to 18 years.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Ordered, That inasmuch as the youth of America have, in the past, and will continue in the future, to defend and give their lives in the defense of our country, and have shown in times of emergency that they are capable of sound and mature judgment; the Congress of the United States be memorialized to enact into law, the recommended legislation of the President; giving citizens 18 years of age the right to vote.

In city council, January 25, 1954.

Attest:

JOSEPH F. MCCHRISTAL,
City Clerk.

BENEFITS FOR VETERANS—RESOLUTION OF WILKIN COUNTY POST, NO. 2766, VETERANS OF FOREIGN WARS, BRECKENRIDGE, MINN.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a resolution adopted by the Wilkin County Post, No. 2766, of the Veterans of Foreign Wars, Breckenridge, Minn., protesting the curtailment of benefits for veterans, be printed in the RECORD, and appropriately referred.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas during the past several months veterans' benefits have been seriously curtailed and limited by administrative action of the Veterans' Administration, Civil Service Commission, and by Federal legislation; and

Whereas such curtailment of benefits does and will work serious hardship on veterans of World War I, World War II, and Korean veterans unless such benefits are immediately and fully restored; and

Whereas these benefits which have been curtailed are principally the following:

1. Hospitalization: By the requirement of the filing of a financial statement (in effect a pauper's oath) with every application by a veteran for hospitalization in a veterans' hospital except in so-called service-connected cases.

2. Dental treatment: By the elimination of the 1-year presumption as to dental defects and granting of treatment only on a one-time basis.

3. Veterans' preference: By the elimination of the five points granted to veterans in civil-service examinations, except for those attaining passing grades.

4. Institutional on-the-farm training subsistence: By the periodical reduction in subsistence allowance for Korean veterans taking on-the-farm training: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by Wilkin County Post, No. 2766, of Veterans of Foreign Wars, at a regular meeting duly convened on the 12th day of January 1954, That this veterans' organization record its disapproval and indicate its grave concern in the curtailment of these benefits for veterans and register its protest in such curtailments and by this resolution petition the Congressmen representing the veterans of this organization to commence immediate action and institute the necessary legislation to reinstate these benefits which have been curtailed and which are and will work a serious and grave hardship on the veterans who should receive these benefits: Be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution signed by the commander of this organization and attested by its adjutant be forwarded to the Representative and Senators of the State and district wherein this post is located to apprise them of our concern and interest in this regard and for the purpose of receiving from such Representatives and Senators an answer as to the position they now take or intend to take in restoring these benefits to the veterans.

Dated February 6, 1954.

ROY V. HANSON,
Commander.

Attested:

URVAN LE NOUE,
Adjutant.

MADONNA COMMEMORATIVE STAMP FOR MOTHER'S DAY, 1954, IN HONOR OF MARY, THE MOTHER OF CHRIST

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, many citizens of my State of Minnesota

have written to me in recent days suggesting that a Madonna commemorative stamp for Mother's Day, 1954, be issued this May honoring Mary, the mother of Christ.

The symbol of Mary is, indeed, the noblest and sublimest expression of the true meaning of the dignity of motherhood. I believe this proposal deserves most serious consideration. I am, therefore, submitting it to the Postmaster General of the United States. I ask unanimous consent that resolutions and letters I have received be referred to the Senate Post Office and Civil Service Committee, for appropriate consideration.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Minnesota? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

LIBERALIZATION OF SOCIAL SECURITY LAW — RESOLUTION OF AERIE 2192, FRATERNAL ORDER OF EAGLES, VALLEY CITY, N. DAK.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I present for appropriate reference, and ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, a resolution adopted by Aerie 2192, Fraternal Order of Eagles, Valley City, N. Dak., favoring the liberalization of the social security law.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Finance, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESOLUTION FAVORING LIBERALIZED SOCIAL SECURITY

Whereas the Fraternal Order of Eagles was a leader in the campaign for enactment of the Social Security Act and the earlier campaigns for the passage of State old-age pension laws; and

Whereas the Fraternal Order of Eagles, by unanimous vote of delegates in national convention assembled, has urged the liberalization of the Social Security Act so as to extend coverage to all workers and to expand the program to protect wage earners against all major hazards of life and to adjust payments to meet increased living costs; and

Whereas the President of the United States, Dwight D. Eisenhower, in his recent message to Congress, has urged that the Social Security Act be liberalized to provide that—

1. The minimum benefit for retired persons be increased from $25 to $30 per month, the maximum from $85 to $108.50.

2. Ten million additional persons be included in the security system.

3. The first $1,000 of annual earnings by retired persons be exempted from the regulations of the Social Security Act.

4. The "earnings base" for participants in the plan be raised from $3,600 to $4,200.

5. The 4 years of lowest income for such beneficiary be discarded in computing benefits.

Whereas friends of social security, Democrats and Republicans, have endorsed the President's suggestions as a long-step forward in providing adequate old-age security for all Americans: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That our aerie endorse the President's proposals for improving the Social Security Act, and respectfully urge the Congressman from our district and the United States Senators from our State to enact such recommendations into law.

Adopted this 4th day of February 1954.

VALLEY CITY, AERIE No. 2192,
KENNETH COLVILLE,
Worthy President.

Attest:
W. A. GALLOWAY,
Secretary.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. CARLSON, from the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, without amendment:

S. 2728. A bill to authorize the collection of indebtedness of military and civilian personnel resulting from erroneous payments, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 937).

By Mr. CARLSON, from the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, with an amendment:

S. 361. A bill to provide for renewal of and adjustment of compensation under contracts for carrying mail on water routes (Rept. No. 938).

By Mr. CARLSON, from the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, with amendments:

S. 2773. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to provide for the transportation and distribution of mails on motor-vehicle routes," approved July 11, 1940 (54 Stat. 756) (Rept. No. 939).

By Mr. LANGER, from the Committee on the Judiciary, without amendment:

S. 507. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Eleanor Emilie Nell (Rept. No. 942);

S. 662. A bill for the relief of Julie Nicola Frangou (Rept. No. 943);

S. 893. A bill for the relief of David T. Wright (Rept. No. 944);

S. 915. A bill for the relief of Augusta Bleys (also known as Augustina Bleys) (Rept. No. 945);

S. 929. A bill for the relief of Cleopatra Stavros Milionis (Rept. No. 946);

S. 1209. A bill for the relief of Dr. Uheng Khoo (Rept. No. 947);

S. 1265. A bill for the relief of the estate of Susie Lee Spencer (Rept. No. 948);

S. 1594. A bill for the relief of Berenice Catherine Montgomery (Rept. No. 949);

S. 2534. A bill for the relief of Dora Vida Lyew Seixas (Rept. No. 950);

H. R. 711. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Ruth R. Ekholm (Rept. No. 951);

H. R. 752. A bill for the relief of Francoise Bresnahan (Rept. No. 952);

H. R. 788. A bill for the relief of Beryl Williams (Rept. No. 953);

H. R. 823. A bill for the relief of Abraham G. Sakin (Rept. No. 954);

H. R. 824. A bill for the relief of Demetrious Konstantno Papanicolaou (Rept. No. 955);

H. R. 828. A bill for the relief of Dr. Vincenzo Guzzo (Rept. No. 956);

H. R. 907. A bill for the relief of Wolodymyr Hirniak (Rept. No. 957);

H. R. 946. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Louise Blackstone (Rept. No. 958);

H. R. 965. A bill for the relief of Michael Demcheshen (Rept. No. 959);

H. R. 1339. A bill for the relief of Dr. Soon Tai Ryang (Rept. No. 960);

H. R. 1358. A bill for the relief of Dr. Marcelino J. Avecilla and Dr. Teodora A. Fidelino-Avecilla (Rept. No. 961);

H. R. 1495. A bill for the relief of Louis M. Jacobs (Rept. No. 962);

H. R. 1649. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Gisela Walter Sizemore (Rept. No. 963);

H. R. 1688. A bill for the relief of Henry Ty (Rept. No. 964);

H. R. 1795. A bill for the relief of Helena Shostenko (Rept. No. 965);

H. R. 1883. A bill for the relief of the legal guardian of Franklin Jim, a minor (Rept. No. 966);

H. R. 2035. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Michaline Borzecka (Rept. No. 967);

H. R. 2387. A bill for the relief of William M. Smith (Rept. No. 968);

H. R. 2504. A bill for the relief of Sisters Adelaide Canelas and Maria Isabel Franco (Rept. No. 969);

H. R. 2622. A bill for the relief of Maria Teresa Ortega Perez (Rept. No. 970);

H. R. 2623. A bill for the relief of Jose M. Thomasa-Sanchez, Adela Duran Cuevas de Thomasa, and Jose Maria Thomasa Duran (Rept. No. 971);

H. R. 2774. A bill for the relief of Endre Szende, Zsuzanna Szende, Katalin Szende (a minor), and Maria Szende (a minor) (Rept. No. 972); and

H. R. 3749. A bill for the relief of Woldemar Jaskowsky (Rept. No. 973).

By Mr. LANGER, from the Committee on the Judiciary, with an amendment:

S. 235. A bill for the relief of Rev. Armando Fuoco (Rept. No. 974);

S. 267. A bill for the relief of Pantelis Morfessis (Rept. No. 975);

S. 268. A bill for the relief of Harold Trevor Colbourn (Rept. No. 976);

S. 945. A bill for the relief of Moshe Gips (Rept. No. 977);

H. R. 1967. A bill for the relief of the Stebbins Construction Co. (Rept. No. 978);

H. R. 3275. A bill for the relief of the Bracey-Welsh Co., Inc. (Rept. No. 979); and

H. R. 3832. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Orinda Josephine Quigley (Rept. No. 980).

By Mr. LANGER, from the Committee on the Judiciary, with amendments:

S. 1062. A bill for the relief of Eliceu Joaquim Boa (Rept. No. 981);

S. 1156. A bill for the relief of Dr. Jaganath P. Chawla (Rept. No. 982); and

H. R. 2567. A bill to amend the act of July 26, 1947 (61 Stat. 493), relating to the relief of certain disbursing officers (Rept. No. 983).

By Mr. EASTLAND, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

S. 2698. A bill to provide for the appointment of an additional district judge for the southern district of Mississippi; without amendment (Rept. No. 984).

HOUSING

Mr. CAPEHART, under authority of the order of the Senate of February 5, 1954, filed on February 12, 1954, the bill (S. 2938) to aid in the provision and improvement of housing, the elimination and prevention of slums, and the conservation and development of urban communities. The first and second readings of the bill having been previously ordered, it was referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART], I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, in connection with the bill filed by the Senator from Indiana, on the bill (S. 2938) to aid in the provision and improvement of housing, the elimination and prevention of slums, and the conservation and development of urban communities, a brief summary he had prepared, together with a joint statement by the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART] and Representative WOLCOTT, chairman of the House Banking and Currency Committee, on the same bill.

There being no objection, the summary and joint statement were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BRIEF SUMMARY OF HOUSING ACT OF 1954

TITLE I—FHA INSURANCE

1. Increases improvement and repair loans from maximum of $2,500 to $3,000 and repayment period from 3 years, 32 days, to 5 years, 32 days. Changes the existing maximum of $10,000 for multifamily improvement or conversion loans to $1,500 per family unit or $10,000, whichever is greater, and the maximum loan terms from 7 years, 32 days, to 10 years, 32 days.

2. Consolidates and simplifies statutory provisions limiting FHA mortgage terms and changes statutory mortgage limits so that the President under his discretionary authority (provided in title II) could raise mortgage

limits on sales housing to $20,000 on a 1- or 2-family house as compared to the present ceiling of $16,000, to $27,500 for a 3-family home as compared to the present $20,500 limit, and $35,000 for a 4-family home as compared to the present $25,000 limit. Maximum ratio of loan to value would be not to exceed the sum of 95 percent of first $8,000 and 75 percent in excess of $8,000. Under these provisions minimum downpayments could be $400 on an $8,000 house, $900 on a $10,000 house, $1,400 on a $12,000 house, $2,150 on a $15,000 house, and $3,400 on a $20,000 house.

3. The same mortgage terms would be made applicable to existing housing as to new housing.

4. Maximum repayment period on all loans could be increased by the President up to 30 years.

5. Permits the insurance under section 207 of existing multifamily structures, if located in a slum or blighted area and if part of loan is used to repair and rehabilitate the property.

6. President given authority to increase mortgage amounts for multifamily rental housing under section 207 on elevator-type structures up to $2,400 per room (present limit $2,000) and $7,500 per family unit (present limit $7,200). Ten thousand dollars per family unit limitation removed.

7. Where 65 percent of cooperatives are veterans maximum mortgage can be increased by President to $2,375 per room ($2,250 if less than 65 percent), and if elevator type up to $2,850 per room ($2,700 if less than 65 percent).

8. The maximum loan to cooperatives (section 213) would be increased from $5 million to $25 million if the mortgagor is regulated or supervised under law as to rents, charges, and methods of operation.

9. Consolidates all mortgage insurance authorizations and increases FHA insurance authorization by $1½ billion plus up to one-half billion dollars with approval of President.

10. Changes title II Mutual Mortgage Insurance Fund by eliminating group accounts and substituting a general surplus account and a participating reserve account.

11. Authorizes new section 220 FHA insurance on new or existing family dwellings in designated areas in urban renewal areas and where HHFA has approved community programs for slum prevention and urban redevelopment. In such areas authorizes loans on houses with more than 4 family units of $35,000 plus $7,000 for each additional unit over 4. For multi-family units insurance on 90 percent loans with maximum of $2,250 per room ($2,700 in elevator type). Loan insurance would be available on same terms as in section 203 (sale) and section 207 (multifamily rental) until President authorizes higher limits within provisions of section 220.

12. Authorizes a new section 221 FHA insurance program on low-cost housing for families displaced as a result of slum clearance operations or Government action, where community requested such insurance and it met eligibility requirements of HHFA. The FHA Commissioner would determine the need and the number of units to be insured in a particular area. It provides—

(a) Maximum insured loan of $7,000, 100 percent insurance, ($200 cash down required for closing costs) 40-year loans on new or existing structures.

(b) Insurance of $7,000, 100 percent 40-year loans for repair and rehabilitation of dwellings for more than 10 families where mortgagor is nonprofit organization, public or private, and regulated by Federal or State Government as to rents and charges.

(c) 85 percent 40-year loans to builders to facilitate sales to owner-occupants under purchase contract or lease option agreements.

(d) Option to assign mortgages not in default after 20 years to FHA for 10-year debentures at Federal going rate at date of issuance.

13. Extends military housing (title 8) to July 1, 1955.

14. Terminates defense housing (title 9) at expiration date July 1, 1954.

15. Authorizes FHA insurance of "open-end" mortgages on 1- to 4-family houses.

TITLE II—MORTGAGE INTEREST RATES AND TERMS

1. Authorizes flexible mortgage rates and terms.

(a) Gives President authority to set maximum interest rates on FHA and VA loans at different levels for different classes of mortgages, but could not be more than 2½ percent above average market yields on Federal bonds having remaining maturity of 15 years or longer.

(b) President authorized to establish limits on FHA and VA fees and charges.

(c) President authorized to establish maximum maturities and minimum down payments on FHA and VA loans, also maximum dollar limitations on FHA mortgages.

2. Repeals section 504 of Housing Act of 1950 relating to fees and charges.

TITLE III—FEDERAL NATIONAL MORTGAGE ASSOCIATION

1. Recharters FNMA as constituent agency of HHFA, with HHFA Administrator as chairman of board of directors of five Government members.

2. Authorized to purchase FHA and VA mortgages or participations not to exceed $12,500 per family unit.

3. In effect, capital and surplus of existing FNMA would be used to capitalize new FNMA (estimate at $70 million).

In connection with the secondary mortgage facility (see 4) capital contributions of not less than 3 percent of the mortgage or participation amount would be required of all sellers to the association. In return nonrefundable convertible certificates would be issued to the sellers, to be exchanged for capital stock when Treasury stock is retired.

4. Establishes a new secondary mortgage market facility.

(a) To purchase eligible mortgages at prices (not above par) for particular classes of mortgages as determined by Board of Directors. Volume of purchases and sales, prices, charges, and fees would be determined with the view that excessive use of the association's facilities should be avoided.

(b) May enter into one-for-one contracts, but otherwise may not make advance commitments.

(c) To issue Association nonguaranteed obligations, not in excess of 10 times its capital, surplus, reserves, and undistributed earnings to carry out its secondary market operations.

(d) The Secretary of the Treasury is authorized to invest in such obligations up to $500 million, plus an amount equal to reduction in FNMA present portfolio, but not more than $1 billion, until Treasury stock in Association is retired.

5. Provides special assistance functions.

(a) President could authorize advance commitments and purchases of mortgages of various types and classifications as a support for special housing programs or to retard a serious market decline.

(b) Treasury would supply funds in return for obligations of not more than 5 years maturity.

(c) President could authorize not more than $200 million in purchases and commitments to be outstanding at any one time, but would have additional authority up to $100 million to enter commitments for mortgage participation agreements for a fixed 20-percent undivided interest in each mortgage, but with a deferred participation agreement to purchase the remainder in the event of default.

6. Liquidation of existing FNMA portfolio.

(a) Issue to public nonguaranteed obligations against its assets. The funds so obtained would be used to reduce existing Treasury's investment.

(b) Treasury authorized to purchase Association's obligations in sufficient amount to carry out Association's liquidation functions. Such obligations would have maturities of 5 years or less and the interest rate would be based on the average rate of outstanding Government obligations.

(c) Three hundred million dollars of the present authorization of FNMA for mortgage purchases would be made available for the special assistance program (see 5).

7. Separate accountability would be maintained for the (a) secondary market operations, (b) special assistance functions, and (c) management and liquidating functions of the rechartered FNMA.

TITLE IV—SLUM CLEARANCE AND URBAN RENEWAL

All the amendments are designed primarily to broaden and redirect the present slum clearance and redevelopment program so as to assist not only the communities in clearing their slums, as is presently provided, but to prevent their spread by rehabilitating and improving blighted, deteriorated, or deteriorating areas. The criteria, terms and definitions of title I of the Housing Act of 1949 are changed in accordance with the broader scope of the program. In these larger areas, known as urban renewal areas, there could be carried out (in addition to the slum clearance and redevelopment now authorized) plans for voluntary repair and rehabilitation of buildings, clearance of deteriorated structures, and reconstruction of streets and other necessary improvements.

Requirements with respect to local responsibility and local action would be strengthened and increased.

The requirement that a commercial or industrial deteriorated area may be cleared with Federal assistance only if the area be redeveloped for predominantly residential purposes is eliminated. In other words, a deteriorated commercial site can be redeveloped for commercial purposes. However, there would be substituted a requirement that the project be in accordance with an urban renewal plan to achieve such community objectives for the establishment and preservation of well-planned residential neighborhoods.

The 2/3–1/3 formula for Federal local grants now in the law would not be changed. However, in the gross project cost might be included, in addition to those items now included, expenditures for carrying out plans for a voluntary repair and rehabilitation and the acquisition of property for the broader purpose indicated above, as well as the installation, construction, and reconstruction of streets, utilities, parks, playgrounds, and other improvements (which need not be in a slum-clearance area) necessary for carrying out the urban renewal plan.

TITLE V—LOW-RENT PUBLIC HOUSING

1. Extends preference in public housing, now limited to those displaced from public-housing or slum-clearance projects, to include also those displaced by other public actions, such as code enforcement and closing of structures, highway construction, etc.

2. Make payment of 10 percent of shelter rents in lieu of taxes mandatory for public-housing projects, except where this would reduce local contribution to less than 20 percent of the Federal contribution.

3. Permits localities to elect to charge full taxes provided they make up the difference in cash to maintain a local contribution equal to 20 percent of the Federal contribution.

4. Requires that the governing body and the public be informed of total local contri-

bution, including the difference between payments in lieu of taxes and amount that full taxes would require.

5. Provides that after projects are fully amortized, that net revenues go proportionately to Federal and local governments on the basis of their contributions, in order that in time such contribution may eventually be recovered as far as possible, and the projects be made self-liquidating.

TITLE VI—HOME LOAN BANK BOARD

1. Provides method whereby Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation may be served with notice of suit anywhere, and not just in the District of Columbia. Also bars enforcement of claim against the Corporation after 3 years from date of default, or, if the Corporation denies validity of the claim, after 2 years from the date of denial.

2. Increases maximum loan that a Federal savings and loan association may make (beyond exception already allowed) to $35,000, instead of the present $20,000 limit, set in 1933. Makes comparable changes as to collateral acceptable by Federal Home Loan Bank for advances. Also provides procedures for appointment of conservators and receivers of Federal savings and loan associations.

TITLE VII—URBAN PLANNING AND RESERVE OF PLANNED PUBLIC WORKS

1. Provides $5 million to Housing and Home Finance Administrator for planning grants up to 50 percent of estimated cost to State, metropolitan, and regional area agencies for metropolitan or regional planning, and to State planning bodies to assist municipalities under 25,000 in urban planning.

2. Provides $10 million to resume non-interest bearing planning advances to local and State bodies for public works plans, repayable when construction is undertaken, in order that such works can be ready for construction if the economic situation should require it.

TITLE VIII—MISCELLANEOUS PROVISIONS

Includes exemptions from preference provisions of unusual types of permanent Lanham Act projects and provides for a consolidated report to Congress on agency's activities instead of assorted reports on various programs and activities. * * * Provides for consideration to be given to the reduction of vulnerability of congested areas to enemy attack in carrying out housing programs.

JOINT STATEMENT BY SENATOR CAPEHART AND REPRESENTATIVE WOLCOTT ON HOUSING ACT OF 1954

The Housing Act of 1954 contains comprehensive legislative provisions designed to (1) assure a high annual level of residential building starts, (2) equalize FHA mortgage insurance terms between new and old houses, (3) enable homeowners to have access to financing to better maintain, by renovation and repair, our existing housing inventory, (4) afford a broader approach to preventing and eliminating slum and blighted areas from our metropolitan areas, (5) provide a new source of housing supply for low-income families, (6) provide a secondary mortgage market, initially Government financed, to afford a more even flow of mortgage funds and make available needed housing funds in areas which are unable to provide such funds from local sources, (7) assure flexibility in mortgage terms to keep pace with general economic conditions, (8) provide funds to assist small municipalities in urban planning and (9) modernize existing provisions of several housing laws.

The new bill, consisting of eight titles, is the outgrowth of an intensive housing study inaugurated by the President last year when he appointed the Advisory Committee on Government Housing Policies and Programs to develop a new and revitalized housing program.

FHA INSURANCE AUTHORIZATION

New FHA insurance authorization granted in the amount of $1.5 billion plus an additional $500 million which could be made available by the President, would permit FHA to operate at last year's level of activity. In 1953 new housing starts approximated 1.1 million units. The new act would liberalize certain maximum mortgage insurance terms with respect to dollar amounts, ratio of loan to value, and maturity but they would only become operative upon direction of the President. Authority would be granted to equalize FHA mortgage insurance terms as between new and existing construction.

MODERNIZATION AND REPAIR LOANS

In keeping with the emphasis which the new act would place on maintenance and improvement of our housing inventory the limit on insured FHA title I repair and improvement loans for single family units would be increased from $2,500 to $3,000 and the term extended from 3 years to 5 years. With respect to repair and improvement of buildings for 2 or more families the existing loan limit of $10,000 would not apply provided the cost did not exceed $1,500 per dwelling unit, and the term would be increased from 7 to 10 years. A further incentive for improvement of existing housing would be provided through permitting FHA to insure advances made to a mortgagor under an open-end mortgage thus permitting him to obtain more favorable financing based on interest rates related to mortgage security.

HOME MORTGAGE INTEREST RATES AND TERMS

As previously noted the President would be given discretionary authority within the maximums provided in the act to vary FHA and VA ratios of loan to value and maturities and to carry FHA mortgage limitations on a per-room or per-family-unit basis. The President would also be given discretionary authority to set interest rates for VA mortgages and FHA mortgages and debentures, and related financing charges to assure that such rates and charges are geared to current economic conditions. A statutory flexible maximum for interest rates on FHA and VA mortgages would be established by providing that the maximum rate set could not exceed the average market yield on long-term Government bonds plus 2½ percent. The maximum rate set on FHA debentures could not exceed the average market yield on long-term Government bonds. The President would exercise the above-mentioned discretionary authorities after taking into consideration the then current investment market and conditions in the building industry and the national economy.

FEDERAL NATIONAL MORTGAGE ASSOCIATION

The new act would provide for reincorporation and change of authority of the Federal National Mortgage Association. The new FNMA would have three functions, namely to provide (1) a true secondary mortgage market, (2) financial assistance for special housing programs, and (3) for orderly liquidation of the mortgages acquired by the former FNMA. Initially the capital stock of the association (in the amount of the former FNMA capital funds) would be provided by the Treasury but provision would be made so that users, through a capital contribution based on 3 percent of mortgages sold to the association, would build up equity funds to the extent the Treasury stock eventually could be retired. The association would be granted authority to sell its obligations in the private market to obtain funds in connection with functions (1) and (3) above enumerated. Such obligations although not Government guaranteed would enjoy the benefit of "backstop" Treasury borrowing authority which would be granted the association. The special-assistance function enumerated in (2) above would be financed direct from the Treasury. Borrowing authority for the secondary market function would be limited to 10 times capital funds but not exceeding a Treasury "backstop" of $1 billion. Operations under the special-assistance function could not exceed purchases, commitments, and participations in a total amount of $700 million outstanding at any one time. Borrowing authority under the liquidating function would be limited to the amount of mortgages held and commitments of the existing FNMA (not exceeding $3.35 billion) and would be progressively reduced by the amount of mortgage sales, repayments, and commitment cancellations. The Treasury "backstop" borrowing authority for this function would likewise be progressively reduced and eventually eliminated.

URBAN RENEWAL

The slum clearance and urban renewal provisions are designed to broaden and redirect the present slum clearance and community redevelopment programs by not only clearing slums, but requiring affirmative local action to prevent the spread of slums and urban blight. They would require communities, before being eligible to receive Federal assistance, to have an official plan of action for effectively dealing with the problem of urban slums and blight within the community and for the establishment and preservation of a well planned community with well organized residential neighborhoods of decent homes and suitable living environment for adequate family living. Special provisions would be included in the FHA insurance program for the construction and rehabilitation of dwelling units within urban renewal areas. These special FHA insurance programs would provide for the rehabilitation and construction of both single family and multifamily housing units. One special feature of the program would be 100 percent FHA insurance of mortgages up to $7,000, with 40-year maturities and small downpayments, available to displaced families in urban renewal areas. These special FHA programs could be assisted by FNMA, the Government secondary mortgage market, when authorized by the President, by either purchasing or participating in such mortgages.

The bill would also authorize up to $5 million in grants to localities to develop, test, and report on new and improved techniques for preventing and eliminating slums.

URBAN PLANNING AND RESERVE OF PLANNED PUBLIC WORKS

Provides $5 million for planning grants up to 50 percent of estimated cost of such planning to State, metropolitan, and regional area agencies for metropolitan or regional planning and to State planning bodies to assist municipalities of under 25,000 population in urban planning.

Provides $10 million to resume non-interest-bearing planning advances to local and State bodies for public works plans repayable when construction is commenced in order that such works can be ready for construction if the economic situation would require.

HOME LOAN BANK SYSTEM

Provides a new procedure for the appointment of conservators and receivers of Federal savings and loan associations and a new system of administrative and court proceedings in cases involving noncompliance with rules and regulations of the Home Loan Bank Board where in the judgment of the Board the circumstances do not require the appointment of a conservator or receiver.

MISCELLANEOUS

There are several amendments which modernize and perfect existing housing legislation.

SENATE DOCUMENT NO. 100

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART], I ask unanimous consent to have printed as a Senate document a more complete explanation of the Housing Act of 1954, which the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART] has prepared for the use of the Committee on Banking and Currency entitled "The Housing Act of 1954—A Summary of Provisions of the Housing Act of 1954."

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from California? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

BILLS AND A JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED

Bills and a joint resolution were introduced, read the first time, and by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. BRIDGES:

S. 2939. A bill for the relief of Paul G. Hamel and certain dependents of the late Michael P. O'Donnell; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. MARTIN (for himself and Mr. DUFF):

S. 2940. A bill to authorize certain beach erosion control of the shore of Fresque Isle Peninsula, Erie, Pa.; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. MURRAY:

S. 2941. A bill for the relief of Kim Kwang Suk and Kim Woo Shik; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LEHMAN:

S. 2942. A bill to amend section 9 of the Hatch Act with respect to its application to officers and employees performing duties relating to employee loyalty or security programs; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

(See the remarks of Mr. LEHMAN when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado:

S. 2943. A bill to provide for the transfer of all powers, duties, and functions of the Federal Civil Defense Administration to the National Guard Bureau of the Department of the Army, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

S. 2944. A bill for the relief of Silvia Dular; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HAYDEN:

S. 2945. A bill for the relief of Eulalio Rodriguez Vargas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. EASTLAND:

S. 2946. A bill for the relief of Patrick D. Smith; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MAYBANK:

S. 2947. A bill to remit the duty on certain bells to be imported for addition to the carillon of The Citadel, Charleston, S. C.; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. IVES:

S. 2948. A bill for the relief of Chaim Wolf Weintraub, Sara Liebe Weintraub, and Jorge Weintraub; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SPARKMAN (for himself, Mr. ANDERSON, Mr. BURKE, Mr. CLEMENTS, Mr. DOUGLAS, Mr. GREEN, Mr. HENNINGS, Mr. HILL, Mr. HUMPHREY, Mr. HUNT, Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado, Mr. LANGER, Mr. LEHMAN, Mr. LONG, Mr. MAYBANK, Mr. MCCARRAN, Mr. MURRAY, Mr. NEELY, Mr. ROBERTSON, Mr. STENNIS, Mr. MORSE, Mr. LENNON, and Mr. KENNEDY):

S. 2949. A bill to continue authority to make funds available for loans and grants under title V of the Housing Act of 1949, as amended; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

(See the remarks of Mr. SPARKMAN when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. DUFF:

S. 2950. A bill for the relief of Domenico Scaramuzzino; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FLANDERS (by request):

S. J. Res. 127. Joint resolution declaring the right of sovereignty of the United States over certain areas of the Antarctic Continent, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

AMENDMENT OF HATCH ACT RELATING TO CERTAIN OFFICERS AND EMPLOYEES

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill for the amendment of title 18 of the criminal code and that portion thereof known as the Hatch Act, for the purpose of making it illegal to engage in political activity for any Federal officer or official whose primary function or one of whose major functions relates to the administration of any employee, loyalty, or security program.

I ask unanimous consent that the bill be printed textually in the RECORD, together with a statement I issued on Friday, February 12, describing the intent of this proposed legislation, and an editorial from the New York Herald Tribune of February 13, entitled "Politics and Security" which bears on this matter.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill, statement, and editorial will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 2942) to amend section 9 of the Hatch Act with respect to its application to officers and employees performing duties relating to employee loyalty or security programs, introduced by Mr. LEHMAN, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 9 (a) of the act entitled "An act to prevent pernicious political activities," approved August 2, 1939, as amended (5 U. S. C. 118i), is amended by inserting before the last sentence thereof a new sentence as follows: "Nothing contained in the preceding sentence shall be construed to make the provisions of the second sentence of this subsection inapplicable to any officer or employee (other than the President, the Vice President, or the head of an executive department or independent agency) whose primary function or one of whose major functions relates to the administration of any employee loyalty or security program.

The statement by Mr. LEHMAN is as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR LEHMAN PROPOSING AN AMENDMENT TO THE HATCH ACT TO COVER ALL SECURITY OFFICERS

Upon the convening of the Senate Monday, I will introduce an amendment to that part of the Criminal Code known as the Hatch Act, so as to forbid overt political activity by any Government employee whose function or responsibility is primarily, or includes in a major way, personnel security.

I consider it unconscionable that any employee, officer, or official of our Government, one of whose primary functions is to investigate, determine, or judge the loyalty or security of other employees of the Government should be permitted to participate in overt partisan, political activities.

It is unthinkable that political considerations should enter into the functions of personnel security. I am shocked even to think that there should be any doubt as to the complete impropriety of political activity on the part of any Government officer who presides over the delicate questions of individual loyalty and security.

If there is any room for different legal interpretations as to the application of the Hatch Act to any such employee or officer, whatever his technical or simulated rank, there can certainly be no question as to the moral proprieties. My proposed amendment would plug the legal loophole, if there is one. I hope it will be speedily adopted.

My amendment would apply not only to Mr. Scott McLeod but to every other security officer and security employee of the Government.

I believe that the Nation has been shocked by Mr. McLeod's recent activities just as it would be shocked if Mr. J. Edgar Hoover went out on a political speaking tour in behalf of the Republican Party or any other political party.

No personnel or security officer should be so permitted.

The possibilities for political intimidation of Government employees on the part of a security officer are unlimited and, indeed, are awful even to contemplate.

My amendment would not, of course, affect the Attorney General although I would personally think that in these times when internal security is such a burning question in the country, and so vital to our national preservation, that even he would retire from the forefront of political activity, because of his immediate concern with questions of individual loyalty and security.

The editorial presented by Mr. LEHMAN is as follows:

[From the New York Herald Tribune of February 13, 1954]

POLITICS AND SECURITY

The controversy over Scott McLeod, State Department security officer off on a political tour, now turns upon whether or not he is barred from such activities by the Hatch Act. A Civil Service Commissioner advised that he is barred; the State Department decided he is not. The State Department has the final word, and there, it seems to us, that particular matter could rest. The real question is not one of narrow legality, but of the wisdom and expediency of having a man in a quasi-judicial position, charged with administering delicate personnel issues, become engaged in politics.

In the work Mr. McLeod is doing, it is not only important that his actions be fair and objective; it is also important that they seem so. Is it likely that his actions will seem fair once he has shown a political interest in building up the list of dismissals to the highest possible total? Will they seem objective once he has implied that his success, and the success of the administration, depend on the number of dismissals and firings? As security officer of the State Department he is doing on a limited scale what Mr. J. Edgar Hoover is doing on a much larger scale. Mr. Hoover is far too experienced and principled to turn up as the orator at partisan gatherings.

Mr. McLeod, when asked about his present course, replied that he didn't know "how you're going to work in Government and not be in politics." If he does not know that, he should not be in the post he now holds. The essence of free government is that there are areas where partisanship does not enter, and that the working of the two-party system does not prevent the fair treatment of indi-

viduals. Altogether Mr. McLeod's tour makes it look very much as if he had so misconceived his role as to make his continuance in the State Department of questionable benefit.

SUSPENSION OF DEPORTATION OF CERTAIN ALIENS—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, from the Committee on the Judiciary, I report an original concurrent resolution, favoring the suspension of deportation of certain aliens, and I submit a report (No. 940) thereon.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The report will be received, and the concurrent resolution will be placed on the calendar.

The concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 60) was placed on the calendar, 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-4934625, Abbey, Alfred.
T-107480, Advocat, Judith (nee Levy).
V-777692, Ahn, Chung Oak.
V-777692, Ahn Moo Hei.
A-6610497, Aniag, Federico Enriquez.
A-2691316, Anninos, Spiros or Spiros Markantonatos.
A-5062766, Athanasiades, Peter or Panagiotis Michael Malakas.
T-142741, Aurora, Delantar.
A-5834397, Ayala-Rodriguez, Demetrio.
A-5919879, Back, Erik Nestor Ernfried.
0300-123824, Bahchavan, Marika Stelianou.
A-9707485, Ban, Chan or Ban Chan or Chin Bin.
V-905914, Barba, Teresa Felipe or Teresa Felipe Agcaoili Asuncion.
V-529612, Bartoli, Nondina Massetti.
V-1634429, Benjamin, Artzweek (nee Hartoun or Hartounian).
A-4037830, Benndetti, Cipro or Cipro Giovanni Mafaldo Bendetti.
V-455711, Bennett, Panalig Gomez (nee Jose) or Fannie Gomez Jose Bennett.
E-22435, Berger, Harry or Mordka Sznaieder.
A-3408662, Bing, Moy or Bang Moy.
0403-2698, Bonanni, Aristide or Harry Bonanny.
T-1807528, Brosch, Mary Elizabeth.
A-2363302, Burgos-Mariscal, Baltazar.
A-5072218, Burns, James Johnson.
A-6592473T, Butani, Kalyan Gyanden or Kalyan Gyandev Butani.
T-1497408, Caraviotis, Gerassimos or Jerry Caar or George Kalamiotis.
A-5347538, Carlsen, Alf Sofus.
T-1892575, Caro, Domingos Salvador.
A-1789328, Casella, Ilario Paul or Mario or Flavio Casella.
A-7266012, Castro, Mabel Christina De or Belle Sommers or Mabel Ferrav.
T-1495439, Cerda, Luis Mario.
T-2760826, Chan, Albert Jeung or Chan Foon Jung.
A-5396158, Chang, Tsuen-Kung.
A-4886664, Chen, Peter You Lo or Chen You Lo.
A-9559629, Chew, Dick Wah.
V-889258, Chiang, Richard Chi-Chen.
A-7415673T, Chiang, Richard Yu-Ying.
A-3119234, Chu, Sun Chang.
T-2072676, Chung, Charles Denson.
E-1174, Churchill, Sylvia Mary.
E-1173, Churchill, Harry George.
A-4403432, Clausen, Claudius Peter or Claudius P. Clausen or Claud Clausen.
E-2230, Comitas, Spyridon or Spyridon Lukas Komitas.
A-8117133, Crawford, James Monroe.
T-1497436, Curtin, William Arthur.
A-6685995, Cywiak, Czmul (Samuel).
A-6675172, Cywiak, Mania.
A-2733441, Daly, Rita or Rita Berman or Rita Medvied.
A-5910610, Deckellis, Salvatore or Sam Pepedicicio.
A-2934221, Depetrillo, Angelina.
A-1161587, Dettman, Heinrich Frederich or Hellman.
A-5998383, Dicenzo, Dorothy Josephine.
A-7476663, Digneo, Angiolina A.
0300-228588, Dolmo, Lorenzo Martinez or Patricio Lorenzo Dolmo Y Martinez.
A-7476513, Duculan, Ricardo Tangalin.
A-5061754, Felizardo, Manuel.
1200-41417, Fleisher, Walter Leon.
T-141338, Foisia, Faapio or Telesia Faapio Foisia.
A-6021829, Fong, Hong Yen or Larry Fung.
A-3224574, Francis, Fernando Emilio.
A-3115089, Franzan, Emil.
A-3536436, Fun, Fu Yue.
A-7279371, Gama, Ubaldo Vasquez.
A-6730889, Garcia, Adolfo Gonzales y or Enrique Najera.
A-7841472, Garcia, Inocencia Claustro.
T-1496107, Garcia-Leon Reynaldo.
0300-396679, Gillespie, Edmund John.
T-2760320, Gisler, Henrietta (Henrike) D.
A-7115195, Gmaz, Maryann Agnes.
0900/42120, Gobos, Angelo Peter.
T-2760278, Godinez, Cruz Romero.
A-6314246, Gomez, Jesus or Jesus Gomez-Porras.
A-7137250, Gonzales, Liselotte formerly Patzold (nee Tatsch).
A-4345185, Gorbach-Dansky, Edna or Gorback (nee Caplan).
A-9682095, Graikste, Fricis.
V-192461, Grazia, Antonio De.
T-1496875, Griffith, Chesley Allan.
A-1773828, Griffo, Onorio Vittorio.
A-5175586, Guertin, Walter Emery.
T-1496439, Haire, Rebecca Joyce.
A-6929726, Han, Lew Fee.
V-1485716, Hansen, Berthilde Marie Yonne (nee Agostini).
A-3652255, Harabalja, Gaudenzio or Rade Hardich.
A-7039526, Haro, Eduvijes Cota.
0300-349142, Harris, Virginia McKinney De.
T-2760110, Hau, Fook.
A-3508069, Hauser, Frank Fredrick or Frank Hauser or Franz Haeuser.
T-1497354, Helgesen, Brynjulf Havernaas or William H. Helgesen.
0300-404729, Hellem, Torger.
A-6099177T, Henning, Leonarda.
A-6429734, Hernaez, Faustina Estraela or Marceline Espanto Benitez.
T-2760847, Hideshima, Juro or Joe Yama.
T-2760836, Ho, Huynh Ngoc.
A-7050162, Hologkitas, Ioannis or John Gitas.
A-4047719T, Holt, John Chi-Chong.
T-2760287, Holthouser, Jane Albright.
V-1022653, Horvath, Ladislaus or Richard Dickson.
V-1022652, Oss, Kenneth or Kenneth Dickson.
E-2211, Houri, Ibrahim.
A-5270901, Hull, Diedrich.
A-7258718, Ignatjeff, Galina or Galina Ignatieff.
A-1191039, Ino Motosaburo.
A-5104058, Inoue, Jube or Satory Ota.
A-6348277, Jadulang, Luisa Baraoed or Fidela Fermin Bartolome.
A-3227332, Jakobson, Viktor A. or Viktor Alexander Jakobson.
A-7392146T, Jen, Loy Gim.
T-2760313, Jew, Steven Chin or Chin Ta Ben.
A-9649397, Johansen, Frank R.
A-5159713, Joung, Jack Hing.
A-7383816, Joyce, Isabella Monica.
T-1496871, Juarez, Benito.
T-2760173, Kawada, Shigeru or Hideo Yano.
A-4583491, Kerr, Jane Young Ritchie.
A-7549306, Kishi, Masao.
A-7828194, Koutroulis, Demetre.
A-7828195, Koutroulis, Anastase.
1200-46282, Kramer, Herta Johanna or Rita Kramer (nee Maurer).
A-5045459, Kremenic, John Nick.
A-6139100, Kudo, Juan Sukehiro.
0300-414309, Kui, Sit or Seid Kwee.
A-6142212T, Kuo, George Chi-chu or Chi-chu Kuo.
A-8189333, Kuo, Ta-Hsien or Lawrence T. H. Kuo.
A-7983477, LaDuc, Juliette Grace.
A-7612531, Lalla, Anna Liisa (nee Ravantti).
A-6919673, Laue, Herbert Otto.
T-2760830, Laurentis, Gelsomina B. De.
A-8106987, Lee, Gee Wing.
T-2760235, Leong, Foon Yau.
A-8082612, Liufau, Moana or Wightman.
T-2760254, Luna, Concepcion Arias.
A-8082613, Ma'Alona, Pifolau L.
A-5696059, MacGregor, Donald Gordon or Cecil George Gordon Ballantyne.
A-3505715, MacKinnon, Malcolm.
A-7743501, Magalee, John Emanuel.
V-120091, Magrisso, Liza Niego or Liza Niego.
T-2760843, Makota, Mita or Shinichi Misumi.
A-7967332, Malinconico, Carolina.
0300-185373, Mapp, Leslie.
A-4193314, Marrinhas, Ismael Da Silva.
E-910019, Martinez-Guzman, Antonio.
T-2760840, Maruyama, Tomio.
A-7427012, Marzekandof, Nina.
A-5760254, Matsudo, Yorisuke.
A-5635890, Matsudo, Toshiko (nee Tanaka).
A-4991483, McLaughlinn, Ana Adela (nee Harty).
T-1497349, Meglio, Salvatore Di or Joe Vitiello.
0300-419066, Meighan, Ernesto Concepcion or Tony Meighan.
A-5620677, Mendez, Maria Correa vda, de.
T-2072689, Mendez-Correa, Jesus.
T-2072690, Mendez-Correa, Carmen.
T-1892719, Mendoza, Evangelio Barreto.
A-3521394, Mendrinos, Theodore George.
0300-210670, Merro, Antonio.
A-5349847, Mickelson, Edith Esther (nee Bjorklund) or Michols.
T-2760257, Milner, Leslie James.
A-4717737, Munoz-Tirado, Alfredo.
T-2760263, Murphy, Norah Marie.
A-6387327, Nadkarni, Moreshwar Vithal.
1600-102807, Nakamura, Denzi or Joe Ikoma Kamimura.
A-7526846, Narian, Suraj.
A-4764451, Nelson, Evangeline Melinda.
A-7197846, Nelson, George Edward.
A-5057432, Novickis, Julian Jahn.
A-4876701, Nusenow, Jennie.
A-6792383, Oglagea, Eudachia (nee Eudachia Rotova).
T-2760371, Ono, Chiyoji.
A-7371642, Orsi, Michele.
A-3206690, Ortiz-Carlton, Miguel or Miguel Carlton Ortiz or Miguel Ortiz.
0300-385723, Osbourne, Lewis Vincent or Osbourne Leslie.
T-2760811, Otani, Kohei.
A-5087633, Pai, Shu Tang.
A-5383161, Paul, Frances (nee Lau Cheng Shee).
A-6458726, Perez-Juarez, Raul.
A-4186066, Perez-Perez, Roman or Roman Perez or Ramon Perez.
T-1497418, Prudente, Nemesio Encarnacion.
T-2760272, Quan, Suet Ying (nee Suet Ying Lu).
E-42710, Ramirez, Emerenciana or De Martinez or vda, De Martinez or Valenzuela or M del or Turrey.
A-6976563, Ramos-Quintana, Juan.
E-43850, Recio, Pedro Sergio.
A-1336338, Richardson, Helen Wai-Fong (nee Shim) or Helen Wai-Fong.
A-6286745, Roland, Rita (nee Serles).
0300-412971, Romano, Vincenzo or Vincent Romano.

T–1496081, Russell, Diana Lynn.
T–1496082, Russell, Sherrann Margaret Yvonne.
T–1497345, Sakahura, Eiichi.
T–1497344, Sakahura, Kiyoko.
T–2760846, Sakamoto, Zenichi.
A–5742858, Salvo, William Pasita or Guillermo Salvo.
T–1408506, Samiano, Felicidad Palpallatoc.
A–6711959, Sanchez, Maria Magdalena Valdez de (nee Maria Magdalena Valdez-Machado).
A–6587969, Sanchez-Nieblas, Vicente.
V–529774, Santina, Romano Della.
T–1892479, Savident, Verna Marjorie.
A–2588651, Sazaglis, Emanuel or Emmanuel Sojacklis or Sajacklis.
A–6199563, Semolic, Iuo Anton.
A–7081057, Sgarlato, Santo.
A–6425290, Shing, Tung or Dong Shing.
0804–7408, Silva-Gonzalez, Fernando.
A–9765536, Smith, Henry George.
A–9620245, Soesman, Hendrik Conscience.
A–5834217, Soita, George.
T–2643827, Soria, Luz Tapia.
T–1497426, Stagner, Jr., Gordon Hall.
T–142450, Steinberg, Robert.
A–6215881, Stenlake, Dora or Dorothy Freudiger.
A–6277626, Stephenson, Samuel Bolivar.
A–3511890, St. Pierre, Pierre Henry.
A–5337683, Strom, Carl Erik or Soderstrom.
T–2760832, Sumi, Zenkuro.
A–7283608, Sung, William Z-Liang.
A–7283610, Sung, Jr., William Kyi-Teh.
T–2760824, Tagumi, Fusao.
T–2760828, Tagumi, Asako.
T–2760159, Tahara, Rokoichi.
A–8001015, Tai, Chien.
V–1344365, Tai, Fen Liu.
0300–292150, Tambolini, Alberto Cesar.
T–2695559, Tesar, Anna.
A–4996462, Therkelsen, Kristian Dahl.
T–2760251, Thomasser, Thomas C.
A–2084203, Toba, Kojira or Susumu Imai.
V–703982, Uribarri, Maria Dolores Guinzanos.
T–2760189, Vargas, Eduardo Austria.
V–904452, Venenciano, Ricardo Viloria.
0300–186842, Villano, Molly Amelia or Molly Amelia Vine.
A–6297293T, Villarama, Jr., Antonio or Tony Villarama, Jr.
A–9783200, Visakis, Antonios or Antonios Vysakis or Antonios Bezakis.
T–2760306, Vonk, Cornelis Nicolaas.
A–6706054, Wall, Sonia Sookhdeo.
T–2073616, Wein, Fern Myrtle or Myrtle Fern St. Clair or Colleen Davis, or Fern Myrtle Jones.
T–64728, Weitz, Rayah (nee Sheindel Ratta Halberstam) or Rayah Halberstam.
T–2760829, Wong, Fook.
A–2659747, Wong, Shee Lum or Gum Hook Wong.
T–2783706, Wong, Toy On or Wong Poo.
A–8258735, Yaps, Gustaf Henry or Gustav Jobs or Jobe.
A–6139101, Yocum, Leonor.
T–2760818, Young, Alfred Acham.
A–7391983, Young, Helen Foong or Fung Yu Feng.
T–2760202, Young, Leong Kam or Leong Lai Ying or Chan Sow Lon or Violet Chan.
A–7539109, Young, Pau Lien.
E–901039, Zepeda, Amado.
A–7397001, Zoppe, Giovanni Alberto or Alberto Zoppe or Alberto Giovanni Zoppe or Giovanni Zoppe.
A–8091938, Hing, Lai Dong.
T–2695128, Poe, Richard Robinson.
A–3269637, Ming, Li.
T–2760195, Miyoshi, Shibeharu.
A–7439475, Montajano-Fernandez, Salvador.
A–5022981, Monti, Dante or Dante Napoleon Monti or Dante Cardel or Dante Demonty or Ramiro.
A–2849042, Morales, Santiago or Santiago S. Morales.
T–2760314, Moshovis, Christos Antoniou.
A–7491006, Moy, Fook Ming.
T–2760373, Alfonso, Maria Anderson.
A–9765372, Ali, Mohammed.
0300–367231, Arzu, Simon.
A–9013403, Azzopardi, Emanuel or Joe Gott or Gatt.
A–7036796, Baillargeon, Joseph Denis Roland.
A–1258558, Barretta, Giuseppe or Joseph Barretta.
T–1956114, Bartolo, Blodia Pena De.
T–1956115, Bartolo-Pena, Aurora.
T–1956116, Bartolo-Pena, Rosa.
A–6507006, Berger, Jechiel Nobek.
A–6465424, Berger, Liezi (nee Balzmann).
E–40207, Binkowski, Sylvia Dorothea.
0300–329285, Birch, Aubrey Samuel or Aubrey Alexander Burke.
0501–15938, Brightly, Irma Miers formerly Irma Miers.
A–5260319, Buttery, Carnette Leofrida (nee Arthur).
A–3072127, Camino, Francisco Luis or Francisco Camino.
A–3455567, Caruso, Nunzio or Nunzio Charles Speciale.
0900–58197, Casillas-Vega, Jesus.
A–2754547, Cassola, Giovanni Angelo or Giovanni Cassola.
0804–6856, Castro, Maria Eufemia Merino De.
T–1892628, Chan, Albert or Chu Hing or Henry Chu.
A–7007271, Chao, Phoebe Shih or Phoebe Stone.
A–7755805, Chao, Wu-Wai or Wu Wei Chao.
T–604401, Chock, Anna or Anna Mooi or Mui Chiu-Yung.
A–7050979, Choy, Mock or Mei Tzai.
T–2760252, Cinquini, Paolino.
T–1496059, Constantouros, George or Giorgio Anthony.
E–28183, Crawford, James Peter or Janis Peteris Skujins.
A–5804994, Domes, Miriam Katherine formerly Scott (nee Runchey).
V–922600, Dorsey, Dorrit (nee Dorrit Pollak).
0300–421138, Erwin, Henry George.
V–304627, Eshabarr, Ada Ferraz.
T–2760343, Fernandez, Luis Piedade.
A–8031554, Filis, Theodore George.
A–5276083, Firth, John Joseph or John Joseph Collins.
A–8031277, Frett, Alice Hilda Maud.
A–7363088, Gianias, Stavroula.
A–7363089, Gianias, Giannoula.
A–8031279, Gramm, Dorothy Noreen or Dorothy Noreen Ray.
A–7244910, Grunberg, Herman or Herman Greenberg.
A–2063373T, Hai, Wong Koon or Wong Shee Tong.
0300–164506, Halberstam, Chaim David.
A–7279436, Handeland, Katherine (nee Geswein).
A–2498890, Hing, Won or Wang Hing Wong.
A–3204928, Hofer, Alexander Karl.
A–3204977, Hofer, Alma Thekla.
A–2994125, Hulungo, Alex.
A–8078869, Jensen, James Bonilla.
T–1496883, Jensen II, James.
T–1496884, Jensen, Lillian.
A–5948272, Jleel, Abdul Rayman.
A–2921239, Jorgensen, Finn Roar.
0300–248929, Karg, Wilhelm Charles or William Charles Karg.
T–79659, Kaufmann, Un Soon (nee Park).
A–8082614T, Kerisiano, Leauga (nee Leauga Manu).
A–7476963, Khan, Awal.
A–9765882, Kobin, John Herbert or John Herbert Kabin.
A–5216277, Kun, Li Ping or Ping Kun Li.
T–1510176, Li, Chow Tze-te or Tze-te Chow Li (nee Chow Tze-te) or Tze-te Chow or May Chow.
A–3511499, Kwai, Liu.
E–2213, Langford, Phillip Jack or Purdy Langford.
A–8155663, Lee, Chia-Ting Chu.
A–3762789, Loo, Yat Kow or Loo Kow.
T–2072606, Lopez-Dias, Carlos.
0300–390568, Louis, Wing Hay or Louis Hay or Louis Wing Hay.
A–1543049, Malarciuc, Nicolai or Nicholas Malarciuk.
A–7251836, Mancuso, Maria (nee Maria Mone).
T–2760837, Maoki, Victor Usaburo.
T–2760155, Maoki, Elena Hitomi.
A–6143979, Maoki, Blanca Sadako.
T–2760157, Maoki, Libia Hideko.
T–2760156, Maoki, Eloy Mitsuo.
T–2672867, Martinez-Gutierrez, Miguel or Luis Martinez, Luis Renteria.
0900/64474, Martinez-Martel, Rosendo.
A–1695687, McDonald, Berl Forbes.
A–6985957, Medina, Virginia Garcia.
A–6502622, Mendes, Manuel Pinto y.
A–2475765, Mileto, Joseph.
A–2118749, Mineshima, Ryotaro or Ryotaro Minejima.
A–1365586, Montero, Manuel Sebastiano or Manuel Montero.
A–8205467, Nappi, Theodore Victor or Teodor Viktor Kos.
A–7915500, Ngow, Kwok Chong.
A–7057299, Pangtay, Concepcion.
0804–5560, Quiroz-Molina, Antonio or Ciro Martinez.
A–9545269, Rial, Francisco Riviero.
A–6149341, Riera, Francisco or Francisco Florentino Rey Riera Y Saborit.
A–7736801, Roderick, Mary Louise Pilon (nee Ladouceur).
A–7736802, Pilon, Harvey Gerard.
T–1956093, Roque, Sylvia Virginia.
0300–419561, Rosanna, Victorio or Victor or Victor Rosonno.
T–1956173, Sanchez-Rodriguez, Eliezar.
T–666954, Sanz, Petra Pardo or Anastasia Pardo Sanz or Anastasia Petra Pardo Sanz or Petra Pardo or Petra Pardo-Sanz.
0606–48862, Sardinas, Jose Penalver y.
T–1892549, Schuon, Marie Gertrud (nee Solomon).
0300–311027, Seidel, Margit.
A–9561973, Shaw, Sau or Saw Ping or Sin Tsan Zou or Zau or Shu Soon Ping or Sha Soon Ping.
A–9692901, Silberberg, Eduard.
E–29695, Soto-Nevares, Luz.
E–29691, Corral-Soto, Efren.
E–29692, Corral-Soto, Ubaldina.
E–29690, Corral-Soto, Arsenio.
A–5211356, Spagnuolo, Carmella Esterine (nee Valentino).
A–5041975T, Symonds, Freda Annette.
T–1510119, Sysmala, John Oskari or Yuho Oskari Sysmalainen.
T–1496866, Takahashi, Kazuyuki.
A–4096539, Takahashi, Yoshinobu or Yoshiharu Ishihara.
0300–396137, Tavarez-Jimenez, Colombina Altagracia.
A–7048753, Taylor, Argie.
A–3623624, Thiara, Bhagat, Singh.
0707–8623, Thompson, Alexander Woodrow or Alexander Reid or Jerema Beckford or Alexander Woodrow Jones.
A–5187721, Thomson, Andrew.
E–40208, Troulinos, Theofrastos.
A–9836727, Tsavolakis, George.
0300–390737, Tung, Wah or Chung Wah or Jung Wa.
A–2708079T, Tyau, Hok Hen Kong (nee Hok Hen Kong).
A–6963120, Vasopoli, Suk Hyun Lee.
E–067382, Vasquez, Bernardo.
T–2626429, Villalobos-Allala, Juan.
A–2440470, Villalobos, Virginia Maria Ontiveros de.
T–1495436, Voropaeff, Victor Paul.
A–7125229, Weiss, Charles or Carol Balan.
T–106482, West, Edda May.
A–8317018, Woolf, Faith Elizabeth (nee Holmes) formerly Young.
A–2947182, Yuen, Kun Choy or Kun Yuen or Yuen Choy.
A–5055232, Adamantopoulos, Theologos V. or Thomas Adams.
A–9776887, Anastassatos, Panaghis.
A–8082615T, Aunu'ua, Itagia.

A-7203341, Bailey, Charles or Phillip Bailey or Phillip Augustus.
A-3536358, Bailey, David.
A-3921778, Ballejo, Juan or Vallejo.
A-6594348, Bendetson, Aaron or Josef Mandel.
0300-234210, Bowen, Lucille (nee Skeete).
A-5730147, Branco, Jose Rodrigues.
0300-394057, Butzalis, Vasilios Theodore or Bill Butzalis.
A-4362095, Cacerea, Hector Edward.
T-2659522, Calascibetta, Francesco.
A-8082529, Capetorto, Giovanni.
A-6650117, Cardenas, Jose formerly Jose Carrillo-Pintor.
A-6650116, Cardenas, Baldomero formerly Baldomero Carrillo-Pintor.
A-3801216, Carlsen, Carl Georg or Karl Georg Karlsen.
A-7469274, Chen, Wen Tsao or W. T. Chen.
A-3390109, Chong, Louie or Chong Louie.
A-6857753, Campean, Ignacio.
0900/61071, Diaz, Carlos Hernandez.
A-4173528, Eng, Jack Gang or Gan Chack Eng.
T-2585527, Fat, Lee Lin or Fred Lee or Lin Fred Lee.
A-8091889, Fernandez, Francisco Avelino Fernandez.
A-4831029, Fillinich, Anthony or Antonio Finilinck.
A-6609410, Foo, Hall John or Hall San Foo or Som Tuk.
E-079904, Forn Olga Rafaela.
T-479520 Frazier, Adelaida Roque or Adelaida Patricia Roque y Santiesteban.
A-9732347, Frederiksen, Karl Frederik.
A-4813522, Garcia, Matias Ponga.
V-963698, Gounaris, Caliroi Spiros (nee Kalogritis).
A-1180097, Hassan, Saedie Ben or Saedie Hassan or Eddie Hassan.
V-928113, Hellenbrand, Maria Josephine or Maria Josephine Costa.
A-5837188, Holmberg, Arthur.
A-9694541T, Janin, Gilbert.
A-4454386, Johansen, Hjalmar or Hyalmer Gulmala Johansen.
A-7222307, Johnson, Maria Grazia or Mary Grazia Restaino (nee La Gala).
A-6097897, Kato, Carlos Magoichi.
A-6139156, Kato, Shizuko.
A-6097891, Kato, Kasumi.
A-6097892, Kato, Kazuo.
A-6075942, Keating, Claretta Sellens.
A-5343310, Koufos, John George, or John Koufor or Ioannis Koufos.
A-2061908, Lakomski, Stanislaus or Stanley Lakomski or John Gumbola or Gumbole.
A-8155662, Lee, Chuan-Hsiang or Leo Lee.
A-7984771, Leong, Him Bo or Yen Leong.
V-754264, Leung, Victoria Hui-Fen Wang or Victoria Wang Leung.
A-7273968, Lombardo, Antonietta (nee Lombardo).
A-8196111, Maderakis, Evaggelos.
A-4386901, Matias, Calikto or Ernesto Matias or Ernesto Ibanez.
A-1294200, McDevitt, Francis J.
0300-355828, McKinney, Alonzo.
A-7439988, McLean, Jonathan Alexander.
A-2955414, Medina-Capeda, Roman.
A-2386280, Meinhardt, Hans.
T-1956166, Medez-Sainz, Martin.
0300-406129, Mun, Tin.
A-6324196, Nicolini, Violet Gladys (formerly White (nee Violet Gladys Peachey).
A-5684909, Niro, Domenic Angelo.
A-5341376, Ohle, Mathilde or Elfriede Ohle.
A-2044457, Okajima, Hisa Takei (nee Takei).
A-3447248, Osmundsen, Olaf Sverre.
A-4551379, Paric, Theodore Bozidar or Natalio Pariz or Nat B. Paric.
V-949897, Perullo, Felicidad Hernandez Rodriguez.
A-1004650, Read, John Patrick.
T-1956176, Rodriguez-Navarro, Eustacio.
A-5353593, Robinson, George Hiram.
A-4273182, Ropero, Mariano Moreno.
A-6819105, Rothberger, Louis or Leiduch.
A-7930630, Safran, Tibor.
V-545024, Sagredo, Gloria B.
0300-408873, Sagredo, Eduardo David.
E-37678, Salinas-Martinez, Eulalio.
A-3938269, Sgambelluri, Carlo Antonio.
V-782635, Shelton, Maria Helena (nee Beckers).
A-7445710, Shoenut, Josephine Mary formerly Smith, Docherty, McLaughlin, Steel, Camerelleri, Schneider or Boyd or Mary McKinley, or Mrs. Earl Coforth (nee Busby).
A-4114054, Simich, Andrew or Andrija Simic.
T-2760220, Singh, Kartara.
A-4981269, Smith, Robert.
A-4941433, Soufarapis, Damianos Thomas.
T-1510249, St. Amand, Marie Anne (nee Poitras).
T-1510250, St. Amand, Edgar or Joseph Edgar Felix.
A-8304554, St. Amand, George or George Cyrille.
A-5270114, Stangeland, Johannes.
A-4471370, Straussman, Yetta (nee Yetta Pepper).
A-3007625, Stuker, Frank or Stucker or Franz Stuker.
A-4780071, Tavares, Antonio Marques.
A-7445938, Toro, Filiberto Ramon del.
A-5059603, Traversoni, Robert Luigi or Luigi Traverso or Alberto Traversone.
0300-325178, Tselentis, Spiros or Spiridon.
1600-101412, Valenzuela, Irma Leija de or Irma Leija Abzave de Valenzuela.
T-1956165, Vasquez-Avila, Cristobal.
A-7457841, Venegaz, Pedro Diaz.
A-5720296, Vernie, Mike.
A-4036455, Williams, Nathaniel Joseph Samuel.
0300/47675, Wilson, Clifford George or Roy George Wilson or Roy Edwards.
A-6624882, Wong, Sung-Yuen.
A-7183457, Yerganian, Elpis Serkos (nee Persou).
A-5719771, Yurko, Anton.
A-2995373, Sakamoto, Rinichi.
T-1499165, Ali, Ahmad Yusaf or Joe Alley.
1411-1484, Alvarado, Juana Gonzalez De.
A-4356461, Angelis, Soterios or Sam Harris.
0300-309207, Antonsen, Halvor.
E-49879, Avera, Eugenia Baiadad or Eugenia Baladad.
A-7802989, Bluehdorn, Fritz Heinrich.
A-5682921, Boettcher, Rudolf Gustav or Rudolf Faust.
0300-289243, Burton, Annegret or Annegret Schaede.
0300-289243, Burton, Gustav Adolf or Gustav Adolf Schaede.
0300-289243, Burton, Walter or Walter Schaede.
A-5612163, Butt, Chan or Chin Butt or Ng Hiwg Dor or Hing Diw Ng.
A-3318221, Calogridis, Theodore Dimitrois.
A-1819770, Cambria, Guiseppe.
A-6526244, Campbell, Lucius Ezekiel or Samuel Campbell.
A-3838658, Cervantez, Ignacio Cota.
0300-311168, Chang, Sheila Liu.
E-16164, Chisholm, John.
A-4083719, Choy, Song or Henry Choy or Choy Song.
T-2760255, Clancy, Ida Espanita.
V-905981, Ciaridad, Angelita Roldan.
V-575941, Concha-Cardenas, Eduardo.
T-2760964, Cortez, Faustino Acevedo.
A-7439858, Cortez-Bedoy, Armando.
0300-407883, Cowan, Morris or Morris Kogan or Moses Cohen.
A-3647357, Cruz, Guadalupe Castillo de or Guadalupe Puebla.
0402/16370, Diaz-Martinez, Jose.
A-6143947, Dodohara, Jitsuo.
A-6143946, Dodohara, Takeno.
A-6143944, Dodohara, Takashi.
A-6143942, Dodohara, Masako.
A-6143945, Dodohara, Tamotsu.
A-6143943, Dodohara, Hiroshi.
E-1225, Downer, Frances Veronica.
A-7805960, Escuton, Aida Lumaque.
A-1809863, Esteves, Joaquim or Jack Stevens.
A-5635045, Fermin, Thomas Joseph or Farmer.
V-339153, Fernandez, Silvio Rafael Almonte or Silvio Almonte.
V-338548, Almonte, Argentina Agustina Peralta De or Argentina Almonte (nee Argentina Agustina Antonia Elena Peralta).
A-5229425, Finch, Arthur Stephen.
T-2760288, Fong, Raymond Poy or Fong Sheu Poy.
A-5190582, Fonoimoana, Toa Gimamao.
A-5190588T, Fonoimoana, Line.
T-2659451, Fortin, Jeannine Marie.
V-162922, Friedle, Galina Marie.
T-2760256, Fulton, Robert Harper.
A-6847783, Fung, Hsien-Shih Yu or Hsien-Shih Yu.
A-1005750, Galvin, Antonia.
A-5799421, Galvin, Lola.
C-6072869, Galvin, Vita.
A-5987747, Garcia, Herman.
T-2760374, Garcia-Jimenez, Carlos.
A-7379730, Garcia-Marquez, Jesus Federico.
A-6006015, Garcia-Sanchez, Francisco.
A-4353149, Gioiello, Vincenzo.
T-609205, Gim, Shirley Li-Ying.
V-922004, Goetz, Walter Andreas.
A-9771442, Goncharoff, Aleksei Nikicith.
A-2380158, Gonzalez-Marcas, Camilo.
E-49880, Guerrero, Manuela Bulosan or Carmen Guerrero Lista.
E-49881, Guerrero, Cierli.
A-7188731, Gutierrez, Antonia.
A-6180693, Gutierrez, Edgardo Calloway.
A-4151737, Haidasch, Eleonora.
A-5821768, Hale, Samuel.
A-5320765, Hansen, Niels Kristian.
A-2181452, Hardy, Charlotte Maud.
A-1478011, Harsi, Oscar Joseph.
0300-398054, Hasim, Abdul.
V-779880, Hing, Archibald Harvey Mah.
T-1956134, Jara, Ramon.
A-6139148, Kamisato, Junken.
A-6139152, Kamisato, Ushi (nee Nakado).
A-6139149, Kamisato, Chieko.
A-6139150, Kamisato, Motoko.
A-6139151, Kamisato, Yasuo.
A-4294896, Katsipis, Evangelos or Angelos Cipas.
V-418197, Kauf, Anastasy Ludwig.
A-9511658, Kew, Chow Ah or Ah Kew Chow.
A-2140784, Klatt, Richard Gottlieb.
A-6804013, Koh, Byung Choll or Byung Soo Koh.
V-904964, Kureen, Ezra Shummail.
V-890211, Kwan, Sung Tao.
A-6763903, Kwoh, Huan-Tsing or Teddy Huan-Tsing Kwoh or Theodore Huan-Tsing Kwoh.
0300-303317, Kwoh, Emily Tzu-Ying or Emily Lu Kwoh or Emily Huan-Tsing Kwoh (nee Emily Tzu-Ying Lu or Tzu-Ying Lu).
T-2760366, Lam, Mee Gim Louie.
T-2760414, Lam, Betty Fung Tan.
0300-361849, Lee, Cy Gum.
A-3711135, Lee, Shue or James Lee.
A-9795338, Lewis, Rufus Emlyn or Michael Sheridan Nolan or Eugene Lewis or Rufus A. Lewis, or Rufus Euguen Sheridan Lewis.
A-6682660, Li, Zen Zuh.
A-7594569, Jen, Li Fong Soon or Soong Jen Fong.
A-3921548, Licon-Carrasco, Ramon.
A-3098631, Licon, Rosenda Rodriguez De.
A-9029164, Ligias, George or Giorge.
A-7539780, Ling, Victoria Kuo-Fen, M. D. or Kuo-Fen Ling or Victoria Rosamond Ling.
A-7444615, Lipschutz, Naftali.
A-6033428, Liu, An-Hwa.
A-6703462, Liu, Ann Ling.
A-7078785, Lopez, Julio Campos.
E-053649, Lopez-Garcia, Aurelio.
E-053650, Olmos-Garcia, Julia.
A-9658696, Lorenzo, Manuel or Manuel Lorenzo Pena.
A-7031302, Louie, Nancy Ma.
A-2933110, Lubrano, Salvatore.
E-44761, Martinez-Rodriguez, Thomas.
E-44762, Martinez-Rodriguez, Efran.
E-15098, McClean, Marion Agatha.

A-7177875, Meeks, Reginald Victor.
T-1497353, Miau, Charles S. C. or Shau Chong Miau.
A-3423342, Miller, John Constantine.
A-8196566, Monserrate, Martha (nee Leon).
A-8065219, Montes-Gonzales, Agustin.
A-6385639, Montes-Gonzalez, Alfonso.
A-6877589, Montoya, Miguel.
E-064649, Mora-Anguiano, Juan.
A-7093002, Muinelo, Luis Antonio Ortiz y.
A-2674257, Nunez, Rosenda Parra de.
T-2760197, Ngiam, Hai or Giam Sim Hai.
A-2031943, Nye, Gladys Catherine or Catherine Goodwin Nye.
V-889494, Orloff, Ivan Y.
A-3599586, Panton, Leslie Alexander.
T-2760250, Paolitto, Francesco Antonio.
0300-387233, Pedone, Paolo or Pablo.
V-435793, Pierce, Maria de Jesus Romero de.
T-2760318, Piretta, Battista.
A-6255887, Quispel, Jan Dirk or John Quispel.
A-5607811, Radich, Anton.
A-2399682, Radovcic, Felicijo or Philip Radovcic or Felicilo Radovcic or Philip Radovich or Filip Radovcic.
A-2028988, Rau, Willi.
A-5296696, Rodrigues, Domingos.
0900/41539, Rodriquez, Jorge Sanchez.
A-7240348, Rojas, Rogelio.
A-7240349, Rojas, Jaime.
A-1151154, Rubio, Alberto.
A-5536719, Sahlberg Olga Emilia.
0300-239870, Samaras, Fanoula.
A-5738547, Sanders, Constance Sophie (nee Howell).
T-1499170, Sanen, John Joseph.
A-7739679, Sang, Leung Mun.
T-1495423, Santana, Helen Alvarez.
A-3870550, Scala, Eduardo.
A-5040491, Schmidt, Mary Ann or Maureen Schmidt.
V-169425, Sehkon, Balwant Kaur.
A-5600896, Selak, George.
E-49911, Shee, Tang Seto.
A-4408554, Shek, Too or Shek Too or Do Dick.
A-8190870, Sikoutris, Michael Pericles.
A-9634473, Silvestre, Julio P.
0502-6579, Simsuangco, Enriqueta Vera or Sims.
A-5602759, Smet, Frans De or Frank De Smet.
A-6171155, Spencer, George McDonald.
A-4648310, Sum, Yip.
A-5967444, Takamura, Kiichiro.
0300-270370, Tchang, Paul, Kiakong.
0300-304548, Tchang, Rose Sui-Hwa (nee Sun).
T-141777, Te'o, Vaioleti Senine Kipeni or Senine Kipeni Te'o or Vaioleti Senine.
A-9245354, Teodosio, Lucio Guardino.
A-7178754, Terashita, Takeshi or Takeshi Matsuno or Yoshikazu Nozari or Jerry Nozaki.
0900/59013, Trejo, Estevan Sandoval.
A-4809136, Trencher, Rose or Rose Grand or Rose Rand.
E-067383, Trillo-Rodriguez, Apolonio.
A-3875034, Tsuchiya, Yoshiyuki.
A-6964557, Unger, Harry.
A-4448158, Vasquez, Placida DeMara de.
A-2033999, Vastarelli, Antonio or Antonio Vastarelle or Antonio Vastarella or Antonio Concetto Vasterelle or Antonio V. Concetta.
A-7469183, Villasenor, Raymundo.
A-7469184, Villasenor, Antonio Espino.
T-1497306, Villasenor, Maria Teresa.
T-1956097, Wang, Chien-San.
A-4936295, Whitney, Chapman Swain.
A-3693064, Wing, Syd Shiu or Sydney Wing-Shiu Wing Sit.
A-6353566, Winn, Alicia Feria.
A-7975202, Wisdom, Leon Lloyd.
T-2760413, Wong, Ding Kow or Angie Wong.
0704-4684, Wong, Helen Ai-Len.
T-2760303, Yamaguchi, Sumi.
E-49883, Yap, Joseph Fook On.
A-9533022, Yee, Ah.
1200-37259, Yee, Wong How or Wong Hom Lee or Yee Nam Gim.
1209-10307, Sing, Yee Loy.
A-9764943, Younus, Sheik Mohammed or John or Johenie Younus or Mohn Younus.
E-1313, Yudgudis, Antanas or Yuodgudis or Juodgudis or Anthony Yuga.
T-1495362, Adachi, Katsuhiko.
T-2783971, Adamec, Anton.
A-9801454, Ahmed, Nazir Uddin.
T-2670509, Ajolo, Eufemia or Encarnacion delos Santos or Eufemia Torio or Encarnacion Dela Rosa (nee Eufemia Bongolan).
T-2670511, Ajolo, Jimmy Jesus or Jesus Torio.
T-2670508, Ajolo, Leatrice Socorro or Socorro Torio.
T-2670510, Ajolo, Virginia or Virginia Torio or Filipina Delos Santos.
A-2384775, Baboura, Theodoros Nicolaos or Teddy Babouras.
1600-100879, Baustian, Carol Mary (nee Fergus).
A-3949927, Blyden, Ina Eudgenia.
V-749701, Bortolini, Pietro.
A-1578365, Bruneau, Therese Beatrice (nee Sevigny).
1515/1271, Bryan, Ruth or Galon.
A-6228522, Camporeale, Anastasio or Anastasia Camporeale Di Gennaro (nee Degenaro).
A-6314501, Carmona, Dolores.
A-3746465, Carregal-Rey, Juan or Jose Carregal Rey.
A-7445878, Charles-Tello, Pedro.
A-7445885, Charles, Marta Dominguez De.
A-9691860, Chevat, Vincent or Chebat or Vincente Chebat or Vincente Nicholas Chebat.
A-5347260, Chianello, Michele.
A-3981732, Chun, Wei Foo or William Chun.
T-1807527, Ciota, Odoardo.
A-5807143, Coster, Conrad.
A-5207735, Crose, Anton or Anton Cross.
A-6223744, Davies, James.
E-2210, Delano, Nora Bertha Hortensia (nee Migliorati).
T-1965175, Drew, Anne Lillian.
A-6362604, Ergas, Ronald Jonathan.
A-3396218, Faber, Josefa (nee Josefa Hutton) or Sophie Faber or Sophie Koehler.
A-3269360, Fink, Nathan.
A-4139678, Firt, Ching or Fat Chong or Chaing Fat.
A-4652050T, Fonoimoana, Mataniu Api or Mataniu Api Tuia.
A-1593703, Franz, Kurt Erwin Otto.
A-5305997, Friedrich, Josefa (nee Riesnhuber) formerly Mentboer.
A-5370523, Gamero, James Pacheco or Santiago Pacheco.
A-5967239, Ganiko, Yaju or Uaju or Jorge Ganiko.
T-209484, Gomez, Francisco Andres or Francisco Gomez or Frank A. Gomez.
A-9798375, Gonzales, Jesus.
A-5327663, Gonzales, Rita Garcia (nee Pivaral Perez).
A-5597777, Gottschalk, Walter or Harry Gottschalk.
V-427436, Grace, Vilma Carlota.
A-6421287, Grinblat, Israel David.
V-126592, Hernandez, Herlinda Pena (nee Herlinda Pena-Garcia).
A-6097844, Honda, Fujie.
A-3078969, Jacobsen, Arthur Conrad or Arthur Jacobsen.
A-6427473, Jadulang, Cresencia Casel or Dolores Mangligot Labangcop.
A-4007834, Jan, Chin.
A-1012212, Johansen, Ejnar or Einer or Ejnai.
0707-9127, Karnavas, Nicolaos or Nick.
A-4491759T, Katz, Bertha.
A-9135882, Kiviroski, Eino.
A-7284985, Kohn, Josef.
A-6830546, Kotakis, Dimitriyos Anastas or Dimitrios A. Kotakis.
T-2760962, Levy, Remedios Cisneros.
0300-251666, Lombardi, Giovanna (nee Giovanna Nardone).
A-4550888, Lopez, Carmen or Carmen Gonzalez Lopez or Emilia Ida Boan.
A-2078340, Lorentzen, Sven Reidar or Sven Lorentzen.
A-4460992, Lum, Ming Yick or Ming Lum or Ming Y. Lum or Eddie Lum.
A-7445275, Lumbreras-Martinez, Miguel.
A-7445555, Lumbreras, Santos Araujo de.
A-7317594, Malar, Pawlo.
0300-280376, Malek, Herman.
0300-280374, Malek, Ligalla (nee Ella Taub).
E-43839, Martinez, Macaria Lara De or Macaria Lara.
A-7445309, Martinez-Siaz, Federico.
0300-277019, Mathes, Shalom.
T-1807526, Medina-Maris, Bernardino or Epitacio B. Medina.
A-7858263, Minguez, Jose Santamaria.
V-353648, Molina, Pas Gonsalez De.
E-901100, Montalvo-Saldivar, Sigifredo.
E-901101, Montalvo, Celestina Gonzalez de.
E-059642, Andrade-Gonzalez, Jose Refugio.
A-3643693, Mosrie, Abbes Joseph Hamed or Abbes Joseph Hamed.
A-6153103, Naganuma, Iwaichi.
A-6153102, Naganuma, Isoka.
A-6153098, Naganuma, Kiyoka.
A-6153100, Naganuma, Kazumi.
A-6153096, Naganuma, Sumika.
A-6153095, Naganuma, Kazuchigue.
A-6153097, Naganuma, Kazaharu.
A-6153099, Naganuma, Kazumi Julia Cesar.
A-5967437, Nakagawa, Yoshio.
A-6096818, Nakagawa, Kazuo or Julio Caesar Kazuo Nakagawa.
A-6153160, Nakasone, Katsujiro.
A-6153159, Nakasone, Makato.
A-6153158, Nakasone, Mitsuko.
A-5977610, Oyakawa, Yoshitatsu.
A-6153194, Oyakawa, Yae or Yae Miyagi-Oyakawa.
V-644957, Pasdermadjian, Bedros.
A-4829891, Pasetorek, Stepan.
A-5674937, Pollock, Ann Boyce or Ann Pollock.
E-052544, Pozo-Olaez, Jose Manuel Bernardino Del.
A-2623497, Ramirez-Vega, Jose.
A-6943413, Reilly, Frances Lilian or Persighetti.
E-901031, Rodriguez-Chavez, Alfonso.
E-901032, Rodriguez, Maria Luisa Patino De.
A-4831958, Schaller, Ellen or Ellen Ljungdael (nee Scharf).
0300-294420, Shan, Dong Ah.
E-49909, Shee, Chu Mark.
A-5190552, Sophas, Merietha Antoinette or Merietha Lucinda Martin.
A-1667289T, Sullivan, Michael.
A-7295723, Sung-Kao, Chang Daniel or Su Yuen Chang.
A-3408081, Weber, Paul or Nikandr Z. Gaidukevich.
V-351314, Wei, Peter Hsieng Lien or Wei Hsing Lien.
V-369382, Wei, Pearl Y. C. Shu or Pearl Yu Chin Shu Wei.
0300-268430, Westley, Fiorella Nannini.
A-3944758, Yow, Chow Ling.
A-4398933, Zimmerman, Dorothy C. or Dorothy Giffen (nee King).
A-8317033, Abair, Lillian Gates.
T-1496079, Aguilar-Castillo, Jose Rodrigo.
T-2760375, Albright, Angeles.
T-2760228, Alderman, Edith Victoria.
0900/39366, Amezcua, Joaquin Suarez or Adolph Veseslada Soris or Robert V. Soria.
A-5306991, Arnes, John.
A-6726982, Ascencio-Garcia, Salvador.
A-5116120, Backman, Sybil.
A-2121297, Baratto, Lydia or Lidia Olivia Baratto or Lydia Menconi.
T-2760267, Barcellone, Ferdinando.
0300-257969, Berndt, Carl Albert Werner.
V-469367, Bien, Charles Wan-Nien.
A-7439148, Bonetti, Gaspare.
0900-65092, Brenco, Guglielmo.
T-1496857, Broadfoot, George Turford.
T-1497380, Browne, Adrian Santa Maria.

A-7197527, Buranis, Polyxeni Dimitriu (nee Badaliarou).
A-5909674, Carstens, Heinrich Harry or Heinrich Harry Carstens Schreiner or Henry Carstens or Heinrich Carstens or Harry H. Schreiner.
0300-264869, Celli, Domenico.
T-1760404, Chang, Hou-Chun.
T-1760405, Chang, Lan-Chuen Chen.
A-9508683, Chang, Wah Tsai.
A-2520258, Chao, Ming Chung or Chao Ming or Ming Kee.
A-4995256, Chester, Arthur Percy or Pearcey Chester.
T-2671920, Chu, Ah Dong or Ah Tsu Dong.
T-2760321, Cleope, Francisco Villegas.
A-9833810, Coelho, Carlos Valentin.
T-1495426, Conde, Edward Marcelus.
T-1495427, Conde, Isabel Laura.
A-9579506, Contreras, Victor Nicasio.
T-1499175, Cortez, Alberto.
V-38991, Cricelli, Rose or Rose Forlano.
A-6361065T, Cruz, Alipio De La or Alipio Tacot.
A-9621936, Czaplak, Jozef Stanislaw or Joseph Stanley Czaplak.
V-304963, Ducay, Livinia Causin.
A-5455408, Duffin, Ella Marie.
0300-418529, Edwards, George.
0300-217040, Fanouriakis, Manthos.
A-4565335, Feldman, Minnie.
A-7596984, Ferrer, Pierre Benoit.
0707-7449, Filipschi, Lucian.
T-1496084, Fitch, May Gertrude.
E-49013, Flores, Angelina Martinez De.
23-109884, Flores-Hernandez, Andres or Andrew Flores.
A-7863939, Flynn, Rosemary Dale.
A-3743395, Fook, Ng.
T-938080, Gadiot, Hulda Ruth.
A-1727782, Gaspar, Joseph.
V-581720, George, Constantina Thomas or Constantina John Thomas or Constantina J. Thomas.
A-6728271, Gluckselig, Elfriede.
A-6038750, Graham, John Lionel.
A-4637839, Guilherme, Augusto.
V-905641, Hale, Anthony.
A-5712360, Hamberis, Ioannis Andreas or George Sarris.
A-7284226, Hartwell, Marie Augusta (nee Joseph).
A-6089779, Hayner, Beatrice Baylon or Beatrice Libre Baylon.
A-1430048, Hrycak, Nellie or Nancy or Chrycak or Nellie Struck or Krondat.
A-5964211, Jacobi, Manfred.
A-5678422, Jones, William John.
E-49903, Jong, Susan Kong Suet (nee Susan Kong Suet Taam).
0300-419718, Joy, Yip or Yip Joy Sen or Yip Yiu or Yew or Jose Yat.
V-1598512, Karm, Aino (nee Rannamees).
A-3600259, Katsatos, Christos Demetriou or Christophores D. Gachos.
A-3809343, Kaufman, Morris or Maurice Kaufman or Meiser Koffman.
A-5902096, Kramis, Salim.
A-3989023, Klock Eugene.
A-9765829, Kosticki, Walter Wladyslaw or Kostecki.
A-1151409, Latiff, Roslie or Roslie Lattif.
A-1151583, Lattanzi, Bertha or Bertha Vogel Lattanzi or Bertha Josephine Vogel or Bertha Josephine Engelberger.
A-7897636, Lauser, Demetria D.
A-9556543, Lee, Shu Fong or Chu Fou.
T-2760411, Leong, Lum or Lam Leung.
0300-6859, Lepp, Boris.
T-2760270, Leung, Yuk Chung.
T-2760963, Levy, Marcel Rene.
A-9701850, Limanis, Oscar Valdenar.
A-2793099T, Lindstrom, Gustav Herman.
0400-47422, Lipson, Rebecca.
A-7041422, Lorenz, John Clarence.
A-6063032, MacGavin, William Ramon.
A-6718350, Mamatos, Stella (nee Virirakis).
V-890076, Kwai, Choo Tung Yuk or Choo Quai Fong.
T-2672866, Man, Choo Chee.
A-9765402T, Manof, Abdul or Abdul Manaf or Abdul Monof.
A-7363576, Marshall, Genevieve Marie Ghislaine (nee Lebrun).
A-1810027, Martinovich, Miljenko or Mel Anton Martin.
A-8021376, Martins-Batista, Jose.
A-9545588, Mavraganis, Dimigrios John.
A-5028090, McBrien, Mary Joseph or Mary Joseph Devany or Catherine Devaney.
A-1251408, Meraz-Flores, Julio.
0400/46404, Miller, Byron George.
A-6153063, Miyahira, Setsuko.
A-6153064, Miyahira, Tetsuo.
A-6153061, Miyahira, Emiko.
A-6153062, Miyahira, Tadashige.
A-6153065, Miyahira, Tadanobu.
A-2166140, Mon, Tse Gin.
A-6420372T, Mou-Lai, Morley or Morley L. or Morley Lai Cho or Morley Cho.
A-6183755T, Chow, Nancy Chow or Yinya Chos Cho.
A-7427570, Mueller, Robert.
A-7583122, Naef, Elizabeth.
T-2760827, Nakano, Hiroto or James.
T-2760217, Nakashoji, Yaichi or Frank Nakashoji.
A-2100540, Ng, Yuk Lin.
A-5773780, Nipp, Frank Lung.
A-7129706, Ogata, Akiko.
A-6185233, Onaga, Yoshihiko.
A-6185234, Onaga, Yuki.
A-6185235, Onaga, Yoshinori.
0900/64265, Ordaz-Velasquez, Rafael.
A-8259845T, Owens-Orjas, Sergio Orlando or Lino Garcia or Orlando Owens.
A-8134559, Pascua, Teodora Lagasca Inovejas or Petra Padua Faraon.
E-050405, Pena, Justo L.
A-7945407, Petersen, Sven Edvard.
A-6708954, Picariello, Dora (nee Villani).
A-7371644, Plumeri, Rosina (nee Plumeri).
T-1497350, Poy, Chow Gum or Sam Poy Low.
A-5645701, Primis, Angeline Paul.
A-9633972, Radovic, Sime.
E-050431, Rarangol, Nicanora Borromeo or Nicanora B. De Guzman.
A-5647947, Montanez, Rosa Raya.
T-1497429, Raya-Cerda, Beatrice.
A-1479617, Raymond, Ross.
A-5953803, Reynaldo, Juanito Romo.
A-4049057, Rodriguez, Daphne Lherisson.
T-1496060, Rodriguez, Juan J.
E-49073, Rodriguez-Flores, Evarardo.
T-1499176, Rodriguez-Larra, Oscar.
A-3452771, Rosen, Issie.
A-3400715, Rosen, Celia (nee Izon) or Sylvia Eison or Anna Gross.
T-2760298, Ruiz, Jesus Gonzalez.
A-4658895, Sacco, Emilio.
A-2984012, Sam, Yuen Chen Shee Chun Ah.
A-4503538, Sassano, Vincenzo.
T-1495434, Seoane, Frank Rocha.
E-49913, Shee, Tai Ling or Yuen Kyau Ling.
A-8227444, Soong, Ts Liung or John Soong.
A-4386630, Soong, Maying (nee Hsi).
A-1211143, Tadano, Takeo or Frank Tadano.
A-5343419, Tamm, Benita Marie.
T-141894, Taulalii, Eneleata.
A-5214225, Taube, Ester Amalia formerly Markkanen (nee Rasanen).
A-4931821, Ting, Robert Ung-Mah.
V-371424, Tom, Share Gum or Kenneth Tom.
A-7445935, Toro, Francisco Ramon-del.
A-6211861, Torres, Fortuna Orta De or Fortuna Horta.
A-3780431, Tripodi, Rosario.
A-4089056, Turner, Robert Weir.
A-7457016, Valle, Piera Maria or Gorini.
E-33543, Valoria, Theresa Garcia.
T-1496093, Vasquez, Josefa M.
0400/39400, Veneziale, Antimo.
A-3084937, Vieyra-Cuellar, Manuel.
T-1497431, Watanabe, Hyakujiro.
A-2696512, Westphalen, Harry or Harry Weston.
A-0901246, Wing, Ah or Huang Hui Hsien or Wong Hui Hsien.
T-2760361, Wong, Joong Seu Chin.
A-6851479, Yang, Yuan-Hsi.
A-6851670, Yang, Stella Chih Hsin.
A-9700101, Yee, Wong.
T-2760965, Yoshida, Tatsuki.
E-49905, Young, Ngan Nung (nee Ngan Nung Lee).
A-3023901, Yue, Kwok John.
V-371425, Tom, Bee Hall.
0300-400109, Johansen, Eilif Mainert.
0500-42905, Pelaez, Eusebio.

SUSPENSION OF DEPORTATION OF CERTAIN ALIENS—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, from the Committee on the Judiciary, I report an original concurrent resolution, favoring the suspension of deportation of certain aliens, and I submit a report (No. 941) thereon.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The report will be received, and the concurrent resolution will be placed on the calendar.

The concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 61) was placed on the calendar, 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-49889, Abrahano, Rhody Mangaser (nee Rhody Maglaya Mangaser).
A-2556502, Acker, Leon or Judah Leib Acker.
A-6427474T, Agatol, Vicenta Tabisola.
A-2085023, Amoignon, Alexis.
A-7983435, Aycart, Jose Guillermo Le Blano y aka Jose Franquiz.
T-2672042, Barrera-Hernandez, Pedro.
A-5395297, Beltran, Fulgencio alias Joe Baltran.
A-1531635, Berger, Emma alias Emma Giacomelli.
A-4363509, Best, Albert Augustus or Albert Best.
A-7357996, Braga, Maria Etelvina Silva.
A-4697469, Brown, Madge.
T-2760280, Bun, Hong.
V-1250373, Cadora, Nameh Yusuf.
A-6382873, Carpio, Teodoro Obispo.
A-7350909, Carugati, Eraldo.
A-7350910, Carugati, Minerva (nee Faini).
T-1892648, Carvallo, Eladio Aris alias Eladio Aris.
A-7849504, Casavecchia, Faliero.
A-7044481, Castaneda, Javier or Javier Castaneda-Simental.
A-7044036, Castaneda, Ramona Lopez de.
A-7350892, Castillo, Hortencia Agor.
A-3292453, Cavallaro, Oreste.
A-1676510, Chen, Louis alias Chen Yon alias Yun Choy.
T-2760305, Chang, Chung Kuei.
A-9103566, Chang, Tom alias Chang Tack.
T-2760268, Chin, Sang.
A-4587736, Chiu, Gin-Hsing alias Chiu Gin Hsing.
E-49884, Chong, Kwai Yuen.
A-7399966, Chow, Hilary Gath (nee Hilary Gath).
A-6531339, Christ, Aspasia or Aspacia Christ or Aspasia Roata.
0300-67259, Clark, Frank Wesley or Frank Clark.
A-9776939, Colli, Vittorio alias Vittorio Mario Carlo Colli.
V-172600, Costa, Angela Aurora or Angela Aurora di Oliveira.
99591/618, Costa-Pereira, Jose da.
A-4435468, Cueneo, Carolina (nee Temacnini).
A-7978966T, Cyarvides, Feliciano Rafael Soto y.

V-906057, Dowell, Milagros E.
A-5345903, Dromi, Rose Maria aka Rose Marie Silipo or Carmelina Davello.
A-3402603, Eichin, Fred Wilhelm.
A-5687748, Eilers, Oscar.
T-1367776, Elauria, Ernesto.
E-33540, Ellis, May Louise.
T-290200, Engbrecht, Henry.
V-1412443, Escobar, Gustavo Jose.
T-2760292, Escueta, Melvin Dangilon.
T-2760291, Escueta, Rosadia Dangilon.
T-2760261, Faraguna, Frank Leo.
A-5993552, Ferrari, Luis Antonio.
T-2760381, Fung, George.
0300-146405, Garcia, Felix Crespo Y or Jose Estrada.
T-2760274, Garcia, Juan Melendez.
A-5987724, Garcia, Julio Cesar.
A-5987649, Garcia, Angela Perdomo.
A-5987746, Garcia, Elvia Maria.
A-5987742, Garcia, Oscar Rolando.
A-5987744, Garcia, Lydilia Angela.
T-2760398, Ghibaud, Ferdinand.
V-1194629, Giacomo, Pepe Filipo Di.
2272-P-25220, Gjuricic, Milan or Milos Gjuricic or Gjurich or Mike Gurick alias Stephan Vukerich.
E-086874, Gong, William Wing Jung.
T-2760317, Grossenbacher, Rachel M.
A-6029512, Haanraadts, Jacobus Aukelinus Hendrikus or Jack Haanraadts.
T-2760175, Hata, Fukakichi.
A-4797435, Hecke, Joseph Louis Van.
T-1496068, Hernandez, Victor.
T-2760284, Hill, Cecil Thomas.
A-5964006, Hlus, Alexander or Klus or Kluss.
T-1496088, Hoh, George Lok-Kwong.
T-676677, Hom, Toy Kim Chin or Chin Toy Kim or Hom Toy Kim.
0300-424284, Housey, Isabell or Elizabeth Hunter.
A-3916245, How, Quang alias Quang, Willie.
E-33529, Hwa, Woo Chiang.
E-33528, Woo, Lily Lee.
E-49266, Ibarra-Garcia, Jose Trinidad.
E-49268, Delgadillo-Ibarra, Maria Jesus aka Maria Jesus Delgadillo de Ibarra.
E-49268, Ibarra-Delgadillo, Jose Refugio.
E-49269, Ibarra-Delgadillo, Rafael.
E-49270, Ibarra-Delgadillo, Maria Guadalupe.
A-7483636, Iorio, Giuseppe Di or Joe Di Iorio or Joseph Di Iorio.
T-2760376, Jarroni, Giovanni.
0300-291057, Johnson, Clara (nee Isidore).
0707-7767, Kadas, Ilona Rozalia (nee Papp).
T-2760229, Kan, Wai Lum.
A-4762794, Karamatzanis, Diamantis Nicholas alias Diamond N. Tzanis.
A-1302620, Kelly, Louise Renee nee Boistart alias Louise Boacy alias Louise Piermattei or Piermattes.
A-8190821, Kemble, William.
T-2760162, Kimura, Teiko.
A-5365304, Klingstrom, Sven Adolf.
A-5364316, Kosik, Joseph or Koshek, alias Joe Hoffman or Joe Singer.
E-061206, Kshivda, Antoni or Krzywda.
A-6311232, Kwan, Elise aka Meu-Tshung Kwan.
A-6173423, Kwan, Kwo-Chun aka Fred Kwan.
T-1496880, Lee, Yue Shuen.
A-2330928, Lecanda, Angel.
T-1506099, Leith, Anne J. (nee Kavanaugh).
T-1892045, Leung, George Git or Leung Sun Git.
A-4743447, Li, Wu Wei or Wu Li Wei.
A-6618327, Lilley, Marion Elvia formerly Marion Elvia Bron.
A-5886736, Lopez-Nunez, Antonio alias Manuel Ful.
A-7469723, Louie, Huana Wan Hsing.
T-2761994, Luca, Sebastiano De.
A-7350805, Madden, Barbara Evelyn or Barbara Evelyn McCauley (nee May).
A-6363939, Mantele, Aurora.
A-8025125, Marce, Arthur Alfred Joseph De.
T-2760265, Markoulakis, Evangelos Gregoriou.
0300-395196, Martinez-Morino, Jose Manuel or Manuel Vasqula, or Manuel Rodriguez, or Manuel Vasquas.
A-2589768, Meder, Eduard or Edward Meder.
A-4882730, Meneghelli, Rudolph alias Rudolph Louis.
A-9115959, Michkovitch, Alexandre alias Aleksander Miskovic.
0300-352660, Miller, Avril Anne or Avril Morais Nunez.
A-1096835, Moeva, Massillie or Jack Moeva.
V-537852, Mojica, Carlota.
T-1892728, Monde, Anne Marie or Anne Marie Monde Delgado.
1519/331, Mora Concepcion Fierro De.
1519/332, Carrillo-Fierro, Luis.
0300-286669, Murray, John.
1501-18468, Musleh, Jiries Musleh or Misleh Mislen or George Misleh.
A-4480024, Naungayan, Perfecta Inigo.
A-1385073, Newman, Asmus Bernard or Asmus Newmann or Newman alias Charles B. Newman.
A-5437110, Olausson, Carl Maurits alias Carl Maurits Leonard Olausson.
A-9764604, Palma, Biruta Blumentals, formerly Palmashuk (nee Biruta Blumentals).
A-8117171, Patsaros, Georgeos.
T-2760308, Patten, Remedios Van.
A-2874053, Perez, Antonio Fernandez.
2078/006, Quai, Moy Dong alias Jimmy Moy or Dan Moy.
A-5030148, Rano, Alfonso or Alfonso Ranous or Ranois.
T-2672868, Rashed, Jimmy.
A-3527227, Rembeci, Nasi P. or Athanas P. Vassiliau, or Muharen Nuri.
A-4398706, Rodriguez, Leodegario or Manuel Fernandez.
A-6758242, Rotberg, Lucien Syman.
0900-60515, Sabala, Jesus Villagomez.
T-2760200, Saeonin, Jim.
A-5994386, Salamone, Antonino or Antonio Salamone or Anthony Salamone.
A-6341307, Salmon, Helen Louise (nee Burns).
A-6112565, Santana, Jose Munoz alias Jose Santana Munoz.
A-4354018, Schmidt, Margaret.
A-5310349, Schmidt, Mathias.
A-7669705, Seamon, Gabriella Hecko or Seaman.
A-4991814, Seidler, Herman Paul.
A-4760223, Shee, Wong or Wong See or Wong Hay Zou.
A-6650207, Sidat-Singh, Grace or Grace Bissessar.
A-2243051, Simonias, Miroslav.
T-1892453, Smith, Iva Calvina.
A-4933092, Spitzner, Hans Nicholas or Nicolaus Spitzner or Johann Spitzner or Hans Spitzner.
A-5677642, Steinberger, Joseph Frank.
0707-K-7565, Stricko, Joseph.
A-7180914, Striek, Andrew William.
A-3809056, Torres-Reyes, Castulo Calixto.
A-2737956, True, Raymond.
A-5619226, Urahama, Tokuji.
A-9548130T, Vazques, Julio Aneiros or Julio Aniros or Julio Anniros Vazquez.
T-2760259, Vecchiardo, Giuseppe or Joe Wechiardo.
A-1489618, Venetiou, Stamatios or Stamatif or Steve or Stamatis.
A-9520413, Verginakis, George or Georges Konstantinos Verginakis.
T-1495337, Villanueva, Montano.
A-4302985, Vlahopoulas, Spiros.
V-772159, Warner, Johanna Maria.
A-6508749, Weinman, Leib or Leib Samuel or Leiv Seiman or Louis Weinman.
A-6216464, Wolinska, Alicia.
A-7415212, Wong, May I-Tseng Liang.
E-4645, Wong, Yong or Wong Yong.
T-1495435, Yasuda, Sei.
A-6096833, Yoda, Masao.
A-6154842, Yoda, Masuko.
A-6444688, Young, Andrew Gock.
T-1864515, Acoba, Marcela Ballesteros or Sabina Sagario Agas.
V-1572652, Aguirre, Maria Trinidad (nee Maria Trinidad Arana y Arrien).
T-2760290, Aksel, Ferdi Abdurrahman.
A-3717046, Alli, John.
V-248194, Avanche, Cynthia Alfonso.
0900-45346, Balagot, Reuben Castillo.
0900-45347, Balagot, Lourdes Ramirez.
T-1496407, Bandon, Frederick or Ferdinand Pantin.
T-2760674, Banegas, Mary Socorro-de La Cruz de.
A-7476997, Benito, Purificacion Martin de or Purificacion Martin-Buted.
T-2760655, Bermudez, Antonio Gomez.
E-057378, Chan, Him or Harry Chan.
A-4873451, Chikourias, Constantinos or Gus Chikas.
0707-8538, Chin, Thomas or Chin Wing or Chin Ming Horn.
A-7445517, Colunga-Olmos, Agustin.
A-7445503, Colunga, Concepcion Ayala De.
1409-14928, Colunga-Ayala, Jose.
1409-14929, Colunga-Ayala, Carlos.
1409-14930, Colunga-Ayala, Tomas.
T-2760673, Cruz, Victoriana De La Torre De La.
A-4735334, Cumella, Calogera (nee Marotta or Pietra Napoli).
A-3632610, Chang, Willie S. or Sze Ah Chung.
A-8262069, Cunha, Joao Gomes Da.
0300-421329, Cutler, Toba or Tau ba Cotler or Esther Tobe Chazin.
A-6931316, Davila, Pedro.
T-2598701, Davila-Hernandez, Jesus.
E-059669, Delgado-Morales, Raymundo.
E-059670, Delgado-Escamilla, Benito.
A-7450951, Dzanetatos, Evangelos.
A-1756596, Erzen, Cevdet Ali or Joe Erzen.
A-7604153, Estrella, Maria Velasco.
A-3327384, Flores, Jesus Olmos de.
A-3327383, Flores-Flores, Luis.
A-3998928, Flores-Olmos, Ramon.
1600-102095, Flores-Olmos, Maria.
A-3957794, Fong, Yong.
A-7391994, Franco-Gonzalez, Jesus.
A-7049530, Garcia-Leon, Domingo or Domingo Leon-Garcia.
A-8017191, Garrison, Dorothy (nee Chase).
A-6774257, Ghandi Sorab Khushro.
A-3709183, Giglio, Nicolino.
T-1496783, Glenfield, Robert.
T-1495424, Gobbo, Ubaldo.
T-2760378, Goitia, Victoriano Abadia or Victor Abadia.
A-5417727, Gomez, Gerardo Valcarcel y or Gerardo Valcarcel.
E-085755, Greenspan, Mollie.
T-2760367, Gucho-Gonzalez, Guadalupe.
T-2760368, Gucho-Gonzalez, Mary Luch Nunez.
A-3560032, Gustavsen, Gustav Bertin.
V-304441, Hernandez, Jesus Barbaza.
E-33805, Hoy, Lee.
A-6033460, Hu, Sien-Tsin.
A-6033467, Hu, Kwan-Ting Chow.
A-8031586, Hua, Ming Young or Meng Young Hua.
0300-346875, Jack, Eng Foon or Foon Jack Eng or Jack Eng or Foon or Foon Jack.
A-7399354, Jiminez-Nunez, Margarita or Margarita Jiminez de Ramos.
A-3687538, Kannengieser, Anna or Anna Daskovski.
A-6963271, Kaprielian, Mardiros or Marco Kaprielian.
T-1496057, Kutz, Emery.
A-9948102, Landeira, Alvaro Pereira Y.
A-9687378, Law, Yam or Law Yam.
A-4892545, Lew, Tai or Lew Share Tai.
T-2760412, Look, Shee Chan or Chan Shee Look.
0900/59540, Lopez, Juanita Garcia.
T-1496848, Lopez-Becerra, Fidencio.
A-8258789, Lopez-Salazar, Melesio.
T-2760102, Lu, Sung Nien.
T-2760103, Lu, Yu Lan Chen.
A-9553451, Marinkovich, Anton.
A-6615646, Marquez, Carlos Ramos.
A-8151362, Ramos, Maria Antonia (nee Abraira).
A-8117703T, Martinez-Garcia, Jose Antioco or Jose Martinez-Garcia or Jose Garcia or Jose M. Garcia.

A-4070522, Masciana, Vincenzo.
T-2760285, Meeuwisse, Gerardus Antonius Maria.
A-2544775, Mets, Julius.
A-6588576, Micelli, Anna or Anna Montella.
A-5209113, Mirna, Walther Maria Heinrich or Theodore Victor Roelof-Lanner.
T-1496078, Moreno-Sandoval, Pedro.
A-5968747, Nivon, Carmen Yglesias De.
A-7966216, O'Young, William Hui.
A-6928242, Partida-Gama, Francisco.
E-14051, Patterson, Johanna Wilhelmina.
0300/418126, Powell, Calvin Emanuel or Calvin E. Powell or Calvin Powell or Donald Wendell Powell or Donald W. Powell or Donald Powell.
0804-7471, Ramirez-Rivero, Alfonso.
A-4441999, Ramos, Antonio Munoz.
A-4944359T, Regueria-Rodrigues, Joaquim.
E-13051, Reina-Cisneros, Marcello Julio or Marcello J. Reina.
A-1789812, Riemer, Gyorgy or George Riemer.
A-6719005, Robertson, James.
A-6958054, Rosales-Silva, Inocencio.
A-6958052, Rosales, Rosa Maria.
E-48433, Rubio, Guadalupe Murillo De or Guadalupe Muro De Rubio.
A-7863925, Salazar-Gomez, Daniel or Daniel Gomez-Salazar, or Pedro Salazar-Gomez.
0900/58598, Sanchez-Colin, Salomon.
T-1496083, Sanchez-Sanchez, Antonio.
T-1496080, Sanchez, Maria Carmen.
A-3266238, Schack, Preben.
A-2346279, Schiller, Frederick Hugo or Frederick H. Schiller or Friedrich Schiller.
T-2760108, Scholobohm, Eunomia T.
A-7249633, Sciuchetti, Remo.
A-1810755, Shung, Chen Yuet or Yuet Shung Chen.
E-15772, Sing, Joe or Chu Mon.
A-4757517, Sponarich, Michele or Nick.
A-9767586, Sundby, Kaare Sorensen or Kaare Sunby.
A-1474604, Swaby, Cyril James.
T-2760117, Swee, Sia Kim or Ling Ah King.
A-6424398, Takacas, Ferencz, or Frank Adler.
A-6438873, Tambocon-Linato, Patria Santa Maria.
A-1129158, Thomas, James Reyene.
T-1496874, Tong, Chong Wo.
A-7394695, Ulloa-Garcia, Leandro, or Epifanio Pedroza-Gonzales.
T-2760689, Uriz, Martin.
E-2218, Walsh, Catherine Josephine, or Catherine Bushey.
A-2572352, Weber, Robert.
A-1663455, Webley, Kenneth T.
A-5968748, Yglesias, Alexandro Nivon.
E-13086, Yu, Lang Ping.
E-13087, Yu, Liu Youn Feng.
A-5968746, Zafra, Carmen Verdugo.
A-5910613, Mejia-Barrajas, Miguel.
T-2072795, Morales-Gonzalez, Nicolas.
A-7392035, Selvera-Gutierrez, Jose.
A-7390753, Selvera, Maria Zarate de.
A-6985699, Aguilar, Eloisa Barrera de, or Eloisa Barrera-Moya.
T-1496892, Aguiniga-Sanchez, Reynaldo.
T-2760383, Aguirre, Ignacio Morales.
A-6857727, Albury, George Washington.
T-2637183, Alva-Gonzalez, Elias.
A-2397499, Alvarez, Tomas Casimiro, or Thomas Alvarez.
V-666045, Arroyo, Roberto Ramos.
V-336632, Au, Fong Chau August.
T-2760385, Barragan-Silva, Salvador.
E-3034, Barrientos-Martinez, Celso, or Celso Barrientos.
A-7016195, Barriga, Maria Gloria.
T-1496878, Campos, Virginia May.
T-1510218, Candelaria, Severino Magdaleno Y Fernandez, or Severino Candelaria.
A-9691862, Canillas, Eduard Chebat.
A-4779242, Cataldo, Vincenzo.
E-3291, Chan, Chin, or Frank Chan or Frank Chin.
E-3935, Chang, Yi Ming, or Mrs. Chin Kiang Chang.
E-3937, Chang, Nai Shun.
E-3938, Chang, Nai Yong.
E-3936, Chang, Nai Chong.
E-3934, Chang, Nai Hung.
T-2753797, Chavez, Julia Aguilera de.
E-050401, Ching, Marjorie Rosetta (nee Marjorie Rosetta Sarsin or Marjorie Rosetta Lam).
E-901117, Cisneros-Garcia, Ramon.
E-901119, Cisneros-Sanchez, Jose Guadalupe.
A-6252159, Clark, Nelly Burgos (nee Nelly Xerez Burgos).
A-4308668, Cobos, Roman.
0100-24366, Cognein, Flaviano.
A-7054538, Collins, Paul H. or Lothar Friedrich Hermann Lapp or Lopp.
A-7898939, Constantinescu, Constantin.
A-6936474, Costa, Manuel Zeferino Braz Da.
A-4065731, Esquibel, Placido.
A-3818366, Fagundes, Manuel Vieria.
A-9553253, Feldmann, Teodors or Teodors Feldmanis or Theodore Feldmann.
A-7983352, Felipe, Marcolino or Felipe Marcolino or Marcolina Felipe.
A-4980838, Filz, Richard Henry.
A-6534319, Fischer, Herman.
A-6943554, Fischer, Zuzana Schonbaum (nee Zuzana Schonbaum).
A-5241973, Fook, Huie Wing or Huey Wing Fook or Hoy Wing Fook or Henry Huie or Hoy.
A-3470218, Fernandez, Antonio.
T-1497369, Galvan-Arrelano, Cirilo or Cirilo Arcazola.
A-7476578, Guerra, Sabina Mata De.
E-33633, Halimah, Mail.
A-5055188, Hazenberg, Lambertus.
A-5516554T, Hecht, John.
A-5534285, Hoffman, Sonia (nee Schenker).
A-7384342, Hsiao, Tsui Beh or Betty Shaw or Betty Hsiao or Betty Chow.
T-2761379, Inouye, Hisao.
A-7983038, Kartchner, Elfida Alicia Corn De.
A-7978331, Kartchner, Verdel.
A-3328901, Kee, Wong.
A-4257255, Keller, Peter.
A-3556986, Koehler, Helga Mary (nee Binder).
A-9770811, Korn, Jacob or Carl Behrends.
A-5226407, Krisberg, Dorothy (nee Doba Friedman).
A-7366498, Kun, Lam Tung or Dennis Lin.
0900-45155, Lu, Eleanor or Eleanor Lin.
A-3620691, Lamberti, Francesco or Frank Lambert.
V-737077T, Lawee, Alfred Khedouri or Alfred Lawee Khedouri.
A-2873670, Lee, Kong.
A-6711103, Liu, Frederick Fu.
E-47582, Long, Aurora Swanson or Maria Luisa Swanson or Carmen Swanson.
A-7021858, Lozano, Edward Paul.
T-2760319, Lucchesi, Alfredo.
A-4758083, Lyons, Dorothy Edith (nee McGregor or Dorothy Edith Pastor).
A-4514742, Mayer, Mathias Lajos or Mathias Layas Mayer.
E-10454, McGinley, Joseph.
A-9133870, Mihatov, Thomas John.
A-5659625, Moncayo, Domingo Pedro or Domingo Moncayo.
A-5956192, Moore, Seamon James.
T-2760101, Mora-Escalera, Heliodoro.
A-6063045, Moreno, Paz Benedicto or Maria Paz Magdalena Benedicto.
A-5569927, Morgenroth, Sigmund.
A-5569926, Morgenroth, Lucie Gast.
T-2672412, Muziotti, Jacques.
A-9693024, Ngo, Chu Chuan.
A-5109697, Nitschke, Reinhold Ferdinand.
A-6960467, Palma-Cardenas, Jesus.
T-2671995, Pastorino, Luigi Giuseppe.
A-5293697, Pierson, Earl James.
A-4654701, Pommer, Alfred Gustav.
T-2760646, Reasola-Olvera, Javier.
T-1496782, Reyna-Bernal, Juan.
T-325737, Rivas-Garza, Avelina.
A-4575430, Rivera, Maria Consuelo Verdugo de (nee Maria Consuelo Verdugo-Espinosa).
A-5644209, Rosier, Marie Josephine De.
A-2549028, Rothie, Eddie or Oddie Rothie.
A-4698921, Russo, Jennie nee Cervasi or Giovanna Russo or Giovanna Cervasi.
A-5731289, Sabit, Vahdi or Mehmet Vahdeddin Sabit.
A-2941373, Saenz, Adela Ronquillo De.
T-1495328, Saiz, Juan Francisco.
T-1495329, Saiz, Olivia Irene.
T-1495330, Saiz, Jr., Juan Francisco.
A-1332786, Sala, Ferdinando or James F. Sala.
T-1496847, Salinas, Luis Garcia.
A-7376144, Sapir, Albert Abraham.
T-1496793, Sekigahama, Satori.
T-2760221, Seminario, Joseph Ysaac.
A-9663441, Seng, Lei or Lai Sing or Li Sheng.
T-1497413, Sepulveda-Salmeron, Rafael.
T-1496061, Shinoda, Sadao Frank.
A-0949600, Shun, Chang Ting or Ting-Hsun Chang or Tennyson Po-Hsun Chang or Po-Hsun Chang.
A-7930304, Chang, Anna May Ing or Anna May Hsi-En Ing or Anna May Hsi-En Ing Chang.
A-7424125, Simoni, Bianca Bolcioni.
A-9767674, Sing, Chang Pah or Chang Pan Sing.
A-3379226, Soalihy, Abdullah.
T-1495431, Solari, Giobatta Ricardo.
0300-195653, Sontanes, Ana or Ana Chana Teitelbaum.
A-4272067, Sorrentino, Umberto or Albert or Alberto.
T-2760225, Sosa-Angel, Francisco.
A-7558995, Sotelo, Enrique Mayorga.
T-2276306, Spitz, Leon or Chaim Arye Spitz.
V-1431643, Spitz, Ester (nee Feldman).
0900/21835, Stock, Gwendolyn Eunice.
A-5004073, Suedkamp, Amalie Johanna or Amalie Johanna Sudkamp.
A-6924551, Talmadge, William Naftaly.
A-1020608, Tjensvold, Jacob Jacobsen or Jacob Jacobsen.
A-3274143, Umana, Lorenzo.
A-6534657, Ure, William Patrick.
T-1496070, Valdovinos, Joyce Elson.
A-5919251, Valerio, Elidio Lopes.
A-2031512, Vasquez, Jose or Trent Vasquez or Jose Trent (Trinedad) Vasquez.
A-7385768, Vela, Juana Evangelina Vega De.
A-5461905, Velliares, George Constantin or George Costas Velliares.
A-4684901, Verdin-Flores, Eleno or Delano Verdin-Flores.
T-2760401, Versola, Teofilo.
A-2488739, Voelker, Clifford Austin.
A-6419238, White, Harry Owen.
T-1892213, Won, Ong or Ong Wong.
A-4236745, Wong, Phoei Kwai.
A-9635020, Wong, Tsang.
V-778294, Wu, Tche-Wei (nee Tche-Wei So).
T-1496870, Yau, Chow Ping.
T-2760376, Yoshida, Noburu.
0707-7872, Young, Flordeliza Pael or Flordeliza Pael.
0707-8033, Young, Ruben Pael or Ruben Pael.
T-1496882, Yuen, Yick Hee.
T-303126, Zebroff, Elizabeth.
A-9302618, Kok, Lum Man.
T-2626088, Acosta-Maqueda, Domingo.
A-5026968, Aguirre, Encarnacion Gonzalez de or Helen or Helene or Elena Sallaberry.
V-906184, Aspiras, Angeles.
T-2672010, Ballin-Ramirez, Magdelano.
A-1812036, Barriga, Antonia Maria Salcedo De.
0900/35364, Bauer, Joseph Carl.
A-7491055, Benes, Vaclav Edvard.
A-5960640, Blumenthal, Ernst.
V-371604, Bow, Jean Chu.
A-7398318, Castaneda, Catarino.
1600/101499, Chavez, Virginia Pacheco-Ruelas de or Virginia Carrillo or Virginia Guardado.
A-8189429, Chin, Wah.

A-6362932, Clushon, Shirley Lyssa or Shirley Lyssa Carini.
E-2225, Dicker, Taimi Alina (nee Haino or Fleming or Oinonen).
T-56019, Dominguez, Agripina Hinojosa (nee Agripina Hinojosa-Gonzalez).
T-2671919, Economou, John Antoniou.
A-6727080, Espino-Garcia, Miguel.
A-7383199, Fedje, Gerd Annie (nee Berger).
A-1337444, Fenkohl, Fred John or Frederich John Fenkohl or Fred Johni Fenkehl or Fred Fenkohn.
A-5829251, Fite, Evelyn Agnes.
0707-6200, Foldi, Peter Andras.
E-053399, Freulings, Klaus Dieter.
T-1495120, Garcia-Escobedo, Felix.
A-5694536, Garz, Albert Rudolph or Albert Garz.
T-1496064, Gonzalez-Gudino, Jesus.
A-3502635, Gustavino, Oscar or Oscar Levine.
A-3277469, Haakonsen, Fred or Frithjof.
A-6853231, Hansen, Alice M.
E-059817, Hernandez-Hernandez, Jesus.
1209-9475, Houske, Caroline Minnie.
A-2908481, Jaso-Macias, Higinio Ignacio.
A-6343643, Katsaros, Efstathios.
A-6343644, Katsaros, Penelopi.
T-1496811, Kobayashi, Tomeki.
A-7841254, Kuang-Hua, Ch'eng or Alfred Kuang-Hua Cheng.
A-9523843, Lee, Ling Ah.
E-36304, Li Heng Yu.
E-6211985, Loh, Yuan Chiu.
A-6624917, Loh, Huan Pao (nee Wang).
A-6052296, Lomeli-Aceves, Sebastian.
V-292481, Mahvi, Abolfath.
V-292480, Mahvi, Josette (nee You).
T-2760694, Marrufo, Antonio Gomez or Antonio Gomez Maroof.
A-5267458, Martinez, Casiano.
E-059775, Martinez-Garza, Pedro.
A-5821019, Mattison, Frances Ida (nee Gerard).
A-7096918, McNeal, Emma Antonius.
A-8259729T, Melville, Cecil Agustas.
T-2760026, Mendoza, Benjamin Garcia.
A-5755983, Mitchell, Gwendolyn Bell.
T-1497419, Mormoris, Andreas Panaciotis.
A-6440324, Moscoso, Luis Saul.
A-1943954, Muller, August.
T-302911, Murguia-Puga, Francisco.
T-302913, Murguia, Encarnagion Vargas de.
A-5011983, Nagi, Ali or Abdu Hashen.
A-6874302, Najat, Mahdokht Mahnaz.
A-6727081, Nava, Socorro or Socorro Nava de Espino.
T-2585055, Niemi, Kalervo.
A-3937040, On, Joe Cing or Joe Hee Yeun.
A-7967507, Pate, Antonia or Pati.
A-9831029, Pepe, Vincenzo.
A-2107665, Perkins, John Rowley.
V-1339606, Potasi, Palolo or Palolo Asi.
A-6726238, Ramos-Collo, Gerardo.
A-5380057, Ratia, Wanda Anna or Wanda Anna Schmidt or Wanda Anna Karska or Wanda Anna Meredyk or Wanda Anna Carlson.
E-057695, Raygoza-Martinez, Tomas.
A-4798742, Renteria-Sotelo, Elena.
T-2626303, Reyes-Villanueva, Pedro.
A-7469329, Reyna-Pena, Marcos.
A-7463894, Reyna, Antonia Garcia De.
A-1475849, Rodriguez, Manuel.
A-5046332, Salo, Eino John or Ruurik Arthur Harold Westerlund.
T-1497358, Sanchez-Mercado, Genaro.
A-6736860, Santa-Maria, Susanna Garavillas.
A-7036697, Scott, Miriam Augusta.
A-9948110, Serrano, Matias Nunes.
E-36310, Strauss, Martha Kaposty.
A-6380955, Sztejn, Samuel or Samuel Stein.
T-2760113, Tafoya, Andrea Gomez.
T-1496202, Tornowski, Max Franz.
T-2760677, Torres-Gonzalez, Paulino.
T-1496786, Toung, Kouang Kuo.
T-1496791, Trujillo-Montenegro, David.
A-8036426, Tso, Lin or Frederick Lin Tso.
T-934704, Tso, Sou-Cheng (nee Hung).
A-5072326, Vallejo, Pedro or Pedro Vallejo Fernandez.
A-4840919, Vega-Vasquez, Antonio.
A-4840907, Vega, Guadalupe Romero De.
A-7995695, Velasquez, Antonio Montano.
A-5336765, Villarreal, Nicolas Rincon.
T-2760222, Wain, Montague Charles.
T-2760245, Wallace, Francis La Fontaine.
A-6990520, Williams, John Jona or John Jona.
E-36307, Wong, Kam Kong.
E-36308, Lowe, Kwok Wun or Mrs. K. K. Wong.
A-5977644, Yamasaki, Chika.
A-4299927, Yen, Sit Chan or Harry Sit.
A-7821371, Ying, Lee Wing or Ying Lee Wing.
A-4147666, You, Eng or Ng You or Johnny Eng.
A-3986175, You, Ho Kee or Wing You Ho.
A-7476091, Zepeda-Banda, Pedro.
E-36282, Acebo, Mary Alisangco.
T-2760114, Acevedo-Echavarri, George or Jorge Acevedo-Echavarri.
E-1301, Agcaoili, Mabel (nee Rios).
E-1302, Rios, Weber.
0800-86904, Aguirre, Maria de Jesus Zapata.
A-6849224, Aispuro, Candelario Lizarraga.
A-5935558, Akerfeldt, Einar Ferdinand or Edhansen.
A-8017244, Alcantara-Trejo, Juan.
E-33735, Alferos, Marina Sebastian.
A-6009506, Alvarez-Reyes, Andres.
V-455688, Antaran, Adoracion Manapat.
A-4829281, Arraes, Jose Maria.
T-1495113, Balderas-Rosas, Jesus.
A-6810120, Barbosa-Torrentera, Carlos.
T-1496-326, Becerra, Margareta Jiminez De.
A-7957137, Becerril, Adolfo Alquicira.
A-5571563, Berner, Julia.
A-3796299, Brown, Ruth Pearl.
E-062618, Bueno, Gonzalo Medellin.
A-3477889, Burchert, William Max.
E-056806, Bzoch, Vladka Jane.
T-1496076, Carrillo-Villagrama, Daniel.
A-7445515, Castillo-Gallegos, Ventura.
T-1020254, Castromayor, Praxedes V.
T-1495997, Cerillo-Martinez, Gilberto.
A-7927369, Cervantes, Abelardo.
A-5756556, Cheng, Andrew I. S.
A-4874588, Cheng, Anna G.
A-6283269, Ching, Goon Yin (nee Goon Yin Cheong).
T-2672418, Cornejo, Alfonso G. or Alfonso Cornejo-Garcia or Ezequiel Mora-Diaz.
0700-16009, Craig, Emelia Marie.
0700-3141, Daikopolos, Tomo Jean or Thomas Jean Daicos or John or Vane or Ivan Dacoff or Ioannis Daikopolos.
A-5494277, Dias, Andrea or Andrea Celestina Diaz De Leon Y Brunet.
T-1496340, Diaz-Robles, Pedro.
T-1496339, Diaz, Jovita Soto.
A-7379204, Dinelli, Marta Marchi.
A-5620232, Dong, You Geou.
A-3270436, Doria-Ramirez, Jose.
A-4672326, Dornow, Ester Susanna (nee Trogen).
V-887347, Duarte-Garcia, Julio or Julio Cesar Edmundo Duarte y Garcia or Julio Duarte or Julio Duarte Garcia.
E-33917, Duck, Woo Quong or Woo Don Lin.
A-5587373, Ellingson, Edward Sevrin.
T-2672522, Ellis, Mary Lydia.
A-5882561, Espinoza-Diaz, Arturo or Arturo Espinoza or Antonio Ramirez.
T-1496310, Espinoza-Rodriguez, Jesus.
0300-306950, Etzler, Manfred or Reilly.
V-941465, Fumel, Fred Fulvio.
A-7123705, Gomes, John Gerhart or Ernest Gerhart Haack.
E-059914, Gracia, Juan Almazan.
1409-10346, Guajardo-Gonzalez, Benito.
T-1496803, Gutierrez, Norma Tatton (nee Norma Tatton).
T-2760315, Hartley, Ruby Helena or Ruby Helena Berntsen.
A-2429309, Hattori, Denzo.
A-7278926, Hausgenoss, Wolfgong Karl.
A-5100619, Hayashino, Shigeaki.
T-2672094, Hernandez-Rodriguez, Antonio.
E-062409, Herrera-Castillo, Jose.
T-1495105, Howard, Eloena Edna.
A-3483573, Hradil, Joseph or Josef Hzadil or Joseph Hodel or Hardil.
T-1495108, Hurtado, Eloisa Romero.
A-5349888, Jenssen, Carl Fritz Julius.
A-6919679, Kakaroukas, Demetrios or James.
A-5110837, Katz, Sara.
A-9631655, Khai, Tan Soen or Tan Khai.
T-1807531, Klemme, Anne Mary (nee Barton or Anne Mary Barton Ranck).
A-9699008, Kong, Cheong.
V-905855, Konrad, Josephine Joan.
A-3631104, Korn, Rose or Rose Kornhauser.
V-1334722, Kosaka, Kimiko.
V-332868, Kuhn, Karin Elfriede or Karin Elfriede Ginnan.
T-2671996, Kwock, Mu Mee.
A-6383560, Latosa, Purita Zurbito.
A-4439617, Lee, Get Fang or Lee Get Fang.
T-2672302, Luna-Vailon, Everardo.
T-1496798, Mah, Wai Lock.
T-2760201, Mar, Teresa Fong or Teresa Fong Chen or Chen Wei Fong.
T-2760649, Martinez-Vedusco, Alfonso.
T-1892394, Mat, Osman Bin.
T-2671891, Mata, Refugio Ruiz De.
T-2626256, Mendez, Roman Cruz.
0802-4671, Mendoza, Patricio Puenta.
A-1674785, Moreno, Esperanza Hernandez De.
E-082167, Nava, Jose Luis.
A-6671895, Nichols, Barbara Jane (nee Jones).
E-36315, Nobriga, Martha Faustina.
V-1257477, Noe Giuseppe Ambrosio.
T-2672030, Pacheco-Lopez, Andreas.
0300-366975, Pappas, George.
A-5670288, Payne, Lasarus.
A-3902995, Pena, Trinidad De La.
A-9577245, Penasales, Tomas Pabale.
E-062542, Perales-Guzman, Andres.
A-4561301, Piccolo, Vincenzo.
T-2760563, Rahim, Abdul or Abdul Maneer.
A-6904862, Ramirez-Hernandez, Pedro.
T-2672368, Rangel-Contreras, Pedro.
A-4189061, Rivera-Hernandez, Vicente.
A-4193438, Rivera, Dolores Vega De.
A-5969080, Robles-Reyes, Manuel.
E-084920, Rosin, Simon.
A-3177562, Rottman, Herman Ludwig or Konrad Koch.
A-7280096, Rumola, Carmela Vicenza.
T-2672069, Salgado-Larios, Alfonso.
A-5673286, Sampson, Samuel James.
A-1093870, Sanchez, Marta Cervantez De.
A-7890539, Santiago, Jose Refugio Munoz-De.
A-3783896, Schachtschneider, Carl.
A-4201416, Singh, Luz Morales De.
A-5612892, Sprude, John or Johan or Jan.
A-4147514, Tai, Lai.
T-1496885, Talantianos, Costas or Costas Tallas or Talas.
A-5582946, Taylor, Leon Jarvis or Leon Taylor.
A-3495192, Tongate, Josephine Catherine nee Cayenne.
A-7457019, Toy, Leung or Leong Toy or Leong Yen Hor.
A-2637370, Valencia-Doneos, Abelino.
T-1496322, Vaquero-Velasco, Alfredo.
T-1496323, Vaquero, Rosa Zavala de.
T-1496324, Vaquero-Zavala, Rosa.
T-2672056, Verduga-Mesa, Jorge.
0300-349602, Wainwright, Aston Percival.
0800/71173, Yamuni-Abdala, Juan Miguel.
A-3808101, Zavitsanos, Nicholas or Nick Zaveson.
E-42667, Almaraz-Mesa, Jesus.
E-48415, Amarillas, Maria Luisa Gallego de or Maria Luisa Gallego De Mara.
A-9654161T, Ascencao, Manuel.
A-5965863, Barragan, Felipa or Sister Mary Emmanuel.
A-4132980, Bauseler, Elizabeth (nee Elliott).
A-6769945, Bradford, Anna Maria Pasquino (nee Pasquino).
A-2574366, Braut, Antica Zgombic.

E-086472, Burgos, Elizabeth Lena or Isabel Alena Burgos.
0300/364107, Castro-Villasenor, Roberto or Robert Castro-Billasenor.
E-1351, Chang, Nai Zing Mimi.
A-6702143, Chen, Hung or Leslie H. Chen.
A-6534347, Chen, Ya-Sun or Pauline Chen.
E-093504, Chong, Cheung Lee or Lee Chong Fong.
A-9801085, Chin, Tim or Chin Yee Gim.
T-2672046, Cruz-Ortiz, Jose.
A-1101063, Dallah, Abrahim.
A-6955163T, Dandie, Castley Roy.
A-6307810T, Dandie, Rosalind Iona.
A-9678723, Dias, Jose Goncalves.
A-5813826, Dietrich, Otto Henry or Henry Dilton.
A-4066738, Dominguez, Antonio Joaquin or Esteves.
A-1282918, Duharte, Pedro Salo.
A-4949778, Duran-Roura, Juan.
A-5643359, Elliott, Frederick Ernest.
A-3195328, Fan, Fong You or Wong You or Fong Lee or Fong Chun.
A-4799954, Flynn, James Patrick.
A-5700183, Foo, Joe or Fok Joe.
A-4210540, Fung, Fung Haan.
A-5036093, Gallardo, Benjamin Mosqueda.
A-5050854, Gariffo, Carlo.
0300-387757, Geong, Leong or Geong Leung or Yick Cheung Leong.
T-2753737, Gomez, Cipriano.
A-6472070, Gonzales, Andrea (nee Andrea Rosalia Torres Rojas).
T-1496308, Gonzalez-Sanchez, Jose.
A-5990216, Gutierrez, Miguel Hermida.
A-5927017, Hamano, Yasuke.
A-7480701, Har, Mui Fung.
A-5967229, Harada, Banroku.
A-7371868, Hatzinger, Otto.
T-2760130, Henry, Elizabeth Shober.
T-2760107, Henry, Lawrence Edwin.
T-2760106, Henry, Alexander James.
T-2671979, Hernandez-Nunez, Phyllis.
T-2671981, Gonzalez, John Vincent.
A-5981989, Higa, Renyu.
A-3549971, Huang, Kechin.
A-3549947, Huang, Tchunki.
A-7019078, Huang, Therese.
A-7019080, Haung, Luc.
A-5280713, Ifil, Lionel Aldwyn or Lionel Foster.
A-2230259, Isobe, Frank Shichinosuke.
A-6616503, Iwamoto, Shizuko Suematsu.
A-6616502, Sakai, Teruko Suematsu.
A-6616501, Suematsu, Masayoshi.
E-42665, Jurado, Magdalena Luna De.
A-9655393, Keung, Kwok Chi or Chi Keung Kwok.
A-6153101, Kikuchi, Shizuka (nee Naganuma).
A-5972343, Komant, Edmund Alfred or Edmund or Edward or Eddy Komant.
0300-403994, Lashley, Charles Ellerton Adolphus or Charles E. A. Lashley.
E-082549, Lee, Sing Fook or Lee Sing Fook.
A-7850810, Mabalon, Gloria Villalva.
A-4632750, Manlapig, Pantaleon Cantanghal.
E-33548, Mark, Kim-Chuan Chen (nee Kim Chuan Chen Ow Yang).
A-7350031, Martinez, Enrique or Enrique Martinez-Enriquez or Enrique Sanchez-Martinez.
E-42653, Martinez, Maria Magdalena Hinostroza De.
A-4667587, Missick, Peblito Alois.
A-5977631, Miyashiro, Kamacho.
A-3600843, Monges, Josephine Castro.
A-5967513, Nakamatsu, Yako.
A-6153129, Nakamatsu, Kameyo.
A-6153130, Nakamatsu, Tokusei.
A-6153131, Nakamatsu, Sueko.
A-6153132, Nakamatsu, Seiko.
A-6153133, Nakamatsu, Seisun.
A-6153134, Nakamatsu, Masayoshi.
A-6153135, Nakamatsu, Shizuo.
A-5237849, Nakamura, Moichiro.
A-4676122, Nakamura, Oko.
A-3743498, Niemann, Jurgen August.
A-3168467, Nieto, Francisco or Francisco Oyarzum or Francisco Nieto Oyarzun or Oyarzun Nieto.
A-5982000, Nishioka, Shigeyoki.
T-1496888, O, Manuel De La.
0707-8766, Olson, Luz Talana.
A-6947388, Ontiveros-Zepeda, Geronimo.
A-7240667, Ontiveros, Julia Esquibel Di (nee Julia Esquibel-Castillo).
A-6608257, Perez-Perez, Francisco Jose Guillermo Ramon.
A-1999412, Pestel, Hans Rolf.
A-5170876, Reinhardt, Ernst Hans or Ernst Reinhardt or Ernst H. Reinhart.
E-7127, Rissardi, Giuseppi.
T-1495134, Rodriguez-Arrieta, Enrique.
0300-193463, Roig, Aida (nee Marti).
0300-200153, Roig, Ricardo or Ricardo Roig Escobar.
A-618742, Saleyman, Safa Mediha.
A-4155880, Santana-Venegas, Jesus or Jesus Venegas Santana or Jesse Santana.
T-1496054, Santillanes, Luis.
T-1496013, Santillanes, Manuela Nava.
E-086915, Sarin, Edward or Eduard Zarin.
A-5977600, Sato, Yasujiro.
V-905034, Saure, Emanuel Jose Raul.
A-6180801, Scheidegger, Macaira Limboy.
A-2531771, Schwartzman, Anna (nee Hirshman or Dukoff or Duhovnaia).
A-3451850, Semmler, Max or Maximilian Semmler.
A-6161498, Shiga, Yoshisada.
A-6161497, Shiga, Masako Takahashi.
0300-69640, Staack, Heinz or Wilhelm Heinz Staack.
A-8150977, Stanogias, Pete Vello or Pete Vello.
A-4955859T, Suleyman, Jemal or Jemal Suleejman or Jim Sam.
A-1599443, Sullivan, Selvin.
A-7744315, Sze, Denise Pei Yu Wei or Denise Yu Wei Pei Sze, or Dora Pei Yu Wei or Denise Ya-Wei Pei or Denise or Dora Yu Wei Pei or Dora Pei Yu-Wei Sze or Yu Wei Pei or Dora Pei Yu-wei.
A-5950757, Takata, Keichi.
A-5977659, Tako, Kokichi.
T-1495099, Talini, Luigi Alfredo.
A-5977656, Taura, Shizuo.
V-812915, Tomasowa, Helena Rosanne.
T-1496876, Uotila, John Waino.
A-9736769, Vintem, Francisco Rodriguez.
0300/389550, Wei, Young Min or Min Wei Young or Wei Yung.
T-1892129, Woods, Hamilton Patrick.
A-8259428, Wright, Robert Theophilcus.
A-6062881T, Yang, Fu Hsine.
A-6095306, Yang, Kia Jing Shen.
A-3621532, Yet, Su or Yet Su.
A-9744863, Yip, Koom Man or Yip Man Koom.
A-5977640, Yogi, Jitsusei.
A-5905002, Yook, Lee or Lee Hong or Lee Yook Kew or Li Hung.
0300/397731, Yuen, Chun.
A-9948032, Palombella, Onofrio.

SPECIAL EMPLOYEES FOR SERGEANT AT ARMS

Mr. JENNER, from the Committee on Rules and Administration, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 212), which was considered and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the Sergeant at Arms is hereby authorized to appoint four special employees to be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate at the basic rate of $1,000 each per annum until otherwise ordered by the Senate.

EXTENSION OF APPOINTMENT OF ACTING SERGEANT AT ARMS

Mr. JENNER. Mr. President, I present a communication from the Sergeant at Arms of the Senate, extending the period of service of the Special Deputy Sergeant at Arms who was appointed on January 2, 1954, to serve until February 15, 1954.

This action is deemed necessary in case any legal question should arise as to the authority of the Acting Sergeant at Arms in connection with obtaining a quorum, or in connection with other duties of that office.

The communication was read and ordered to lie on the table, as follows:

UNITED STATES SENATE,
OFFICE OF THE SERGEANT AT ARMS,
Washington, D. C., February 10, 1954.

In accordance with authority conferred on me by Senate resolution agreed to December 17, 1889 (Senate Journal 47, 51-1, December 17, 1889), I hereby extend the appointment made on January 2, 1954, of C. A. Bottolfsen as Special Deputy Sergeant at Arms of the United States Senate for the period from February 15, 1954, to March 15, 1954, to perform in my absence any and all duties required of or devolving upon the Sergeant at Arms of the United States Senate by law or by the rules or orders of the Senate.

FOREST A. HARNESS,
Sergeant at Arms, United States Senate.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session,

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

REPUBLICAN ORATORICAL ATTACKS

Mr. HENNINGS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD a statement prepared by me relating to a report of President Eisenhower's press conference last week in connection with attacks by Republican speakers on members of the Democratic party.

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

STATEMENT BY SENATOR HENNINGS

I have read with interest the report of President Eisenhower's press conference last week. He was asked a number of pointed questions about the recent rash of oratory which broke out in such virulence at dinners held throughout the country in honor of the man whose life was a monument to "malice toward none and charity for all." The Republican faithful, apparently, were served up a dainty dish of venom along with their filet mignon. The President told reporters, in effect, that while he might counsel his "official family" and the chairman of the Republican National Committee to refrain from intemperate charges, he knew of no way to shut off all partisan attacks.

I think the President is right, especially when it comes to the willingness of members of his party in the Congress to take his advice. We in the Congress take pride in our independence, and it is highly unlikely that some of our Republican friends would meekly submit to any orders from their Commander in Chief—which he obviously is not inclined to give—to restrain themselves. Indeed, members of his party have made it quite clear that they intend to continue in the same pattern—that they intend to scourge us Democrats over the length and breadth of the land as a party of thieves and traitors and villains.

Despite the President's mild words, this is so patently a deliberate and organized attack that, much as he might like to, he cannot stand completely aloof from the mudslinging. He is the head of the Republican Party.

I would not presume to tell my Republican friends how they should conduct their affairs, although it takes no great powers of perception to realize that this kind of nonsense is scarcely in the national interest and certainly is not calculated to win the fealty and cooperation of the minority party in support of the President's program.

These political amenities do not disturb me. They are part and parcel of the free give and take with which each party pays its respects to the other. If some Republicans seem to have lost their sense of proportion, that is their problem. But I am surprised that we Democrats should have so lost our sense of humor as to allow ourselves to be upset by these rantings. I am amazed that we should even consider running to the President for help. And I am a little ashamed that we should whine and beg him to call off his boys. What kind of silliness is this? Are not we capable of standing on our own feet? Are not the principles and ideals of our militant party invulnerable against name-calling and political invective? Or are we a party of so little faith that we must strike our colors and cry for quarter?

I have serious doubts that intemperate attacks by some Republicans are the better part of political wisdom in their own interest. Excesses of any kind are repugnant to the American people and I do not believe that shoddy demagoguery will win friends or converts for the Republican cause. In my judgment, the more shabby the trick, the more blatant the lie, the more irresponsible the charge, the more it will help us Democrats. I think the American people are likely to start asking some disconcerting questions about what the Republicans have done for the country during the 13 months they have been in power, and they may even pry into the embarrassing vacuum which these diversionary attacks try to camouflage.

None of us is really so foolish as to believe that the President's program will stand or fall on the basis of whether we Democrats are treated with kid-glove diplomacy or are on the receiving end of slings and arrows of slander, defamation, and name calling. The program will stand or fall on its merits. I, for one, repudiate any notion that my votes are going to be affected by what some Lincoln Day orators may say about me or my party. Speaking for myself, I may say that I have no intention of abandoning my support of the President's position on the Bricker amendment. I hope only, as I have said before, that he will not desert us.

It is no secret that some of the members of his own party do not like the President's program and they particularly would like to block those portions of it which they suspect are carrying on those dreadful Democratic policies. I wonder if some of this abuse and vilification may not be directed against us Democrats in the deliberate hope of pushing us into opposing any and all of the President's proposals. If so, they are going to be disappointed. I know I speak for many Democrats when I say that we are going to support the President whenever we think he is right, and we have no intention of letting these attacks affect our judgment or our desire to cooperate for the good of the country. Whether he will be able to secure the same measure of support from his own party in the Congress is a matter on which there seems to be considerable doubt.

In the final analysis, I am completely willing to place my trust in the wisdom and good judgment of the American people. I think they are perfectly capable of distinguishing between truth and political claptrap. They are even likely to remember the shrewd words of a wise man who observed: "Where there is smoke there isn't always fire. Sometimes there's just a smoke machine."

THE BRICKER AMENDMENT—EDITORIAL FROM THE WASHINGTON POST

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, an editorial appearing in today's issue of the Washington Post calls for rejection by the Senate of the various constitutional amendments which have been offered as substitutes for the Bricker amendment. The editorial calls for a change in the Senate rules, so as to provide for a yea-and-nay vote on all treaties. This is the proposed change I called for last year, as provided in Senate Resolution 145. I ask unanimous consent to have the editorial printed at this point in the body of the RECORD.

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

THE "HARMLESS SUBSTITUTES"

As debate is resumed on the Bricker amendment today, it is clearly apparent that no satisfactory curb on the treatymaking power has been devised. The hope that some constitutional amendment could be worked out to quiet the fears that Senator BRICKER and his supporters have aroused, without enveloping the treaty power in new confusion or disturbing the balance of power between the President and Congress, has proved to be an illusion. To be sure, the various substitutes offered have served the purpose of routing the original Bricker amendment, and that is no mean achievement. But every one of them leads onto spongy ground. We agree with Senator KEFAUVER in saying that the so-called harmless substitutes should go the way of Mr. BRICKER'S original nostrum.

There is, of course, one useful change the Senate could make. Several persons have written to remind us that in 1952 3 treaties slipped through the Senate with only 2 Senators present and only 1 of those voting. Even though the treaties in question were noncontroversial and had the approval of the Foreign Relations Committee, the effect was to make a farce of senatorial advice and consent. Certainly no treaty should be approved without a rollcall to establish that a majority of the Senate is present.

This reform can be brought about, however, without a constitutional amendment. All that is needed is a change in the Senate rules. Indeed, Majority Leader KNOWLAND has already indicated that he will demand a rollcall vote on treaties coming before the Senate while he remains in his present position. We think this policy should be written positively into the Senate rules, but it is not necessary to put such details into the Constitution.

Another suggested change in the Senate rules would require that body to label each treaty approved as self-executing or nonself-executing. But the Senate already has power to do this. We can see no reason to give that power special emphasis in a rule. Usually there is good reason why a treaty should become law upon approval by the Senate or should be implemented by an act of the entire Congress, and the method to be followed should be made evident by the text itself. So long as the Senate can require supplemental legislation, there seems to be no point in inviting it to complicate the treatymaking process.

If the Senate wishes to do more than require a roll call on treaties, it can, as Senator KEFAUVER and 11 of his colleagues have suggested, pass a joint resolution that would restate, "as the sense of the Congress," the superiority of the Constitution over all laws, treaties, and executive agreements. The resolution offered by this group would also reaffirm the power of the courts to upset treaties in conflict with the Constitution and the power of Congress to nullify the domestic effects of any offensive treaty or executive agreement.

This resolution affords Senators an opportunity to go on record against the imaginary perils that Senator BRICKER has conjured up, without cluttering the Constitution with excess verbiage. In our view, the Senate should turn at once to this modest task, leaving the harmless substitutes in the same pile of relics to which the original Bricker amendment has been consigned.

THE NEW LOOK IN CONNECTION WITH THE MILITARY BUDGET SHOULD BE A TWO-WAY LOOK

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, prior to reaching an opinion on the new-look military budget, I have been attempting to analyze the figures in that budget and the reasoning behind them.

If the photographs in the current issue of the trade magazine Aviation Week, an outstanding McGraw-Hill publication, are correct—and I am assured that they are correct—then it is obvious that what some of us have feared for a long time has come to pass, namely, the Soviets are making further inroads on the air superiority of the United States in this air-atomic age.

We may have more nuclear bombs than they, but no one needs an excess number of rifles to destroy an enemy.

The first of these photographs, the article says, shows the Ilyushin–38, a modern swept-back-wing unit with four turboprop engines—a class we do not have. Its size, according to experts, would appear to be somewhere between that of our B–47 and B–52—that is, somewhere between medium range and long range.

The second photograph shows the Tupolev–200, a new and very long-range, swept-back-wing bomber driven by six turboprop engines. This bomber is of a weight and general performance comparable to our B–36, but far more modern. The article points out that the Tupolev–200 has great speed, atomic capability, and intercontinental range.

If this information is correct, I respectfully ask my colleagues to give full consideration to just what these disclosures mean to the security of the United States today and in the immediate future. Could it be that the Soviets already have had a new look for so long a time that to them it is now an old look—in any case a new look in being?

The article reports that the latter bomber is in squadron service in northern Russia, right across the polar cap from North America. If this be true, then the Soviet position from the standpoint of a combination of performance coordinated with atomic potential may be superior to ours, because we have not a single modern long-range bomber wing in action.

Note that both these new bombers, according to the experts, have radar bombsights.

Just prior to World War II, America had no knowledge of the possession of thousands of Zero fighters by the Japanese. The refusal to recognize the production ability as well as the engineering capacity of our enemy cost this country billions of dollars in treasure, plus many thousands of American lives.

Some years ago, when, as Secretary of the Air Force, I presented to higher authority photographs of the new MIG–15 I was told the Soviets were not capable of producing such a plane, and that probably the pictures were "faked." When we entered Korea and were greeted by hundreds of the at-that-time world's best fighter, the MIG–15, again it was obvious that we had underestimated both the production capability and engineering genius of our enemy—and this, too, cost us heavily in treasure and blood.

On May 20 last, at the time when some were bitterly protesting against the $5 billion Air Force cut, in a hearing before the Senate Subcommittee on Military Appropriations, the Department of Defense asserted that the United States had more long-range bombers than Soviet Russia; also it was stated that there were indications that the Soviet was concentrating on fighter planes and defensive craft. The Secretary of Defense added, "I think our people can take some comfort in that."

If the news story about the new bombers is correct, where is the comfort? On the contrary, we may now be looking down the barrel of a possible intercontinental attack.

Last September 29 the Secretary of Defense stated:

> The Russians' best bomber is an improved version of the B–29.

And on October 6 he added:

> It will take the Russians at least 3 years to get either the aircraft or a droppable bomb to deliver a hydrogen attack on the United States.

He further stated:

> We give the Russians credit for having aircraft that they just don't have.

If the story and the photographs to which I have referred are correct, how can one justify such statements?

Many persons believe the Soviets are ahead of us in the development of the hydrogen bomb. I do not know about that, but I do know that any statement made by the Department to the effect "it will take the Russians at least 3 years to get the aircraft to deliver an attack on the United States" was incorrect even before these photographs were published.

If America makes another mistake—this time in underestimating Soviet engineering and production ability with respect to long-range bombers, as we already have done with respect to fighters—it could well be the last mistake we shall ever be allowed to make.

A "new look" should be a two-way look. It should look inward with respect to our economic development and national military power. It should look outward so as to fix the nature of the power of a possible enemy.

Again I plead that the administration frankly give the Congress and the American people all truth about the strength of our possible enemy which will not help that enemy in its development of plans and weapons necessary to accomplish its oft-announced intention to destroy the free world.

FIFTY-SIXTH ANNIVERSARY OF THE SINKING OF THE BATTLESHIP "MAINE"

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, 56 years ago today the Nation was horrified by the news that the U. S. S. *Maine* had been sunk in the harbor of Habana, Cuba. On a peaceful Sunday evening the great battleship was torn apart by a terrific explosion which cost the lives of 266 officers and men of its crew. The anniversary of that tragic event is worthy of national commemoration. It calls upon us to pay tribute to the honored memory of the gallant Americans who died on the battleship *Maine*.

It is likewise an appropriate occasion to recall with pride the heroic sacrifice of those who gave their lives for their country in the Spanish-American War and on the far-off islands of the Philippines. The destruction of the *Maine* was the beginning of our first overseas war. It sent our fighting men, our ideals, and our honor to the landing beaches of distant shores in defense of freedom. It marked a turning point in the history of the United States in the world.

On that eventful day in 1898 we embarked on a new course of destiny in world affairs. Today, 56 years later, the United States stands as the citadel of God-fearing freemen everywhere with farflung outposts of the air and the atomic age reaching to the ends of the earth.

The *Maine* was in Habana Harbor on a typically American mission, characteristic of our love of freedom. She was on a friendly visit to protect American interests on a neighboring island where the people were struggling for independence against cruel oppression.

The sinking of the *Maine* aroused a great wave of patriotic fervor that swept across the Nation like wildfire. Intervention in Cuba was demanded. "Remember the *Maine*" was the battlecry which united the North and the South.

With the declaration of war President McKinley called for 125,000 volunteers. More than 1 million offered their services. We went into war by land and sea in Cuba. On the other side of the world, 12,000 miles away, Admiral Dewey destroyed the Spanish Fleet in the Battle of Manila Bay, inside the guns of Corregidor. The remainder of the Spanish naval force was sunk and destroyed off Santiago, Cuba. Equally brilliant were the exploits of the Army, although handicapped by poor equipment and lack of supplies.

Historians, in the proper technical sense, terminate the Spanish-American War with the treaty of peace signed at Paris, December 10, 1898. But there was no peace in the jungles of the Philippines. Thousands of heroic Americans fought on for several years to quell the fanatical insurrection and to bring order to those islands.

Mr. President, I consider it most important to note that every man who served in the Spanish-American War and in the Philippine Insurrection was a volunteer. They fought with valor and heroism in the face of the most adverse conditions, yet they were the most poorly treated of all our defenders. The enlisted man's pay was $13 a month. He had no insurance protection, no bonus, no separation pay, no adjusted-compensation pay, no allotment service, no vocational or educational benefits. For 20 years after the war no provision whatsoever was made for service pensions. No hospitalization for Spanish War veterans was available until 24 years after the war ended.

There are today 69,642 living veterans of the Spanish-American War and the Philippine Insurrection on the rolls of the Veterans' Administration. This number is decreasing at the rate of about 6,900 per year. There are only 84,289 widows and dependents on the same rolls.

Today we should recall the names of the units which participated in the first overseas operations by our land forces—infantrymen, cavalrymen, and artillerymen—who carried their regimental colors to the heights of victory.

In the Spanish-American War the overseas regiments serving in Cuba and Puerto Rico included:

The 23d Kansas; 8th Illinois; 2d, 3d, 5th, and 9th United States Volunteer Infantry; 1st United States Cavalry Volunteers. They were Col. Theodore Roosevelt's Rough Riders. Fourth United States Volunteer Engineers, 1st Kentucky, 47th New York, 6th United States Volunteer Infantry, 1st United States Volunteer Infantry, 2d United States Volunteer Engineers, 3d Illinois, 6th Massachusetts, 4th Ohio, 16th Pennsylvania, 3d Wisconsin, and 1st United States Volunteer Engineers.

The units of the old Eighth Army Corps in the Philippines included many of our great fighting outfits under brilliant leaders. They were:

Astor Battery of New York, 1st California, 1st California Heavy Artillery, 1st Colorado, 1st Idaho, 51st Iowa, 20th Kansas, 13th Minnesota, 1st Montana, 1st Nebraska, Nevada Cavalry, 1st North Dakota, 2d Oregon, 1st South Dakota, 1st Tennessee, Utah Light Artillery, 1st Washington, 1st Wyoming, and the 10th Pennsylvania Infantry in which I had the honor of serving.

Mr. President, we can point with the greatest possible pride to the fact that this was the only 100-percent volunteer army in the history of the world. It was an army of freemen, asking nothing but the honor and glory of serving their country and their flag. Only in this great free Republic could such an army ever have been created. Only Americans could have so nobly accomplished their assigned missions and objectives.

On this occasion I am happy to salute my comrades of 1898 who now serve their country as able and distinguished Members of this body:

The senior Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN], lieutenant, provisional

company A, Rhode Island Militia; the junior Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE], sergeant, 52d Iowa Regiment, United States Army; and the junior Senator from West Virginia [Mr. NEELY], private, Company D, West Virginia Volunteer Infantry.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MARTIN] has just called our attention to the anniversary of the sinking of the *Maine* in the harbor at Habana, Cuba, and mentioned units from Kansas.

This action set off the spark that kindled the Spanish-American War.

Kansas played an important part in that conflict, and we are proud of the record of the volunteers who answered the call of President McKinley and the Governor of our State.

It is interesting to note that Gen. Fred Funston, a Kansan who commanded the 20th Kansas, played an important part in the history of that war.

Being short of stature, he was called "Five Feet Five Fighting Fred Funston," and the pages of history tell of many of his military exploits and his ability as a military leader.

It is generally agreed that Gen. Fred Funston, had he not died early in 1917, would have been the commanding general of our troops in the American Expeditionary Forces in World War I.

I should like to mention that during my military service at San Antonio, Tex., I was given the last picture taken of Gen. Fred Funston during his lifetime. It is one of my prized possessions.

Other Kansas names which played a prominent part in that war are those of Col. Ed Little, Wilder S. Metcalf, Charles S. Huffman, and many others.

Kansans can well be proud of the fine men who have served our Nation from our State in the Spanish-American War and other wars.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, in reply to the distinguished Senator from Kansas, let me say that I recall Gen. Fred Funston, then a colonel, very well. He commanded the brigade in which I had the honor of serving. He was a man slight in stature, but with a great appeal. The men who served under him had great confidence in him.

I think the Senator from Kansas is entirely correct in his statement that if General Funston had lived, he would have commanded our forces overseas in World War I.

ERRONEOUS STATEMENTS ABOUT EFFECT OF THE ADMINISTRATION'S AGRICULTURAL PROGRAM

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, my attention has been called to an unsigned leaflet which apparently is being given wide circulation in the State of Minnesota, and possibly in other States. The leaflet is being mailed in envelopes of the Farmers Union Grain Terminal Association, of St. Paul.

I do not recall ever having seen more misleading propaganda than is contained in this sheet, which I ask consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point.

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

What the President's proposed flexible price-support program could cost Minnesota farmers

[Comparison of the 1953 farm values of Minnesota-grown grains and oilseeds based on actual production at actual 1953 support prices, with a 20-percent reduction in acreage and the administration's minimum proposed support prices, as outlined in the President's Jan. 11 message to Congress]

[Figures to nearest million dollars]

Product (entire production used to figure)	Farm values at support levels and production indicated		Difference	
	With 1953 production and present 1953 program	With 1953 production reduced 20 percent and proposed minimum loans and lowered parity	Down	Down
				Percent
Corn	$403,000,000	$234,000,000	$169,000,000	42
Oats (hitched to corn loan)	117,000,000	67,000,000	50,000,000	42
Barley (hitched to corn loan)	29,000,000	17,000,000	12,000,000	42
Rye (hitched to corn loan)	2,000,000	1,000,000	1,000,000	42
Wheat	34,000,000	19,000,000	15,000,000	45
Soybeans	68,000,000	44,000,000	24,000,000	36
Flaxseed	34,000,000	19,000,000	15,000,000	44
Total	687,000,000	401,000,000	286,000,000	42

Support prices are national average farm loan rates, which are slightly below Minnesota farm loan rates; State loan rates are not calculated, only county loan rates, and data are not available to figure a State loan rate; the national loan rates understate by 2 or 3 percent the actual value by counties.

Soybeans and flaxseed do not have a mandatory place in the AA of 1949; we assume a 75 percent-of-parity loan for soybeans, same as for corn; and a 60 percent-of-parity loan value for flaxseed, as compared with 80 percent for 1953, 70 percent for 1954, and 60 percent in 1950 and 1951.

Production of corn and other feed grains is not all sold, but instead fed to livestock and poultry on farm where grown, because this is more profitable than sale of case grain. Actual worth to farmers is therefore higher than indicated here.

JANUARY 1954.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, as the leaflet discloses, it attempts to show that the income of the Minnesota farmer who is producing grains and oilseeds would be reduced 42 percent under the Eisenhower farm program.

This propaganda sheet purports to compare the income of the farmer with the income he theoretically would receive if the 1953 acreage of crops were reduced 20 percent, if the modernized parity formula were immediately put into effect for all crops, and if the minimum price permitted under the President's flexible support program were to prevail.

This misleading propaganda fails to state that the 20-percent reduction in acreage for wheat is required under the program which the opponents of the President seek to have continued.

It fails to state that under the law which they seek to continue, this reduction in acreage will likely be permanent.

Under President Eisenhower's set-aside program, this full 20-percent reduction in acreage would be unlikely, and any control programs in the future would probably be limited to only 1 year at a time.

In order to make the picture look worse, this propaganda also assumes a 20-percent reduction in acreage of corn, oats, barley, rye, soybeans, and flax. This is a ridiculous assumption, and thoroughly false.

The propaganda sheet assumes lower parity prices under the Eisenhower program.

The only crops possibly affected by removal of the present premium resulting from the use of the 1909–14 cost period would be corn and wheat.

The Minnesota farmer normally markets very little corn as grain. He markets a large part of his production through hogs, which today are bringing 25 cents a pound.

The premium to the wheatgrowers, amounting to 35 cents per bushel, would, under the Eisenhower program, be reduced only 5 percent a year until it reaches a balance, under the new parity formula, with dairy products, hogs, and other field crops.

The propaganda sheet assumes that the minimum support level for all commodities would prevail.

If the President's proposal, including the set-aside program, is approved by the Congress, the minimum support level would not possibly prevail.

Under the President's program, 90 percent supports would be mandatory so long as farmers keep production in line with demand.

Instead of reducing the income of the Minnesota farmer, the Eisenhower farm program would in all probability result in a substantially increased net income.

I do not know what prompted the preparation and distribution of such false assumptions and misleading propaganda in the envelope of the Farmers Union Grain Terminal Association. Perhaps it is desperation. Perhaps it is part of the political effort by some of President Eisenhower's opposition to spread fear among the American people and create a depression in an election year.

LICENSING OF CERTAIN PROPERTY IN HONOLULU TO LEAHI HOSPITAL

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 6025) to authorize the Secretary of the Army to grant a license to the Leahi Visitor Hospital, a nonprofit institution, to use certain United States property in the city and county of Honolulu, T. H.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The pending amendment, which has been submitted by the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 2, in line 2, it is proposed to strike out "without consideration" and to insert in lieu thereof "at a consideration of 50 percent of the fair-rental value."

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, the pending bill, H. R. 6025, has already been under some discussion on the floor. Last Monday the bill was passed over at the request of the junior Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE]. The discussion of this bill has centered around the question of whether a lease should be granted to the Leahi Hospital without consideration.

The Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL], who reported the bill in my absence, set forth the reasons why the Committee on Armed Services did not insert a provision requiring the hospital to pay rental for use of the property as a parking lot. The first reason was the revocable nature of the lease which made the tenure of the property indefinite. In other words, the Government could move in at any time it wanted to do so. So there was in effect a lease without leasing.

The second reason was the fact that the hospital will necessarily have to expend a certain amount of money to pave the acreage in order for it to be useful as a parking lot.

The third reason was the fact that the hospital, though supported mainly out of Territorial funds, is a charitable institution whose primary purpose is to treat patients suffering from tuberculosis.

On February 11, the Senate resumed consideration of the pending bill. The junior Senator from Oregon proposed an amendment to the bill which would require the hospital to pay 50 percent of the fair-rental value of the property.

The amendment reads as follows:

On page 2, line 2, strike out the words "without consideration" and insert in lieu thereof "at a consideration of 50 percent of the fair-rental value."

Since the bill was considered the last time the Committee on Armed Services, through its staff, has been in touch with the Delegate from Hawaii, who in turn has been in touch with the hospital authorities. The proposed amendment is entirely satisfactory to the Territory of Hawaii, which I hope will soon be a State, to the hospital authorities, and to the Delegate, Mr. FARRINGTON.

The junior Senator from New Jersey realizes that in all likelihood the bill will be passed without question now that there is no objection to the proposed amendment.

I wish to take this opportunity, however, to commend the Senator from Oregon for being alert in this instance to the application of what he calls the Morse formula. I believe that formula serves a very valuable purpose. The distinguished junior Senator from Oregon knows full well that as chairman of the Republican calendar committee through my service in the Senate I have tried to safeguard the Morse formula at all times.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Jersey yield?

Mr. HENDRICKSON. I shall yield in a minute. I regret exceedingly, because of the nature of the bill and because of the charitable purposes which it would serve, that more thought was not given to the matter referred to by the Senator from Oregon when the bill was under consideration by the Committee on Armed Services.

I now yield to the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I desire to say that, in connection with the application of the so-called Morse formula, no one on the calendar committee has been more cooperative with the junior Senator from Oregon than the junior Senator from New Jersey. Time and again, in my absence, the Senator from New Jersey, knowing that a committee bill would violate the formula in my absence raised objection to the consideration of the bill, and notified me on my return that the objection had been raised. I always appreciated his action very much.

The bill which is now before the Senate involves a lease. There have not been a great many such cases brought to the floor of the Senate. As the Senator from New Jersey has stated, other circumstances are involved in the pending case, which caused the committee to report the bill without the inclusion of the Morse formula.

I appreciate the cooperation which has been extended to me by the Senator from New Jersey and by the Committee on Armed Services in connection with the pending bill. At least from my standpoint a very important principle is being protected by the action taken by the Committee on Armed Services and by the Senator from New Jersey. The acceptance of my amendment protects the Morse formula. It helps make clear that the formula applies to leases of Federal property as well as the sale of such property.

It is only fair to the Committee on Armed Services and to the Delegate from Hawaii that I advise the Senate, as I told him I would, that the Delegate from Hawaii called me on the telephone this morning and said he had been in communication with the hospital authorities in Hawaii, and as a matter of principle they had no objection to the amendment which I had offered last Thursday. He asked me if I would indicate with some emphasis the points to which I alluded in the original consideration of the bill. I assured him I would do so because I believe the points are very important when the persons responsible for it come forward with their appraisal of the fair rental value. They should take into consideration these points:

First, I indicated that there will be improvements made on the property amounting to between $12,000 and $20,000. No one seems to be certain as to the actual amount until the improvements are made to the property. I want the RECORD to show very clearly that to the extent these improvements are of value to the United States Government in its possible use of the property for defense purposes that fact should be taken into consideration when determination is made of what the appraised fair rental value of the property is.

That fact, of course, leads to the second point in determining what the appraised fair rental value is, namely, the fact that the hospital is on the property really as a tenant by sufferance. Legally that is what its possession is, and that factor should also be taken into account when determination is made of the fair rental value of the property.

Of course, it is not for me, or for any other Senator, to say when such factors are involved in an appraisement problem, what the rental figure should be.

I do not want the hospital to pay more than 50 percent of the appraised fair rental value of the property, taking into account any benefit which will accrue to the United States Government from the improvement of the property, which will be necessary, in order to put the property into such shape that it can be used for a parking lot.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. The Senator from Oregon is saying that the whole subject should be determined by real estate experts; is that correct?

Mr. MORSE. That is correct. That is always what the Morse formula calls for. Determination will have to be made of the fair rental value. The property must be appraised. The committee report states the rental value is $2,356. I do not know whether that is the fair rental value. I do not want this amendment adopted on the basis of any assumption that half of that amount is the rent which is to be paid. The important factor which has to be taken into account is the rent which this amendment contemplates. The amendment does not mean, either, Mr. President, that whatever the hospital may have to pay in order to place a hard surface on the property shall be deducted from the rental value but that such amount may be deducted only to the extent that the Federal authorities can honestly say it constitutes an improvement which will serve the interest of the United States. I do not think we should ask the hospital to assume the full cost of surfacing the property if that would make it more usable for the Federal Government as a place for aerial defense.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. That is the ultimate purpose.

Mr. MORSE. That is the ultimate purpose. All these appraisal factors should be taken into account by real estate experts. I want the Government to get 50 percent of the appraised rental value of the property.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, I share completely the views of the distinguished Senator from Oregon. When I accept the amendment I am accepting it, I am sure with the unanimous approval of the Committee on Armed Services.

I accept the amendment, Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE].

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment. If there be no further amendment, the question is on the engrossment of the amendment and the third reading of the bill.

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

The bill was read the third time and passed.

AMENDMENT TO THE CONSTITUTION RELATING TO TREATIES AND EXECUTIVE AGREEMENTS

The Senate resumed the consideration of the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 1) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to the making of treaties and executive agreements.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON], on behalf of himself and other Senators, which the clerk will state.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 3, line 5, after the word "treaty", it is proposed to strike out the words "which conflicts with" and insert "or other international agreement which conflicts with, or is not in pursuance of."

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Griswold	Martin
Anderson	Hayden	Maybank
Barrett	Hendrickson	McClellan
Bricker	Hennings	Monroney
Bridges	Hickenlooper	Morse
Burke	Hill	Murray
Bush	Hoey	Neely
Butler, Md.	Holland	Pastore
Butler, Nebr.	Humphrey	Payne
Byrd	Hunt	Potter
Carlson	Ives	Purtell
Clements	Jackson	Robertson
Cooper	Jenner	Russell
Cordon	Johnson, Colo.	Saltonstall
Daniel	Johnson, Tex.	Smathers
Dirksen	Johnston, S. C.	Smith, Maine
Douglas	Kennedy	Smith, N. J.
Duff	Kerr	Sparkman
Dworshak	Kilgore	Stennis
Eastland	Knowland	Symington
Ellender	Kuchel	Thye
Ferguson	Langer	Upton
Flanders	Lehman	Watkins
Frear	Lennon	Welker
Fulbright	Long	Williams
George	Magnuson	Young
Gore	Malone	
Green	Mansfield	

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN] is absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Maryland [Mr. BEALL], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE], and the Senator from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Utah [Mr. BENNETT], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART], the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. MCCARTHY], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT], the Senator from Kansas [Mr. SCHOEPPEL], and the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] are necessarily absent.

Mr. CLEMENTS. I announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ] is necessarily absent.

The Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE] and the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN] are absent on official business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. PAYNE in the chair). A quorum is present.

Mr. FERGUSON. I understand the question now before the Senate is the amendment to section 1 of Senate Joint Resolution 1, on page 3, line 5, and that it may be possible to obtain a yea-and-nay vote on the amendment. The original amendment was modified at the end of last week. I wish to revert to the amendment, which has been printed and has been lying on the desks of all Senators for their study, and to submit a modification of that amendment, the modification being on page 3, line 5 of Senate Joint Resolution 1, to insert, after the word "treaty", the words "or other international agreement." Section 1 of Senate Joint Resolution 1 would then read:

> A provision of a treaty or other international agreement which conflicts with this Constitution shall not be of any force or effect.

Before I ask for the yeas and nays, I ask the Chair for a ruling on whether the modification may be made.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair advises the Senator from Michigan that he has a right to modify his amendment at this time.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Is the Senator from Michigan now referring to the amendment proposed jointly by himself, the Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND], the Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN], and the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL], designated 2–11–54–A?

Mr. FERGUSON. I am now proposing a modification of the original amendment.

Mr. KNOWLAND. If the Senator from Illinois will look at Senate Joint Resolution 1, which he will find on his desk, and turn to page 3, line 5, and after the word "treaty", insert the words "or other international agreement," he will then have the amendment in the form in which it is now before the Senate.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from Michigan yield for a question?

Mr. FERGUSON. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Florida.

Mr. HOLLAND. Does the amendment now proposed make the first section read exactly the same as the first section of the so-called George substitute?

Mr. FERGUSON. If it were agreed to, it would read the same.

Mr. HOLLAND. I thank the distinguished Senator for the information.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays on the pending amendment.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Michigan yield?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield to the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Does the Senator propose to discuss the amendment further?

Mr. FERGUSON. I do not, unless the Senator has a question.

Mr. DIRKSEN. No. It occurred to me that there ought to be a physical quorum present before the Senate passed on it.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded and that further proceedings under the call be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. HENNINGS. Mr. President, of course I am in opposition to the pending amendment, just as I have been in opposition to all so-called substitute amendments, for the reason that no international agreement or so-called executive agreement should be elevated to the dignity and the status of a treaty within the provisions of the Constitution of the United States.

Mr. President, as I understand the amendment submitted by the distinguished Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON], for himself and certain other Senators—namely, on page 3, in line 5, after the word "treaty", to insert "or other international agreement"—it is identical with the amendment in the nature of a substitute, offered by the distinguished senior Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE]. At this time I shall undertake to address myself not only to the pending amendment, but also to the amendment in the nature of a substitute, which I understand will come before the Senate a little later this afternoon.

I should like to speak briefly about a number of points raised in the discussion last Thursday between the distinguished senior Senator from Georgia and myself, concerning his proposed substitute for the Bricker amendment.

During the preceding debate on the substitute amendment of the Senator from Georgia, I stated that, in my opinion, his amendment would weaken the ability of the States to resist Federal encroachments, even though that was clearly not his intention.

The Senator from Georgia, disagreeing with me as to the effect of his amendment, stated his position in these words:

> No one need be worried for fear that I am trying to weaken the power of the States under the Constitution.

That statement appears in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of February 11, 1954, at page 1665.

Mr. President, without being legalistic, but in an effort as best I can, within my limitations, to reduce to the simplest terms to which it can be reduced a question which is legal in import, and which certainly relates to constitutional law and interpretations of such law on which many able and respectable lawyers dis-

agree, I desire to state that I believe the point at issue needs further development. That point is the President's right to use the device of executive agreements as an instrument of foreign policy. I believe the President's power in that respect is an implied power.

The other day the distinguished Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER], in the course of a colloquy with me, said he believed the President had no inherent or implied powers.

The Constitution at present contains no specific mention of executive agreements. The President's right to use this device as an instrument of foreign policy is an implied power stemming in large part from his powers as Commander in Chief and as manager of our foreign relations. Because the power to execute executive agreements is an implied one, and does not come from the provision of the Constitution creating the presidential treatymaking powers, the executive branch of the Government does not claim that executive agreements and treaties are interchangeable or that treaties can be bypassed by the use of executive agreements. If, however, we lift executive agreements to the dignity provided by specific constitutional sanction, which would be one of the results of the proposal of the distinguished Senator from Georgia, we may well open the door to their indiscriminate use by future Presidents who might be inclined to ignore the traditional difference between treaties and executive agreements.

The deep concern of some of us over the substitute of the distinguished and eminent Senator from Georgia stems from the belief we hold that if, by adopting the George substitute, we give executive agreements specific constitutional dignity future Presidents will have little reason to use the treaty procedure when they can obtain approval of executive agreements by a simple majority of both Houses of the Congress. This is so because under the proposal of the Senator from Georgia executive agreements approved in Congress would have all the domestic force and effect of treaties.

I shall refer to one of these exceptions, the annexation of Texas, to show that my concern over the George proposal is neither ridiculous nor fanciful. In the 20th century our Presidents have exercised restraint in the use of executive agreements in lieu of treaties. This restraint has been traditional with American Presidents. There have been, however, some important exceptions.

In 1844 the United States and the Republic of Texas signed a treaty under which Texas was to have been admitted to the Union. In June of that year, however, 2 months after the treaty was signed, the Senate rejected the treaty with Texas, largely on the basis of partisan opposition to President Tyler.

President Tyler was certainly a cautious President in the exercise of his constitutional powers. Following the Senate's rejection of the treaty Tyler sent the following message to the Congress:

> While I have regarded the annexation [of Texas] to be accomplished by treaty as the most suitable form in which it could be effected, should Congress deem it proper to resort to any other expedient compatible with the Constitution and likely to accomplish the object I stand prepared to yield my most prompt and active cooperation. The great question is not as to manner in which it shall be done, but whether it shall be accomplished or not.

Subsequently, in 1845, when it became apparent that Texas might decide to continue as an independent nation, the House of Representatives adopted a joint resolution authorizing the annexation and admission of Texas to the Union—Congressional Globe, 28th Congress, 2d session, 1845, page 194. Thereafter the resolution was amended in the Senate and passed by both Houses and Texas joined the Union. In passing I might note that Thomas Hart Benton, the great Missouri Senator, opposed the treaty from the very beginning, urging that the annexation and admission of Texas should be accomplished by a joint resolution.

The use of an executive agreement implemented by a joint resolution approved by a simple majority of both Houses to achieve an objective which had earlier been prevented by the two-thirds constitutional requirement when attempted in the form of a treaty was described in the following words:

> It is now admitted that what was sought to be effected by the treaty submitted by the Senate, may be secured by a joint resolution of the two Houses of Congress incorporating all its provisions. This mode of effecting it will have the advantage of requiring only a majority of the two Houses, instead of two-thirds of the Senate.

And by whom do you suppose, Mr. President, these words were uttered? These were not the words of a Secretary of State during the Roosevelt New Deal, or of the Truman Fair Deal. They were not even the words of John Foster Dulles. These words—and I hope my southern colleagues mark this well—were spoken by that strict constructionist, John C. Calhoun, one of the greatest statesmen the deep South has ever produced, then serving as Tyler's Secretary of State.

Later, in 1868, the United States Supreme Court gave its approval of this use of an international agreement other than a treaty for the admission of Texas to the Union, as a proper constitutional procedure.

What has all this to do with the George substitute, which is being debated. It seems true that, contrary to the unsubstantiated fears of some Americans and the claims of those shrouded in the fog of isolationist schemes, few, if any, recent Presidents have given evidence of avoiding the treaty procedure through the use of executive agreements approved by simple majority of both Houses of the Congress. The history of the annexation of Texas should, nonetheless, serve as a warning to those who have failed to understand the dangers to States rights implicit in the George substitute. When we remember that even John C. Calhoun, without the support of Senator GEORGE's substitute to lean on, felt that a joint resolution approved by a simple majority of both Houses of Congress could be used in lieu of a treaty requiring the approval of two-thirds of the Senate, we have, Mr. President, real reasons to be concerned as to where the George proposal will take us. When we remember that the Supreme Court in 1868 upheld the use of an executive agreement approved by the simple majority of the Congress as a substitute for the more traditional treaty procedure, our grave doubts are fortified.

I have no fear, of course, that the Senator from Georgia is trying to weaken the powers of the States under the Constitution. But I have the gravest fears that, despite his sincerest intentions, the actual result of his amendment would be to work a most grievious weakening of the rights of the 48 States to protect themselves against Federal encroachment. I reiterate that I am sure that the Senator from Georgia does not intend this result, but it is the actual result that is accomplished by the amendment, rather than the intentions of its author, that is of importance.

In view of what I have said, I am unable to understand why the Senator from Georgia does not believe that his suggested amendment will do away with the historical and presently existing right of the States to demand a two-thirds approval of the Senate before an international agreement other than a treaty will be permitted to override State laws and State constitutions. I do not see why Senator GEORGE believes that future Presidents will not be able to introduce such things as the Genocide Convention, the Human Rights Covenants, conventions on socialized medicine, and the like, as executive agreements for the consent and implementation of a simple majority of both Houses of Congress, rather than as treaties for the consent of two-thirds of the Senate, as at present? Will not the smaller Southern and Western States be losing one of the greatest protections that was given to them by the Founding Fathers, and one that they have cherished and zealously guarded all through our long history?

Do the States of Georgia with only 10 Representatives, Arkansas with only 6, New Mexico with 2, and Arizona with 2, and other States wish to give up the protection provided by the requirement of a two-thirds vote of the Senate and match their strength with New York with 43 Representatives, Pennsylvania with 30, California with 30, Illinois with 25, Ohio with 23, and Michigan with 18, to mention merely some of the more heavily populated States? The situation certainly would apply with respect to the State so ably represented by the distinguished occupant of the chair, the Senator from Maine [Mr. PAYNE]. I doubt that the small States want such a result. I know that the State of Missouri does not want to give up the traditional protection afforded it by the treaty procedure. I shall let other Senators speak for their States.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, will the distinguished Senator from Missouri yield for a question?

Mr. HENNINGS. I yield to the distinguished Senator from Tennessee for a question.

Mr. GORE. It is a privilege to ask a question of the distinguished and able senior Senator from Missouri. Does the

Senator concede that an executive agreement can now become internal law, in some cases overriding State law, when in conflict therewith, through the action of the President, and without reference to the Congress?

Mr. HENNINGS. I shall go into that point more fully during the course of my discussion, as I have on the three past occasions when I have undertaken to address the Senate. However, I should like to ask the distinguished junior Senator from Tennessee what he means by internal law. I have never found any authentic definition of the term.

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

Mr. HENNINGS. I yield.

Mr. GEORGE. Is not the Senator a member of the Committee on the Judiciary?

Mr. HENNINGS. I am.

Mr. GEORGE. The distinguished Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] and the distinguished Senator from Missouri [Mr. HENNINGS] have talked about no one having defined the term internal law. I refer the Senator from Missouri to the hearings of his own committee, in which the question was discussed repeatedly by various witnesses who appeared before the committee. There was a discussion held of municipal law. There was a discussion held of domestic law. Finally there was a decision reached by the Senator's own committee to use the term internal law, as contrasted with external law.

I submit that statement also to the distinguished Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE].

The Senator from Georgia did not pull any rabbits out of his hat. It is a subject which has been considered already by the Committee on the Judiciary. It has already had the advice of distinguished lawyers and jurists who are experienced in that field. Therefore I used the term "internal law," although to me it is a bit awkward. But it does not seem to be objectionable, and it has been considered by the Committee on the Judiciary, of which the distinguished Senator from Missouri is himself an able Member. I ask if that is not true?

Mr. HENNINGS. It was considered by the committee. However, I wish to call attention to the fact——

Mr. GEORGE. Oh, the Senator was in the minority.

Mr. HENNINGS. I was one of the minority of that committee.

Mr. GEORGE. Oh, yes.

Mr. HENNINGS. If the Senator will let me finish I should like to say that I joined in the minority views as one of four such Members. Of course the fact that the term "internal law" was considered by the committee does not mean that it was adequately defined; nor that any committee definition or consideration gives the phrase "internal law" any standing.

Mr. GEORGE. But why did not the Senator——

Mr. HENNINGS. I should like to finish my statement.

Mr. GEORGE. Why did not the Senator, as a member of a distinguished committee, insist upon its being defined, if he wanted the term to be defined?

Mr. HENNINGS. I was not a member of the subcommittee which considered the Bricker resolution.

Mr. GEORGE. I merely wanted to call that fact to the attention of the Senator and the Senate.

Mr. HENNINGS. I am glad to have it called to my attention.

Mr. GEORGE. I wanted to do so because it has some bearing on the motion to recommit.

Mr. HENNINGS. Yes.

Mr. GEORGE. I wanted to call it to the attention of the Senator from Oregon also. In that regard it will be found that more than one witness discussed the question. I do not care to enter into any controversy about it. I selected the term because the committee majority had selected it. I thought the committee understood the term.

Mr. HENNINGS. I should like to——

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Missouri yield?

Mr. HENNINGS. Not at the moment. I shall undertake to answer the last comment of the distinguished Senator from Georgia with respect to the fact that the committee considered the phrase "internal law." Even though I was not a member of the subcommittee, I did join in a report with three other Senators, the so-called minority views, in opposition to what is known as the Bricker amendment.

One reason for my dilating further on the question of the phrase "internal law" is that no one really seems to know what it means. For example, John W. Davis, who I gather has some standing as a constitutional lawyer before this body and with the general public——

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, if the Senator from Missouri will permit me——

Mr. HENNINGS. If the Senator from Georgia will let me read the telegrams at this time I will appreciate it very much. I telegraphed Mr. Davis:

FEBRUARY 10, 1954.

JOHN W. DAVIS,
New York:

In connection with Senate debate on Bricker amendment and other proposals, I would greatly appreciate receiving a wire collect as soon as possible stating your opinion concerning Senator GEORGE's substitute proposal to amend the Constitution to provide:

"SEC. 2. An international agreement other than a treaty shall become effective as internal law in the United States only by an act of the Congress."

Thank you.

THOMAS C. HENNINGS, Jr.,
United States Senate.

In reply to my telegram, John W. Davis wired as follows:

YEAMANSHALL, S. C., *February 12, 1954.*

Hon. THOMAS C. HENNINGS,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:

Your telegram of 10th, section 2, George amendment, seems objectionable to me because its effect and interpretation are quite unpredictable. I am not familiar with the phrase "internal law." Assuming it means law within the territorial boundaries of United States and its possessions, only few executive agreements are so confined. Many have a foreign as well as domestic aspect. Are they to be good without legislation in one sphere but invalid in the other? I do not favor any proposed amendment the meaning and scope of which is not clear on its face. Better far than this that matters should be left as they are.

JOHN W. DAVIS.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Missouri let me interrupt for just a minute? I should like to say that I have great respect for John W. Davis, but inasmuch as John W. Davis does not know what the Court will decide in all instances and in all cases there is no very good reason why we should follow his view on this matter. I believe I could show the Senator, and my dear friend, John W. Davis, if he were here, that in almost countless cases the Supreme Court has disagreed with his interpretation and with what he thought was the Constitution.

Mr. HENNINGS. I do not believe there is any doubt about that at all.

Mr. GEORGE. That is correct.

Mr. HENNINGS. The Supreme Court itself disagrees among its own members. Some Justices disagree with their brethren in the interpretation of the Constitution.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, let me repeat to the Senator that I used the words "internal law," because the able Committee on the Judiciary, of which the distinguished Senator from Missouri is an honorable and honored member, had used the term itself in reporting the amendment to the Senate. The term "municipal law" could be used, and that term was used in an old treaty, but perhaps that term is too narrow. The term "domestic law" could have been used, and in a very large sense I used it in that way. However, the committee itself used the phrase "internal law" and the phrase "external law."

Mr. President, if I have been misled, I have been misled by the light from heaven, represented by the distinguished Committee on the Judiciary of the Senate. [Laughter.]

Mr. HENNINGS. The only reason I read the telegram from John W. Davis at this time was to indicate, not that John W. Davis necessarily speaks from Parnassus, or that he is infallible, but that as a lawyer of standing and as a lawyer of vast experience who often appears before the Supreme Court and who has for the major portion of his life been considered a profound constitutional lawyer, he himself does not understand what the term "internal law" means as used in the substitute of the distinguished Senator from Georgia.

If John W. Davis does not understand it, is it not conceivable that the courts may not understand it? Is it not conceivable that many members of the Judiciary Committee may not have understood it? If the Senator from Georgia undertakes to tax me with what some members of the Judiciary Committee had to say in a report, from which I dissociated myself by signing the minority views, I shall accept that responsibility insofar as in the judgment of other Senators I should accept it, but I repudiate the majority report; I repudiate the term "internal law," insofar as I can, be-

cause I do not think it means anything. It means one thing to one set of men, and another thing to another set of men. I think that applies to the courts, and as well to the Members of this body and to our brethren at the other end of the Capitol.

I shall be glad to yield now to the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Missouri has yielded to the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. GEORGE. I merely wanted to say that I have a great deal of respect for John W. Davis. I know that his voice is very persuasive on a great many legal points before the Nation. I want to acquit the Senator from Missouri of having approved the use of the words "internal law," because the Senator says he was in the minority and he dissented from the approval of that term. On that point, with all respect to my distinguished friend from Missouri, I simply observe that Ephriam is still joined with his idols.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Missouri yield?

Mr. HENNINGS. I yield to the distinguished Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, in view of the fact that the Senator from Georgia has just made reference to what I said on the floor a few days ago, I desire to say that by reference I wish to reincorporate it in the RECORD, because he has said nothing today which modifies the remarks I made at that time.

I was aware of the fact that the Judiciary Committee had had some discussion of the phrase "internal law," but the fact still remains that the discussion took place as an incidental discussion in the Judiciary Committee when the Bricker amendment was before that committee. It was quite a different discussion from that which would have taken place if the attention of the committee had been focused on the George amendment, as the committee should do, and call before it constitutional experts to testify on the meaning of the George amendment with the phrase "internal law" contained in it.

I respectfully submit that any discussion which has taken place up to this time on the phrase "internal law" was wholly ancillary in its nature and effect, and it was an entirely different type of hearing than the type for which the junior Senator from Oregon is calling when he asks that the George amendment be sent back to the committee so that for the first time there may be before the Judiciary Committee a full-dress hearing on the phrase "internal law" and all its implications.

The second point I made—and I should like to have the Senator from Georgia give me some evidence on this point before he leaves the floor—was that thus far in the running of the cases we are still looking for a United States Supreme Court decision which gives a definitive meaning to the term "internal law" as that phrase is used in the George amendment.

I say it is a very serious thing to vote for the amendment of the Senator from Georgia, with all the respect I have for him and for his constitutional-law knowledge, on the basis of his definition of "internal law." So far as I am concerned, Mr. President, it is not good enough for me. I want to have brought before me whatever cases there may be on the subject, and I want to have the benefit of the testimony of the top constitutional experts of the country with reference to the meaning of to what I think is a new constitutional concept.

Mr. HENNINGS. Mr. President, we were unable, after running the cases, insofar as our abilities and understanding were concerned, to find in any of the decided cases a constitutional definition of the phrase "internal law." It certainly seems that when we are undertaking to amend the Constitution of the United States on the floor of the Senate we should know with certainty what that phrase means. As I said when I read the telegram from John W. Davis, I did not suggest that he was on a plateau of absolute infallibility, any more than I would claim such an attribute for myself, though I would more readily concede it to the distinguished Senator from Georgia——

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I do not think the Senator from Missouri is justified in that statement. I said I hoped John W. Davis was infallible.

Mr. HENNINGS. I do not suggest that he is not fallible, and I would say that the distinguished Senator from Georgia would be heir to no greater fallibility than is John W. Davis.

But I think reasonable lawyers, good lawyers, able constitutional authorities, disagree. What right have we, as United States Senators, when there is a difference of opinion as to the meaning of a phrase, to embed that phrase in the Constitution of the United States and go to the country, saying, "This is what we have handed you. Now, work your will upon it in the State legislatures"?

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Missouri yield further?

Mr. HENNINGS. I shall be very happy to yield.

Mr. GEORGE. I merely rose to say that I had used that term because it had been used by the Judiciary Committee after a prolonged hearing. I assumed that the committee had explored its full meaning. I can see that it is somewhat broader than the term "municipal law"; it is somewhat broader, maybe, than the term "domestic law." It may be almost equivalent to the term "law of the land." I do not know. I assumed that the Judiciary Committee, of which I knew the distinguished Senator from Missouri was an honored member, had explored it fully, and, because, in the very resolution reported to the Senate, that term is used. I hope the Senator will not think I claimed any superior wisdom in suggesting it, but I am sure it must have been suggested by some very learned persons who appeared before the Judiciary Committee. I am sure the members of the committee understand it. I do not believe, however, Mr. President, that there would be any misunderstanding of the term in the State Department or in the Executive Department, if we had the courage to say what we believe ought to go into a constitutional amendment.

That is my position, my whole position.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Missouri yield?

Mr. HENNINGS. Before the distinguished Senator from Georgia leaves the floor, let me say that I hope he will not tax the Senator from Missouri or other members of the Committee on the Judiciary with all things which may emanate from that committee of which I am very proud to me a member. The distinguished Senator from Maryland [Mr. BUTLER] will recall that this morning in the Committee on the Judiciary there were a number of divided votes on certain questions. There is a great deal of business to consider in that committee, and we are confronted with many things as to which Members receiving one or another point of view disagree.

I should like to ask the Senator from Georgia if he thinks there could be any dubiety in the minds of reasonable men, in the minds of learned scholars, in the minds of constitutional authorities, or in the higher courts of this land as to the meaning, implication, and impact of the phrase internal law. If not, I think it would be most helpful to all to understand precisely what that phrase means, beyond cavil, beyond speculation, and beyond the realm of conjecture, because it is tremendously important in this discussion.

Mr. GEORGE. I have already tried to state my position on the phrase "internal law," and my definition of it. I now repeat what I have previously said, that any treaty or executive agreement which overrides an otherwise valid law of a State ought not to be entered into by any President or by the State Department.

I regard the fifth amendment as a limitation upon all powers of government. It is a limitation upon all, or it is a limitation upon none. I regard the limitations in the Constitution definitely as restraints upon the exercise of every power in or under the Constitution. That is my position.

Mr. HENNINGS. The Senator from Georgia and I are in complete accord in that regard.

Mr. GEORGE. I am very happy to note that fact.

Mr. HENNINGS. There is no question about that in the mind of anybody who understands the implications.

Mr. GEORGE. I think that statement, that premise, solves the whole question. If we are in agreement, then we should have no difficulty. I do not believe there can be any difficulty about the words "internal law." But I have not studied the question as has the Committee on the Judiciary. I did not have the opportunity to do so, because I am not a member of that committee. But I do not believe there is any real misunderstanding of the words "internal law." As used in the substitute, they simply mean that when, by a treaty or an executive agreement, it is proposed to override an otherwise valid law of a State or of the constitution of a State, that shall not be done. That is all I think the phrase means, and that is all I want it to mean.

I hope the Senator from Missouri will excuse me. I thought he was addressing himself to the amendment which had been offered and which now is in the same language I suggested, but not at first, because in very large measure it had been suggested by the distinguished Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER] and by the Committee on the Judiciary. With that amendment I am entirely content. I think we could do nothing less than to agree to it, even if we were disposed to set on our hands and do nothing. I think that could be done without any affront to the Constitution or to anyone.

I cannot see why my distinguished brethren, who are learned, earnest, and experienced advocates of the law, should be worried about the phrase "internal law," because we are dealing with two factors. First, every treaty and every executive agreement is concerned with the external effect of the treaty or agreement, which involves the exercise of the political power of a sovereign nation as it may affect another sovereign nation. That is external law beyond all doubt. I do not wish to affect that in any way. I have not suggested anything to affect it. I do not want to disturb it, because I conceive it to be essential in our system of government. In the case of an executive agreement, at the very moment when the President attaches his signature to it and delivers it, it becomes fully effective as external law. It sets up our obligations and presumably creates counter obligations on the part of the other sovereign to us.

But if anything in such an agreement touches upon, modifies, or overrides an otherwise valid law of a State of the United States, then such an agreement ought not to become law—until when? until the Senate by a two-thirds vote approves it? I do not think so. I think Congress, in the ordinary, normal method of making laws, should pass upon it.

When Congress has passed upon such an agreement, it will immediately become effective in the United States whether it be a treaty or an executive agreement. Then, so far as I am concerned, I shall acquiesce in it.

I know the United States is a sovereign nation. I want it to remain a sovereign nation. I have never suggested in any proposal I have put forward, and I never shall, that the hands of the United States Government should be tied in dealing with its political powers as they affect foreign nations. The moment the President places his signature on an executive agreement confined to external matters, the matter is ended, so far as I am concerned, because the President has acted. But if in such an agreement there is anything which touches, modifies, overrides, or repeals a provision of a State constitution or a State law, it ought to come before Congress for consideration. It should not be considered by only one branch of Congress, but by both, and should be dealt with in the ordinary, normal processes of legislation. That is my whole position.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Missouri yield, to permit me to ask the Senator from Georgia a question?

Mr. HENNINGS. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. I am seeking to learn what the amendment of the Senator from Georgia means. Would it be fair to say that what he is proposing, in part, is that there shall be established a requirement of the application by Congress of a doctrine of separability in connection with executive agreements as to internal and external matters, in the sense that the Senator has used the words "internal" and "external"?

Mr. GEORGE. In the sense that I am using those words, yes. I may say to the Senator from Oregon that my profound conviction is that Judge Cooley was entirely correct when he said that each branch of the Government has the responsibility, primary and absolute, so far as it is concerned, to determine what is and what is not a constitutional enactment. I utterly disagree with any appeal, however worthy the objective, that Congress should disregard what it believes to be constitutional limitations, in order to work what we think is an immediate good. I am certain the distinguished Senator from Oregon does not disagree with that premise.

Mr. MORSE. I do not agree with the principle. I have one other question. Is it the view of the Senator from Georgia that if at present the doctrine of separability is applicable to executive agreements, it is very confused in the present state of the law; and that, therefore, the Senator from Georgia believes the confusion ought to be eliminated by saying to the courts that it is the intention of Congress and the people, if the proposed constitutional amendment shall be adopted, that when the President signs an executive agreement, it shall be subject to the doctrine of separability?

Mr. GEORGE. I think that is correct. I have not explored the subject exactly as the Senator has stated it, but I think that is substantially and essentially my meaning.

Mr. MORSE. I want the Senator from Georgia to know that I have never been in any doubt as to his meaning. I believe he has made his meaning clear. I have simply been in doubt as to what a great many constitutional experts would say about the Senator's amendment. The doctrine of separability has a great many ramifications.

Mr. GEORGE. I admit that.

Mr. MORSE. I desire to know, in the light of full dress hearings before the Committee on the Judiciary, what can be said on both sides of the question before I vote. That has been the only plea I have made on that point.

Mr. GEORGE. I understand the position of the distinguished Senator from Oregon. I merely wish to remind him of a fact, which he already well knows, that only the ignorant agree upon what a law is or how it should be interpreted; but lawyers always disagree upon legal questions.

Mr. MORSE. I also know that the people suffer when the ignorant disagree.

Mr. GEORGE. Yes; but I also know, and I again remind the Senator, that if he will go as far as I have suggested here, at an early date he will go much further, because the American people understand the issue. I hope my friends will not mistake that statement. I do not mean that when the roll is called in some subsequent Congress, Senators present today will not be here. [Laughter.]

Mr. HENNINGS. That was what Jim Reed said at the time of the debate about the case of Missouri against Holland.

Mr. GEORGE. Yes. He was right, and he was wrong. But I say that the American people understand this simple issue. They are not profoundly disturbed. A great many eminent lawyers are. A great many members of the American bar are profoundly disturbed about treaties becoming the internal law of the country, or the domestic law—let us not quarrel about terms—until Congress passes on them; but in the Constitution there are many restraints on the President. So far as I am concerned, I am satisfied that President Eisenhower will regard such restraints. I have no fear about what President Eisenhower will do about those restraints when they are called to his attention.

Furthermore, there is the power in the Senate to say, by a two-thirds vote, that a treaty may not become the law of the land. I think I have answered that simple question. I think that is sufficient to say with regard to treaties. That is my view of it. That is my opinion. I have not desired to project either House of the Congress any further into the treatymaking power than it already is under the Constitution of the United States.

My whole concern has been and is with executive agreements, with arrangements and understandings reached by the President with a foreign power. In many instances such agreements do affect and do touch internal law. I believe that, under our constitutional powers, we ought to say, and we have the perfect right to say to the people of the States: "Here is our proposal: Before an executive agreement affects your law, your State constitutions, you should have the right to pass on it, not as States, but through both Houses of your Congress, the Senate and the House, through the ordinary, normal processes of legislation."

I think that is going a long way toward States' rights. Although the distinguished Senator from Missouri did not say so, I think he meant to say that I should be following John C. Calhoun; and I am going to follow John C. Calhoun in many things, but not in the extreme States' rights view he expressed. It never has been my conception that a State had a right to nullify an act of the Congress of the United States, or to withdraw from the Union. It has been my conception that States had rights in the larger field of personal relationships which grow up in the States and which affect all their people, all their businesses, all their schools, and all their churches. There is an essentially sound doctrine of States' rights in that large field; and whenever such rights are abandoned, we will abandon liberty in this country, because one cannot maintain human liberty, one cannot promote freedom of the citizen, when one looks alone to a central government in Washington. Such matters must be handled in jurisdictions which are controlled and presided over by men who are elected by

local representatives, who are responsive to local opinion, and who can hear petitions for redress of grievances and correction of wrongs. That is my idea of States' rights. I do not measure up to the stature of the statesman referred to, but the opinions I have stated are my views of States' rights. However, I express again the profound conviction that something of John C. Calhoun's views will enter into the philosophy of the Supreme Court of the United States, and something of the magnificent doctrine of John W. Davis will prevail in the councils of that Court, when they decide the essentially States' rights issues now before the Court.

Mr. HENNINGS. Before the distinguished Senator from Georgia leaves, I believe he announced on Thursday that he would discuss the Pink case. The Senator was somewhat at variance with the interpretation some of us gave to that case. I advert to that because, at page 1668 of the RECORD, in response to a question which I asked the Senator from Georgia, he said:

> I confess that that is true so far as executive agreements are concerned, because had not the Pink case gone as far as I believe it has, keeping in line with the general trend of some of the decisions that have tended to interpret executive agreements as being very closely akin to treaties, I would not have offered my substitute.

I believe the distinguished Senator from Georgia said last week that the Congress, and particularly the Senate, had taken no action relating to the Litvinov assignment. Is that not correct?

Mr. GEORGE. No; I did not. The Senator misunderstood me. I read later what the Senator referred to. I referred only to the action which was taken with reference to the German claims in the First World War and the claims against Germany and her allies in the Second World War. In fact, we have taken such action in every war. We have created a commission to adjust the claims of citizens of the United States. That is all that was involved.

Mr. HENNINGS. I refer to page 1665 of the RECORD, wherein the following was said:

> Mr. HENNINGS. Let me ask a question regarding that point, please. Does the Senator from Georgia tell us that Congress did not implement the terms of the Litvinov agreement?
>
> Mr. GEORGE. I have no knowledge that the Congress ever acted upon those assignments.

Mr. GEORGE. What the Senator has read is correct.

Mr. HENNINGS. The fact of the matter is that the Senator from Georgia was a member of the Committee on Foreign Relations at that time and that the Congress did create a commission to consider such claims. The fact further is that Congress at that time, prior to any judicial determination, by its vote, could have refused to accept the terms of such agreement. Is that not true?

Mr. GEORGE. Oh, no. The Senator is incorrect and misapprehends the whole effect of such matters as they came before the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate and the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives. We did sanction the creation of a commission to determine the claims of American nationals against the Russian Government and, in some instances, against Russian nationals who may have been representing the Russian Government; but we were not dealing specifically with the Litvinov agreement. In fact, I doubt that we had any knowledge of it. I know I did not. Certainly we were not acting with reference to the assignment which was made.

It is true that under the assignment, funds may have been available or may have been made available to pay some American claims; but far more was involved in what we were doing than merely the Litvinov assignment. As in the case of arrangements with Mexico, and with Germany in World War I, and with Germany and some of her allies in World War II, we were undertaking to appoint a commission which would adjudicate the claims, not only of our Government but of our citizens, against nationals of other countries who were engaged with Germany and against whom complaints had been made. That is all there was to that. Now they may have recovered whatever assets were recoverable under the Litvinov assignment. That I do not deny. I do not know, but presumably they did.

Mr. HENNINGS. Mr. President, does the distinguished Senator say, then, that Congress did act specifically upon the Litvinov assignment when the Senator was a member of the Committee on Foreign Relations?

Mr. GEORGE. Absolutely not, to my knowledge or recollection. I have no recollection of it.

Mr. HENNINGS. Does the Senator deny that when the matter came before the Senate, the Senate could have repudiated the Litvinov agreement by its vote?

Mr. GEORGE. No, I do not deny that Congress could have, if it had known anything about it. The other House of the Congress might have resorted to the other very great remedy, which has been suggested, namely, that of impeachment; but they did not do it.

Mr. HENNINGS. But Congress did know about it, because Congress created a commission.

Mr. GEORGE. But the commission was to determine the validity of the claims of United States nationals against foreign governments or the nationals of foreign governments. That is all that was. We did that in the case of Mexico.

Mr. HENNINGS. Yes; I am aware of the Mexican Claims Commission.

Mr. GEORGE. Yes. We were a little more generous in that instance, in that we provided the money with which to pay the claims.

Mr. HENNINGS. Does the Senator from Georgia suggest that at the time when the matter of the creation of the commission came before the Senate and the commission was created, the Senator from Georgia, as a member of the Foreign Relations Committee, knew nothing about the assignment?

Mr. GEORGE. Nothing on earth. I knew nothing of it, unless it had been before the courts. I might have read a court decision on it; but if I did, that was all. It did not come to us officially.

Mr. HENNINGS. The Senator from Georgia knows that the Pink case did not come until much later.

Mr. GEORGE. The other day I told the Senator from Missouri that I would discuss the Pink case if it were necessary to do so.

But let me invite the attention of my colleague from Missouri to one thing: I think he will find that the final court of appeals under the British system, from which we have obtained so much of our jurisprudence, requires all judges to write opinions, even though they agree with what has been found, for in that way courts and citizens can determine what was in the mind of the court. So I invite the Senator from Missouri to read just two things in connection with the Pink case: First, the headnotes.

Mr. HENNINGS. I have read the fifty-odd pages of that case, including the headnotes. I have read the entire case a number of times.

Mr. GEORGE. The headnotes specifically say what was decided. Presumably the judge who rendered the opinion might have had some control over the headnotes, although he is not responsible for them. I grant that; I have been on the bench of courts of appeal.

But I invite my colleague to read the dissent of Chief Justice Stone. There he will see that Chief Justice Stone was not setting up a strawman to be knocked down. He knew what Associate Justice Douglas and the other Associate Justices of the Court had agreed to; and he completely demolished every line of their reasoning, in my judgment. Let my colleague read that decision.

Mr. HENNINGS. I have read it.

Mr. GEORGE. Then the Senator from Missouri will understand the Pink case.

Mr. HENNINGS. Of course on Thursday the Senator from Georgia told us that he would discuss the Pink case.

Mr. GEORGE. I may do so.

Mr. HENNINGS. Let me ask the Senator from Georgia whether he agrees with the position taken by Mr. Justice Owen Roberts in that case. He was one of the dissenting Justices, was he not?

Mr. GEORGE. Yes; he agreed with the Chief Justice.

Mr. HENNINGS. He agreed with Chief Justice Stone, did he not?

Mr. GEORGE. Exactly.

Mr. HENNINGS. At this point let me read from a letter I have received from Owen J. Roberts, under date of February 11. The letter was in reply to a letter from me, relating to the amendment of the distinguished Senator from Georgia. Later, in the course of my prepared remarks, I shall advert further to the letter from Owen J. Roberts; but at this time I shall read from it, as follows:

> The Supreme Court of the United States reexamined the matter for itself, and found that the Russian decree had extraterritorial effect.

This letter is from one of the dissenting Justices, Owen J. Roberts, with whom the distinguished Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] concurs.

I read further from the letter:

> But this nominally would be a question upon which the Supreme Court would not

review a State court. In order to reach out and take jurisdiction, a majority of the Court had to hold that Litvinov's assignment had the effect of overruling State law in this respect, and that President Roosevelt in receiving it so intended it. There is not a word in the record to show this; it is purely inference.

Mr. Roberts then writes:

Let me point out that Senator GEORGE's proposed amendment would not have altered the situation in the slightest. Congress knew—

Although the distinguished Senator from Georgia said Congress did not know of the agreement—

of the Litvinov agreement, approved it, and implemented it by providing for a commissioner to examine claims and distribute any funds that the United States might get under the assignment. See House of Representatives 865, 76th Congress, 1st session. See also joint resolution of August 4, 1939.

Mr. Roberts goes on to say:

But suppose Congress had gone even further and had affirmatively approved, ratified, and ordered carried into execution the Litvinov assignment. The same question would then have been presented to the Supreme Court, namely, Was so broad an effect to be given the assignment as to hold that it abrogated the law of New York concerning the distribution of an insolvent's assets? Clearly the administration would have prevailed in the Supreme Court on the same basis, namely, the construction of the assignment, as it did in fact prevail.

As I said in my telegram to you, and as I repeat, the George amendment would not have altered in the slightest the decision in the Pink case.

Former Associate Justice Roberts then writes:

I thought, when it was decided, that that decision was wrong. I still think so. But if there be any defect whatever, it is the defect in the attitude of the Supreme Court concerning the scope and the effect of the assignment. To strike down the power of a President to make necessary agreements in connection with the recognition of a foreign government and with many of the details of our daily relationships with our neighbors, because of what I think is the erroneous decision of the Supreme Court in the construction of a written instrument, seems to me to be the height of folly.

That letter comes from the Justice who joined with Chief Justice Stone in the dissenting opinion in the Pink case, which the distinguished Senator from Georgia has urged me to read, and which I have read repeatedly, but which I have been unable to interpret as being a foundation to justify an attempt to amend the Constitution of the United States in language and terms upon which the most eminent and respectable authorities, including both laymen and lawyers, are unable to agree, or which they are unable to understand.

I say it would be a reproach to this body, which is said by some to be the greatest deliberative body in the world, to endorse without its being submitted to the Committee on the Judiciary for consideration by it as to the meaning of the amendment of the distinguished and eminent Senator from Georgia. That committee should consider its possible effects and impacts not only upon our relations abroad and our international dealings with other countries, but upon dealings throughout the length and breadth of the land.

Of course the Senator from Georgia professes the greatest respect for the learned Judiciary Committee, from which he borrowed the term "internal law." However, the Senator from Georgia now seems well content and very happy to bypass the committee, when it comes to considering the meaning of his substitute amendment.

Mr. GEORGE. No, Mr. President; I merely called attention to the fact that the expression was contained in the committee's report, and that the committee took evidence regarding it.

Judging from what the distinguished Senator from Missouri has read from the letter from Mr. Justice Roberts, I think it clear that Justice Roberts is still of the opinion that the construction in the Pink case did override State law, clearly, definitely, positively. He says that my amendment would not have reached that situation. Suppose it had been in effect when the parties to that case in New York undertook to plead the Litvinov assignment, to which the President had assented. The parties to that suit could have said, "This agreement has never been approved by the Congress of the United States," and it would have been a complete answer to the suit, Mr. Justice Roberts to the contrary.

I might invoke the doctrine that while a juror may sustain his verdict, he is not——

Mr. HENNINGS. He may not impeach it.

Mr. GEORGE. He is not entitled to repudiate it.

Mr. HENNINGS. Let me say to the distinguished Senator from Georgia that it is coincidental that I happened to have been a member of the Foreign Affairs Committee of the House of Representatives at the time this agreement came before it. The distinguished Senator from Georgia was then a member of the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate. The Senator from Georgia having said that the Congress acted upon a number of agreements setting up commissions, if he will indulge me——

Mr. GEORGE. I mean at different times; not at that time.

Mr. HENNINGS. I invite attention to House Report No. 865, 76th Congress, first session, under the heading of "Claims of American Nationals Against the Government of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics." The report quotes a letter to President Roosevelt, dated June 1, 1939, signed by Cordell Hull, then Secretary of State.

Mr. GEORGE. What is the date of it?

Mr. HENNINGS. I have just read the date of the letter, June 1, 1939. The date of the report is June 19, 1939.

I quote from the letter as it appears on page 2 of the House report:

It has not thus far been possible to bring about an agreement with the Soviet Government for the settlement of such claims, but on November 16, 1933, preparatory to the settlement of all claims and counter-claims between the two Governments, the Soviet Government assigned to the Government of the United States certain assets in this country. Some of these assets have been liquidated and covered into the Treasury where they have been deposited in a special fund; others are the subject of litigation now pending in our courts. Such of them as may be held to be payable to this Government under the assignment will be deposited in the fund as they are collected.

Let me say to the distinguished Senator that that agreement was published in 1933. It consisted of an exchange of letters between President Franklin D. Roosevelt and Mr. Litvinov, dated November 16, 1933. I shall introduce into the RECORD the photostatic copies of this correspondence as reported by the New York Times on November 18, 1933, at the conclusion of my remarks.

Mr. GEORGE. When was that letter published?

Mr. HENNINGS. In 1933.

Mr. GEORGE. I am not asking for the date of the letter. I am asking when it was published.

Mr. HENNINGS. The document which I hold in my hand was first printed in 1933, according to the notation. The copy which I hold in my hand is a reprint. The notation is to the effect that it was first printed in 1933. So we did have notice, of course, of the Litvinov assignment, and we did have notice of the recognition of Soviet Russia in 1933.

Mr. GEORGE. Even if we had notice of the Litvinov assignment we could not have had any notice of what the Supreme Court of the United States subsequently held, with five Justices on the majority side, and with the Chief Justice and Mr. Justice Roberts dissenting. In a devastating dissent the Chief Justice answered all points in the case.

I repeat that what we were doing in the case of Russia was no more than what we did in the case of Germany or in the case of Mexico. It was no more than what we have done in all cases, namely, to create a Commission to adjudicate the claims of our nationals against the Russian Government, the German Government, or the Mexican Government, and also, in many instances, to adjudicate the claims of the United States.

The funds derived under the Litvinov agreement could have been only an infinitesimal part of the total claims which were asserted and have been asserted, or prevented, at least, against the Russian Government. We had a claim of some $11 billion, and up to this time, so far as I know, no great part of it has been paid. But certainly that sort of recognition did not put the Congress on notice of anything that was in the Litvinov agreement, or what the Supreme Court of the United States might hold. The holding of the Supreme Court is the signal of a danger against which we here seek to guard. We are seeking to provide that these agreements, which are not assented to by the Congress in the first instance, or even necessarily brought to the attention of the Congress, shall not become binding within the United States as a part of our domestic law, so as to override otherwise valid laws and provisions in State constitutions, unless the Congress—not the States—through the ordinary, normal process of lawmaking, shall have approved them.

Mr. HENNINGS. In the opinion of the learned Senator, would the ordinary process of lawmaking be to refer this

proposal back to the duly constituted Committee on the Judiciary for further examination of the Senator's amendment?

Mr. GEORGE. No. Frankly, I believe that the proposal to send it back to the committee is simply a method of interment or burial. At least, that would be the hope of some. That would not be true in the case of the distinguished Senator from Missouri or the distinguished Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], but that would be the interpretation placed upon such action by the country.

This question has been before the Committee on the Judiciary for many months. I do not know for how long. This very question has been discussed. In view of those facts, I believe that we ought now to be prepared to act upon the proposal. I do not say that we must approve what the committee has reported, but we should approve a definite, positive policy, so that we can submit it to the people of the States.

Let me say to my friend that I have no fear of submitting a proposed constitutional amendment to the State legislatures. They will scrutinize it. They will give it life if it should have life. I have no fear of permitting them to do so. But I again say, without any attempt to warn any Senator, that we will now go as far as I have suggested, or that at a no great distant date we will go perhaps further. I do not want to take an extreme step which would disturb the proper relationship, as I conceive it to be, between the National Government and the States in the field of treaty-making.

Mr. President, I hope that the distinguished Senator will now address himself to the first amendment, which is the Ferguson amendment, although it is now the same as my amendment.

Mr. HENNINGS. Mr. President, if the Senator from Georgia will remain for a while, I shall address myself to the Ferguson amendment and to the Senator's substitute. To the best of my ability I shall undertake to do so as quickly as I possibly can. I had hoped that the distinguished Senator from Georgia would advert more to the Pink case today, as he indicated he would on Thursday.

Mr. GEORGE. No; I have already stated where the Senator can get the meat of the Pink case. If he will read the dissenting opinion of Mr. Justice Stone, he will get it.

Mr. HENNINGS. I thank the distinguished Senator for his contribution. Is Justice Roberts still on the high plateau to which the Senator has referred?

Mr. GEORGE. Oh, yes; I have nothing to say against Mr. Justice Roberts, except that he is mistaken in what he says about my amendment.

Mr. HENNINGS. In accordance with the distinguished Senator's request, I shall address myself both to the amendment offered by the Senator from Georgia, as I stated at the outset, and also to the amendment offered by the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON]. I made that statement when I began my address, and I repeat it now for the benefit of the Senator from Georgia.

I understand the Senator from Georgia makes the general assertion that the President alone can make executive agreements which are binding on the States, without even a majority of either House passing upon them. He relies on the dicta of one Supreme Court case for his assertion. All the Court held is that in the exercise of a specific power granted him under the Constitution, such as the President's power to recognize a foreign government, the President can conclude executive agreements which can override conflicting State policies or State laws. The holding is very narrow.

I believe the Senator from Tennessee wanted to ask a question at this point during the rather protracted colloquy between myself and the Senator from Georgia.

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

Mr. HENNINGS. First I should like to conclude my remarks on this point, so that I can stay on the track, so to speak. When I have concluded my remarks I shall be very happy to yield to all Senators, until we turn the lights out. However, I should like to make these comments first. By so doing we may save some time.

Except for the dicta in this one case there is no indication that the Supreme Court has any intention of permitting executive agreements, which are made outside the President's specific constitutional powers, to override State laws.

It seems to me that any Senator who, like the Senator from Georgia, advocates that the States should give up to Congress one of their most potent and living protections against the encroachment of Federal power, namely, the two-thirds vote in the Senate, because he feels that the Supreme Court might, at some indeterminate time in the future, allow a President by executive agreements to act in derogation of the rights of the States, is not thinking of the doctrine of State sovereignty or the supremacy of the States under the separation of powers theory. As I have said before, this is rather fatal medicine for a hypothetical disease, or for something which has not happened and is not very likely to happen.

There are a number of other aspects of the debate which I wish to explore further. During his remarks on Thursday, the Senator from Georgia made several statements which indicated that he feared secret agreements can override State and Federal law. For instance he said:

> There must be an act of Congress carrying into effect those provisions of a secret agreement which override otherwise valid State laws. That is all I propose.

That statement will be found at page 1665, column 1, of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

I submit that the George amendment has nothing to do with secret agreements, be they treaties, executive agreements, or other international agreements. All the George amendment proposes to do is to prevent executive agreements from having effect as internal law unless there is an implementing act by Congress. We have just learned that the distinguished Senator from Georgia was a member of the Committee on Foreign Relations and did act upon the so-called Litvinov assignment, of which he stated earlier today and the other day he knew nothing.

However, secret agreements, by their very nature, cannot possibly have any effect on internal law. How could a court—any court—possibly allow a litigant to make any use whatever of an executive agreement which has been kept a secret by the President? By the very fact that it had been kept secret, neither the litigant nor the judge would have any knowledge of it, obviously, and could not possibly make any use of it as internal law, as the distinguished Senator from Georgia now says he understands what that term means and wants us to understand what it means, because the Committee on the Judiciary used the phrase, and because other learned men, he says, used that phrase, and they must know what it means. Once an agreement is made public, it is no longer secret, and only then can a litigant use it.

Mr. President, I should like to anticipate the specious argument which might be made by asking the question, "Well, how about an agreement that is kept secret for 10 years and is then made public; would not that become internal law?" We have been touching on that question to some extent this afternoon. Whether it would become internal law would depend on the constitutional power under which it was concluded. But it is perfectly obvious, even if such an agreement is effective as internal law without any implementation, that no court would ever permit the prosecution of anyone for a violation of it, committed prior to the publication and prior to the time it could be presumed that the violator had knowledge of it. Any other result would be unspeakable and unknown in the American process of justice.

Thus I say, all the talk about secret agreements is completely irrelevant. The George substitute does not deal with them. In any event they cannot take effect as internal law until after they are made public.

During the discussion last Thursday, I suggested to the distinguished Senator from Georgia that the Congress could have negated the Litvinov assignment if it had chosen to do so but that the Congress on the contrary had chosen to implement this executive agreement. In reply to my statement, the Senator stated that, so far as he could recall, the Congress knew nothing about the Litvinov assignment until it became subject to litigation in the courts and that he did not know of any implementation by the Congress of this assignment. Later in the discussion I referred my distinguished colleague from Georgia to the act of Congress which implemented the Litvinov assignment, a joint resolution passed by both Houses of Congress and approved by the President on August 21, 1939—53d United States Statutes at Large, page 1199; House Report No. 865, 76th Congress, 1st session. This joint resolution in substance authorized the President to appoint a commissioner

to determine the validity and amounts of the claims of American nationals against the Soviet Union.

In reporting this measure to the Senate on behalf of the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations, of which the Senator from Georgia was, as now, a member, Senator Pat Harrison, of Mississippi, said:

I do not know of any other way for American nationals to have an opportunity to present their claims against the Soviet Government. (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 84, pt. 10, p. 10631.

It is perfectly natural that the learned Senator from Georgia would not have remembered that the Litvinov assignment was made public in 1933 and that the Congress in 1939 passed a joint resolution implementing it. During the time he has been a member of the Foreign Relations Committee of the Senate this committee must have handled thousands of items, and this joint resolution was adopted by the Senate after a very brief explanation of the measure by Senator Harrison. I bring these facts to the attention of the Senate merely to establish the fact that the Congress did know about the Litvinov assignment prior to the time it became the subject of litigation, and did, in fact, implement it by passing a joint resolution authorizing the President to set up a commission to determine the validity and amount of American claims against the Soviet Government.

The Litvinov assignment was effected by an exchange of letters dated November 16, 1933, between President Roosevelt and Maxim Litvinov, the then Commissar of Foreign Affairs of the Soviet Union.

The State Department published the Litvinov assignment in late 1933—Department of State Publication 528, Eastern European series, No. 1, old series. I hold in my hands a reprint of this agreement issued by the State Department in 1948. Also, the full text of the assignment was published in full in an edition of the American Journal of International Law published in January 1934.

Mr. President, last Thursday when I discussed the Pink case briefly with the senior Senator from Georgia, he referred a number of times to the philosophy of the case as a great danger to us all. I am not sure exactly what he means by "philosophy," but I presume that he means the paragraph or two of dicta in the case which, though unessential to the decision, speak of executive agreements having a similar dignity to treaties, whatever that may mean. I should like to point out that never has the philosophy of the case, nor have the dicta of the case, been put into practice by the courts, or, for that matter, ever been repeated by the courts even as dicta. As all lawyers know, most courts are prone to add obiter dicta to their opinions. Lawyers also learn not to take such dicta too seriously. It is only when it is implemented in a later case that it is of importance. The dicta in the Pink case have never been implemented by a later case. The possibility that it might be is no ground to amend the Constitution of the United States. If we amended the Constitution every time a Supreme Court Justice appended some far-reaching and vague dicta to an opinion, we would have as our Constitution an unworkable document a hundred times the size of our present compact and workable document.

In regard to this matter on February 10, 1954, I sent former Justice Owen D. Roberts the following telegram:

In consideration of your dissent in Pink case which Senator GEORGE is principally relying on in support of his proposal, I would greatly appreciate receiving a wire collect as soon as possible stating your opinion concerning his substitute proposal to amend the Constitution to provide:

"SEC. 2. An international agreement other than a treaty shall become effective as internal law in the United States only by an act of the Congress."

Thank you.

THOMAS C. HENNINGS, Jr.

In reply Mr. Justice Roberts sent the following telegram:

George amendment would not reach Pink situation. President has sole power to decide on recognition foreign power. He may as he did with Russia demand as condition that such power abandon or assign claims against our nationals. Trouble in Pink case was that Court read into mere assignment an intent to change State law, as to effect of assignment. I am still against any amendment.

OWEN J. ROBERTS.

The telegram was followed by the following letter from Mr. Justice Roberts:

FEBRUARY 11, 1954.

DEAR SENATOR HENNINGS: Pursuant to your telegram received this morning, I sent you a day letter today briefly stating why I did not think the Pink case was relevant to the present discussion of the proposed amendments to the Constitution.

Mr. President, the distinguished Senator from Georgia a few days ago stated on the floor of the Senate:

I confess that that is true so far as executive agreements are concerned, because had not the Pink case gone as far as I believe it has, keeping in line with the general trend of some of the decisions that have tended to interpret executive agreements as being very closely akin to treaties, I would not have offered my substitute.

Mr. President, I continue reading from the letter from Mr. Justice Roberts:

I should like to elaborate that telegram so as to make more understandable my position concerning the Pink case.

I do not suppose even the most radical advocate of limiting the President's powers would suggest that the matter of recognition or nonrecognition of a foreign government rests anywhere but in the executive. It has not been uncommon for Presidents to condition their recognition of a foreign government on that government's fulfilling certain conditions. I do not understand that it is proposed to alter this prerogative of the Chief Executive.

In the light of these statements, I come to the recognition of Russia by President Roosevelt. Much hard feeling and difficulty had been created by certain claims against our nationals and certain refusals to recognize debts owed to our nationals. When President Roosevelt determined to recognize Russia, he imposed a condition that the U. S. S. R. should assign to the United States all claims against our nationals. This would mean a relinquishment of all claims to funds held in the United States for account of citizens of Russia and would no doubt furnish a fund which could be used to pay certain valid claims of our citizens against Russia and Russian citizens. Now it should be observed that President Roosevelt made no "agreement" as to what we should do for Russia. He merely exacted from Litvinov an assignment by the U. S. S. R. of all its claims against our nationals. Naturally the agreement did not specify what those claims were nor did it specify that all claims by Russia must be considered valid by the courts of the United States. It was obviously to be construed as an assignment of whatever would have been collectible by Russia and Russia's nationals against our nationals in whatever court had jurisdiction to adjudicate the validity of a claim. The Supreme Court so held in *Guaranty Trust Company* v. *U. S.* (304 U. S. 142), where it held that the defendant in a claim under the assignment could plead the statute of limitations. In the Pink case, the insurance commissioner of New York had paid all domestic claimants. Then a number of claims against the fund were filed by foreigners. The administration evidently decided to try to keep the foreigners from coming in on the fund so that it could go to the United States to be distributed amongst claimants against Russia. The Attorney General, therefore, took the position that the Russian decree of confiscation had extraterritorial operation, and was within the category of "claims" specified in the Litvinov assignment. The Court of Appeals of New York was of a different view. The Supreme Court of the United States reexamined the matter for itself and found that the Russian decree had extraterritorial effect, but this normally would be a question upon which the Supreme Court would not review a State court. In order to reach out and take jurisdiction, a majority of the Court had to hold the Litvinov assignment had the effect of overruling State law in this respect and that President Roosevelt, in receiving it, so intended. There is not a word in the record to show this. It is purely inference.

Now let me point out that Senator GEORGE'S proposed amendment would not have altered the situation in the slightest. Congress knew of the Litvinov agreement, approved of it, and implemented it by providing for a commissioner to examine claims and distribute any fund that the United States might get under the assignment. See H. R. 865, 76th Congress, 1st session; see also joint resolution of August 4, 1939, 53 Stat. 1199. But suppose Congress had gone even further and had affirmatively approved, ratified, and ordered carried into execution the Litvinov assignment. The same question would then have been presented to the Supreme Court, namely, Was so broad an effect to be given the assignment as to hold that it abrogated the law of New York concerning the distribution of an insolvent's assets? Clearly the administration would have prevailed in the Supreme Court on the same basis, namely, the construction of the assignment as it did in fact prevail.

As I said in my telegram to you, and as I repeat, the George amendment would not have altered in the slightest the decision in the Pink case. I thought, when it was decided, the decision was wrong. I still think so, but if there be any defect whatever, it is the defect in the attitude of the Supreme Court concerning the effect and scope of the assignment. To strip down the power of a President to make necessary agreements in connection with the recognition of a foreign government and with many of the details of our daily relationships with our neighbors because of what I think is the erroneous decision of the Supreme Court in the construction of a written instrument seems to me the height of folly.

Yours sincerely,

OWEN J. ROBERTS.

As Justice Roberts points out in his letter the George amendment would have had no effect on the outcome of the Pink case. The amendment proposed by the Senator from Georgia would not have altered the situation in the slightest. The Pink case is the case on which the distinguished Senator from Georgia seems to rely as the basis for the amendment which Congress is asked to adopt or to write into the Constitution on the floor of the United States Senate. The Litvinov agreement was implemented by the Congress and would have been approved by the Congress even if the George substitute had been part of the Constitution in 1933; and to strike down the necessary powers of the President to act for the Nation's safety in this atomic age would be the height of folly.

In discussing the Pink case on Thursday, the distinguished Senator from Georgia stated, at page 1665 of the RECORD:

> I am not complaining whether the Pink case deprives a United States citizen or a foreigner of his rights. If today, a foreign citizen can be deprived of his rights, tomorrow a United States citizen can be deprived of his rights, under the same theory or the same doctrine. I would never discuss this point upon so narrow a principle as that.

To me, at least, it is perfectly clear that the only deprivation of rights took place because of the expropriation decrees of the Soviet Government. There were many such decrees and they affected many shareholders, Russian and American alike. The whole object in making the Litvinov agreement, as recognized by the Supreme Court in the now famous Pink case, was to assure American creditors priority over Russian creditors in the disposition of assets of the expropriated Russian companies in this country.

The Supreme Court dealt at some length with the question of rights under the fifth amendment, which the Senator from Georgia discussed very ably this afternoon. On last Thursday, Mr. President, I read several pages of the Court's opinion on this point. The Court went to some length to spell out that since the expropriated companies were Russian companies, what Russia had done in the way of expropriation was not a matter for judicial consideration in the United States. Our laws and the provisions of our Constitution, as I am certain the distinguished Senator from Georgia knows, do not have extraterritorial effect, except in relation to our own citizens. So when the Senator from Georgia makes great point of the fifth amendment, certainly he must know it has no effect extraterritorially, except as affecting citizens of the United States of America. That argument would seem to me to be totally without merit.

Although aliens get the benefits of our laws and our Constitution so far as transactions occurring in this country are concerned, they must look to their own governments for any redress to which they may be entitled for losses occurring in their own countries. Palpably, we in this country cannot undertake to protect Russian citizens against decrees issued in Russia. The fact that a foreign citizen is not entitled to the protection of the fifth amendment, of which the Senator from Georgia spoke earlier, in relation to a transaction occurring abroad, whereas an American citizen might be entitled to it in an American court, is no justification whatever for the statement by the Senator from Georgia that:

> If today, a foreign citizen can be deprived of his rights, tomorrow a United States citizen can be deprived of his rights, under the same theory or the same doctrine.

The Senator from Georgia apparently bases his statement on the false premise, which I am certain he must understand, that our laws and our Constitution have extraterritorial effect for the benefit of aliens and citizens alike in relation to transactions in this country. I cannot conceive otherwise than that the Senator from Georgia must have misspoken when he undertook to explain the extraterritorial application of the laws of the United States. In point of fact, they have no such extraterritorial effect, as the Court so clearly points out in the Pink case, citing many earlier cases and restating, as all lawyers know, a well-known rule of law.

Another statement made by the Senator from Georgia needs, I think, some discussion. The statement to which I refer is the following:

> [The President] does, in the first instance, make his decision, and, as I have said, it puts upon him no great burden. I daresay the President does read every agreement he signs, and if it be an agreement which invades an otherwise valid right under a State law, the President would say so.

That statement was with relation to a question I had asked the President about a review of all the executive agreements.

The Senator from Georgia has said he presumes the President "does read every agreement he signs." Although I think many Senators seriously doubt whether the President reads all the executive agreements which are presented to him for his signature, rather than merely the ones which are pointed out as being important, the question really is of no great significance. I say this because the President of the United States actually signs only a very small fraction of the executive agreements which are concluded on his behalf. Most of the important ones are signed for him by his agent, the Secretary of State. But, in numbers, even these constitute a very small percentage of the total.

When the Senator from Georgia said the other day, in answer to a question, that the President must read the agreements in order to know what he is signing, it seems palpably inconsistent and absurd that any President could possibly do so, there being thousands upon thousands of such agreements made during the course of a year. The great bulk of executive agreements are signed on behalf of the President by our Foreign Service representatives all over the world. These agreements run into the thousands, even the hundreds of thousands, a year, and cover subjects ranging all the way from those of the gravest importance, such as the Korean armistice, to the most trivial. It is extremely doubtful whether even a large percentage of all these executive agreements ever are collected in one place. I doubt if even the State Department has anywhere nearly all of them. I am certain that no single person, nor one small group of persons, has cognizance of all of them. There is no need for it. I presume that if the George amendment were agreed to, a sizable appropriation would be sought to hire a staff to perform the rather artificial and needless task of collecting all executive agreements, an unrewarding, monumental assignment, virtually impossible of ever being fulfilled.

The Senator from Georgia also is unclear about the type of determination which the President or a group of his agents would have to make under the proposed George substitute amendment. At page 1668 of the RECORD, the Senator from Georgia says that the President, after reading an executive agreement he was to sign, would say so "if it be an agreement which invades an otherwise valid right under a State law."

I should like to point out that the determination which the President would have to make, or rather have made for him, in regard to thousands of executive agreements would not be whether the agreements invade "an otherwise valid right under a State law." The determination which he would have to make would be an extremely more difficult one; it would be whether a particular agreement should have "an effect as internal law," whether or not it invades an otherwise valid right under a law, State, Federal, or local. Or, to state it another way, it seems that what the President would have to decide would be whether any legitimate American litigant would like to use the executive agreement in an American court to help prove his case. What the proposal of the Senator from Georgia—and it would certainly apply to the perfecting amendment of the distinguished Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON]—says is that "an international agreement other than a treaty shall become effective as internal law in the United States only by an act of Congress." As I read the amendment, before a litigant can make any use of an executive agreement in court, whether or not it invades a State or Federal law, the agreement must be implemented by some sort of act of Congress.

If the George amendment should go into effect, certain executive agreements would automatically fall into the category of those which should be submitted to the Congress for implementation, although on their surface they might appear to have no effect on internal law in the eyes of a nonlawyer.

The Korean armistice is a good example. To a lawyer it is obvious that all sorts of litigants would need to use the agreement in court and the President would be bound to send it to Congress for implementation.

But the Korean armistice is a "cinch" case. There are thousands of executive agreements concluded yearly all over the world by many representatives of the United States. Who can possibly tell which of these will be of legitimate interest to some unknown and unforeseen

litigant? One can think of thousands of examples. Let us take, for instance, an agreement which is concluded for the President by our representative in Saudi Arabia with the government there, and which concerns the living conditions of certain categories of American oil workers on a particular project in that country. Can anyone readily foresee actual lawsuits in the United States which would require the pleading of such an agreement? It would not seem to comport with reason that anyone could.

It appears to me that almost any lawyer can think of plenty of hypothetical cases which might well arise and which would require that the agreement be used as internal law. For example, an American workman in Saudi Arabia might be injured in an accident in a company-supplied house. If he was seriously injured, he would probably be returned to the United States. In time he might want to bring suit against the oil company in a court in the United States, possibly on the ground that the company had been negligent in constructing the house in Saudi Arabia. Both the workman and the company would probably want to plead the executive agreement between the United States and Saudi Arabian Governments. I believe that this would require implementation by Congress. If the Congress had not implemented the agreement at the time the suit was brought, both parties would have a legitimate grievance either against the President for not having submitted it to Congress, or against the Congress for not having implemented it. That would happen under the so-called George substitute.

This example would apply to thousands of executive agreements every year. Even if all of them were collected in one place and examined by a single group of men, as yet undetermined, there would still be the almost insuperable problem of deciding which of them should be submitted to Congress as of potential interest to unknown American litigants. The end result of such a process would be that the President would, so as to be on the safe side, present thousands of executive agreements to the Congress every year, because once they were submitted to Congress the onus would be upon the Congress to take some action on them.

As I have said before during the course of the debate on the proposed constitutional amendment, I am at a complete loss to know what we could do with them; and if the senior Senator from Georgia has any suggestions as to how we could intelligently act upon these thousands of executive agreements, I would certainly like to be enlightened. Under the terms of his amendment, the Senate would get thousands of them, and I simply do not know what we could do with them that would be of any value to anyone. The only people who stand to lose under this system would be legitimate American litigants whose cases would be "fouled up" because the President had failed to refer to Congress, or Congress had failed to act upon, obscure executive agreements which no one could guess in advance would be of interest as internal law to anyone.

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

Mr. HENNINGS. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Iowa for a question.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. The question I have is on the point the Senator is discussing. Conversely to the situation the Senator has just stated, which is an important question in the discussion, would be the situation of a workman in Saudi Arabia who would have enforceable rights in the courts of this country, and the President would make an executive agreement, which would not be known to the public or to the particular workman or to anyone else, which would destroy the right of the workman to sue in this country under the procedures of our courts.

There is a double-barreled injustice involved. In the first case to which the Senator referred, if the Congress failed to act, an injustice might occur. In the second case, if no one knew about the destruction of an individual's rights by an executive agreement, an injustice would occur. I desired merely to call that situation to the attention of the Senator from Missouri.

Mr. HENNINGS. I thank the Senator from Iowa for his contribution. I undertook to discuss that subject earlier, before the distinguished Senator from Iowa came to the floor. I recognize that there is uncertainty and difference of opinion as to the effect of many executive agreements.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I raised the point only because I thought it was pertinent to what the Senator was discussing.

Mr. HENNINGS. As an able lawyer, the Senator from Iowa realizes, of course, that my point is that the amendment under discussion, together with all other substitute amendments or perfecting amendments, including the so-called George amendment and the Ferguson perfecting amendment, should go back to the Committee on the Judiciary in order that the committee may study their language. There seems to be, on the part of able constitutional lawyers, judges, and others who are interested in the matter, a great difference of opinion as to the effect of such amendments.

The George substitute amendment, and in particular the phrase "effective as internal law" contained in it, raised so many unanswered questions in my mind that I decided to attempt to find out whether or not it caused similar serious misgivings in the minds of some illustrious Americans whose judgment on this subject I value very highly. I sent the following telegram to Mr. John W. Davis, Gen. Lucius D. Clay, and Mr. Homer Cummings:

In connection with Senate debate on Bricker amendment and other proposals, I would greatly appreciate receiving a wire collect as soon as possible stating your opinion concerning Senator GEORGE'S substitute proposal—

Which is virtually the same as the amendment submitted by the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON], for himself and certain other Senators—

to amend the Constitution to provide:

"SEC. 2. An international agreement other than a treaty shall become effective as internal law in the United States only by an act of the Congress."

Thank you.

General Clay sent the following reply to my telegram:

My respect for Senator GEORGE is so great that it is difficult for me not to fully accept anything he proposes. However, I have seen no analysis which would indicate the types of transactions which would be affected by section 2 nor any authoritative statement of what constitutes internal law. For example, would the amendment curtail the essential powers of the President as Commander in Chief in event of an invasion of our soil, say, perhaps in Alaska? If this was a possible interpretation, it could result in catastrophe. With highest respect and kindest regards.

And Mr. Homer Cummings, the former Attorney General of the United States, sent the following reply:

Thank you for your courteous telegram. In my judgment the power of the President to deal with foreign affairs is set forth in the Constitution succinctly and effectively. It has successfully stood the test of time and experience, and no change is warranted. Any amendment, no matter what the phraseology may be, would introduce elements of doubt and uncertainty and might do incalculable harm. I am, therefore, opposed to the Bricker amendment or any substitute therefor, no matter what form it may take.

The wire from Mr. John W. Davis I read to the Senate earlier in my remarks.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD a letter, under date of February 12, which I have received from Mr. John Lord O'Brian, in response to the telegram I have read.

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

COVINGTON & BURLING,
Washington, D. C., February 12, 1954.

Hon. THOMAS C. HENNINGS, Jr.,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR HENNINGS: Replying to your telegram, permit me to say that despite the very deep respect that I entertain for Senator GEORGE I am strongly opposed to his proposed amendment, as indeed I now am opposed to all of the so-called substitutes. My opposition to the Bricker amendment was the result of historical study and my profound faith in the good judgment and commonsense of the American people and of their representatives in the Senate.

It seems to me that it is far safer to rest in that confidence than to introduce into our fundamental law such new phrases as "executive agreement," "internal law," etc. In these difficult and troublesome times and in those that are certain to lie ahead of us, there is a very real danger that such a constitutional provision might frustrate essential executive action with truly disastrous consequences. Least of all is there any excuse, in my opinion, for introducing into the Constitution reaffirmations of meanings which the courts have long attributed to it.

Furthermore, when the consideration of so grave a question reaches the present stage of discussing refinements intended to meet objections of particular representatives this is, to me at least, the clearest evidence of all that none of the proposed amendments are

necessary. If there is to be any experimenting, let it be by amending the Senate Rules, without tampering with the Constitution itself.

Thanking you for the opportunity to express my views, I am,

Faithfully yours,

JOHN LORD O'BRIAN.

Mr. HENNINGS. Mr. President, to summarize my arguments in opposition to the George substitute, let me briefly note the following points. I have directed my attention to his suggestions because I am sure that his proposal or some variation of it is the only proposition the Senate is at all likely to adopt; and because the eminence of the Senator from Georgia, his great distinction as a Member of this body, and his accepted position as a constitutional lawyer and authority, give his amendment much greater weight than a similar proposal might have if it were to emanate from almost any other Member of this body. His amendment has the surface aspect of reasonableness. With the brilliance and prestige of the great Senator from Georgia to support the proposition, I am anxious lest my colleagues may adopt it. I have no fear that the Senate will adopt the extreme proposal in any of its variations urged by the Senior Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER].

The Senator from Georgia urges that on the basis of the Supreme Court's dicta in the Pink case, we amend the Constitution in a manner that many eminent constitutional lawyers, including former Justice Roberts, who dissented in the Pink case, and also including John W. Davis, think would strike down necessary Presidential powers. Justice Roberts in his telegram and letter to me stated emphatically that the substitute amendment of the Senator from Georgia would have had no effect on the outcome of the Pink case, upon which our learned friend, the Senator from Georgia, relies absolutely, and as a result of which his amendment was spawned and first saw the light of day, according to the Senator's own statement.

If Justice Roberts is correct—and according to my view, there is no question but that he is correct—the entire case for the amendment of the Senator from Georgia falls.

Mr. President, in this connection let us bear in mind that Mr. Justice Roberts was one of the justices who dissented from the majority opinion in the Pink case; and the Senator from Georgia professes to have great admiration for and concurrence in that dissenting opinion.

Furthermore, the proposed amendment would make it easy and logical for Presidents to avoid the protection provided to States rights by the requirement that two-thirds of the Senate must consent if State laws and constitutions are to be changed by an international agreement.

Thus the Senator from Georgia would dilute his own power as a United States Senator, and certainly he would greatly dilute the power of all other Members of the Senate, particularly those representing States with relatively small populations, as compared to the population of New York, with its 43 Members of the House of Representatives, as well as 2 Members of the United States Senate. Under the amendment of the Senator from Georgia, such things as the Genocide Convention, the Human Rights Covenant, and so forth—highly controversial proposals which, as a matter of fact, have languished for some years in congressional committees—could be made domestic law in the United States through use of an executive agreement implemented by a simple majority of both Houses of Congress.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, is the Senator from Missouri willing to yield at this point or does he prefer not to be interrupted at this stage of the proceedings?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BUSH in the chair). Does the Senator from Missouri yield to the Senator from Arkansas?

Mr. HENNINGS. I am glad to yield.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I had understood that the proposals the Senator from Missouri has just mentioned were the very things the supporters of these amendments have been saying they would protect us against.

Mr. HENNINGS. That is exactly correct; they are what the proponents of these schemes—if I may use that word: the amendments have been hasily devised and brought before us—to amend the Constitution of the United States, have said they would prevent, whereas, as a matter of fact, the present requirement for concurrence by two-thirds of the Members of the Senate must now be met before such proposals can be made treaty law.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. So, in the Senator's opinion, the proponents of such amendments as the George amendment would make easier the adoption of such rather radical proposals as he has mentioned.

Mr. HENNINGS. Is there any question in the mind of the distinguished Senator from Arkansas that that would be true?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The Senator is correct. I wish to congratulate the Senator on the analysis of the Pink case which he made last week. I read it with great care.

I ask this question only to emphasize what seems to me to be a very obvious weakness in these proposals. Instead of strengthening the protection of the Senate and of the country against such supposed dangers, which have been the inspiration for the entire movement behind the Bricker amendment and its subsidiary developments, such proposals would make us more vulnerable to such dangers. I think the Senator has done an extremely able service in analyzing the Pink case, which I dare say very few Members of this body understand.

Mr. HENNINGS. I thank my distinguished friend from Arkansas for his contribution and for his kind observations with respect to me, some of which I certainly must disclaim.

I do not know whether the Senator was present the other day when I suggested that often lawyers have a great deal of fun, and silence the questions of opponents, when engaged in a discussion, by saying, "My opponent has no right to take any part in this discussion, because he has not read the Schultz case." Such a statement often disarms an opponent. Certainly the Senator has not read the Schultz case. Often the Schultz case has no bearing whatever on any part of the discussion.

I say that the Pink case has been misunderstood and so presented to the Members of this body as to indicate that it constitutes a real threat, when anyone who takes the time and trouble to read it can readily see that it is not in point at all. Mr. Justice Roberts, who sat in the Pink case, says clearly that the amendment of the Senator from Georgia would have had no effect upon that decision if it had been in effect.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I read every word of the debate last week, and as a consequence I even read the Pink case.

Mr. HENNINGS. I must compliment the learned Senator from Arkansas for having read the case.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I agree with the Senator's analysis of the Pink case and what it means. It involves a complicated set of facts. I think it is difficult to understand. The Senator from Missouri has performed a great service in analyzing it and presenting his analysis to the Senate. There is no excuse for any Senator not reading that debate.

I had understood that the principal reason for the so-called George amendment was the Pink case. I think the Senator from Missouri cut away any excuse for that amendment.

Mr. HENNINGS. I thank my distinguished friend for his observations. I may say that the Senator from Georgia himself says that the reason for his amendment was the decision in the Pink case. If the Pink case is established as the premise, and if we take the Senator from Georgia at his word, he having suggested that the predicate for his proposed amendment to the Constitution of the United States is the Pink case, we see that in and of itself the Pink case is not in point in any manner whatsoever. That statement is not only sustained by other lawyers, but it is sustained by one of the very justices who sat in the case, Justice Roberts, who said that had the George amendment been in effect it would not have affected the ruling in the Pink case in any degree whatsoever.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I do not know that the Senator from Georgia has formally agreed, but he has stated that he would specifically except certain agreements made in pursuance of the constitutional right of the President to recognize foreign governments.

Mr. HENNINGS. The Senator from Georgia has already stated that he would except any agreement made in furtherance of the recognition of a foreign government. In one breath he says he will accept what the Pink case might seem to hold, embodying, as it does, the Litvinov assignment and the agreement to recognize the U. S. S. R.; and on the

other hand he seems to repudiate it, because the Pink case is what causes him all the trouble and concern, and for that reason he has offered his proposed amendment to the Constitution of the United States.

I think the Senator from Arkansas is eminently correct, and I thank him for his further development of this exceedingly important point. I believe that if Members of this body would read the Pink case—and I am sure many of them have done so with greater understanding than I—and then read the debate and analysis centering about that case, they would not agree to the substitute offered by the learned and distinguished Senator from Georgia.

I cannot conceive that he realizes that he would be surrendering, to a great extent, the power of the State of Georgia as a sovereign State, acting through its representation in this body, when he would dilute the power of that State by sending executive agreements over to the House of Representatives, where Georgia and every other State below the Mason and Dixon's line could be outvoted by the State of New York, for example.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for one further question?

Mr. HENNINGS. I am very happy to yield.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. It is especially strange when one recalls the struggle which has taken place on the floor of the Senate to retain the two-thirds rule when proposals have been made to change the rules of the Senate. I have participated in that struggle at great length. I believe it is a correct and proper rule. Yet in this instance, in a little different way, it is proposed that we give up without a struggle.

Mr. HENNINGS. In effect the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] and the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON] would destroy the two-thirds rule on the floor of the Senate. The Senator from Arkansas is indeed correct. It seems incredible that such a proposal should come from the source from which it comes, namely, the State of Georgia.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. That is my impression also.

Mr. HENNINGS. However, the question is before us and we are asked to deal with it. The proposal is presented to us with gravity and seriousness.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I want the RECORD to show that I am not in favor of destroying the two-thirds rule.

Mr. HENNINGS. I take it, then, that the distinguished Senator from Arkansas wishes to preserve the sovereignty of his State, to such extent as he can, and to preserve the rights to which his State is entitled under the Constitution as it now stands.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The Senator is quite correct.

Mr. HENNINGS. I thank the distinguished Senator.

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

Mr. HENNINGS. I am glad to yield to the Senator from New York.

Mr. LEHMAN. I wonder whether the distinguished Senator has read the letter which Louis H. Pink wrote to the New York Times last Saturday. I placed it in the RECORD earlier in the day.

Mr. HENNINGS. I was present when the distinguished Senator placed it in the RECORD. I saw it in last Saturday's New York Times, and I wrote to Mr. Pink and asked him to write me a letter, which has not yet arrived.

Mr. Pink, the Commissioner in the case to which the junior Senator from New York refers, in his letter to the New York Times, said that had the George amendment been in effect, it would not in any way have affected his administration of the the so-called Litvinov assignment.

Mr. LEHMAN. At the time the case came before the courts, Mr. Pink was probably more familiar with it than anyone else except the justices of the court who finally made the determination.

Mr. HENNINGS. That is correct.

Mr. LEHMAN. I think the distinguished Senator from Missouri has rendered a very great service in so clearly and forthrightly analyzing the various proposals, including the George amendment.

Mr. HENNINGS. I thank the Senator.

Mr. LEHMAN. He has drawn our attention to the fact that literally thousands of so-called executive agreements, many of which, of course, are purely technical in character, are entered into between our Government and other governments during the course of a year.

The Senator has also pointed out that if the question of approval were to have any effect at all, it would require either a close scrutiny of thousands of agreements, which would be a physical impossibility, or a general approval of such agreements.

Mr. HENNINGS. It is impossible to do that, as the Senator from New York well knows, he having been the chief executive of the Empire State of the Union for four terms, if I recall correctly. He is very familiar with the great burden of paper work and the literal and physical impossibility of the President of the United States examining all executive agreements, and, as the Senator from Georgia says, reading them and sending to the Congress those which in his judgment may affect internal law—whatever "internal law" means. We cannot agree upon the definition of internal law. No one knows with certainty what internal law means.

Mr. LEHMAN. I quite agree, of course. I am sure the Senator from Missouri will recollect that in the months which lie behind us, during which the so-called Bricker amendment was first discussed, its greatest emphasis, and practically its only emphasis, was on the necessity of safeguarding the sovereignty of the States and the rights of the citizens who reside in those States.

Is it not perfectly clear that if we give up the two-thirds vote that is required to approve a treaty which supersedes State laws, if not found to be in conflict with the Constitution, we would not in merely one case but possibly in hundreds of cases put Congress on record by a majority vote, not a two-thirds vote, as sanctioning a procedure which might very seriously affect and impede the sovereignty of the States and the rights of the individual citizens?

That is one of the reasons I am fearful of the George amendment. It seems to me that there is a very real danger that, instead of safeguarding the sovereignty of the States and the rights of the citizens, as has been claimed right along as the main purpose of the Bricker amendment, we would actually be tearing down the sovereignty of the States and imperiling the rights of the citizens of those States.

Mr. HENNINGS. I thank the distinguished Senator from New York for his contribution. There is no question about it. Starting with the Bricker amendment and the three amendments to it—I believe three amendments have been reported by the committee since the Bricker amendment was first introduced; and now the Ferguson amendment and all the other perfecting amendments and the George substitute—as we go through all of them we become increasingly aware of the fact that there is being dug a series of pitfalls, if you please, Mr. President, into which the Senate might fall, simply because we have not completely and thoroughly discussed or studied them, or had the advice and help of many lawyers and judges and constitutional authorities as to what the precise effect of the George amendment might be.

Here we are, presumably responsible representatives of the States of the Union, with some of us about to vote on something which will, if put into effect, dilute our power as United States Senators and certainly water down the strength and sovereignty of our own States.

Mr. LEHMAN. Is it not a fact that under the present system there are not more than 10 or a dozen or 15 treaties at the most which are submitted to the Senate during a year, and that those treaties, being small in number, can be carefully studied and analyzed, and that with a two-thirds vote in the Senate the interest of the country and of the States and of the citizens of those States are amply protected?

Mr. HENNINGS. The Senator from New York is eminently correct.

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

Mr. HENNINGS. I should like to conclude my remarks first, if the Senator does not mind. Then I shall be very happy to yield.

Finally, our present constitutional system of checks and balances contains adequate safeguards against abuse of the power to make executive agreements. These are, first, the power of Congress to annul the domestic effect of any treaty or executive agreement by subsequent act of Congress; second, the power of the courts to invalidate any treaty or executive agreement which contravenes the Constitution; third, the power of impeachment; and, fourth, the power of public opinion, including a presidential election every 4 years.

I cannot agree with the distinguished Senator from Georgia that these safeguards are, to quote him, "ridiculous."

Mr. President, before yielding the floor I should like to ask the Senator from

Georgia the following specific questions, which I believe should be answered before we are asked to vote on his proposed substitute. Since he is not in the Chamber I suggest, after he has had the benefit of consulting the RECORD, that he may see fit to answer some of the questions tomorrow. I had hoped he would answer some of the statements in connection with the Pink case which were made on Thursday, when the learned Senator from Georgia told us he would come in today and set us right on that case, as to its meaning and its full import and implications, and with respect to his scheme, which is now presented to the Senate.

I should like to ask the Senator from Georgia:

First. Is there anything except dictum in the Pink case that justifies adoption of the amendment? Of course we understand that dictum is not a part of a decision.

I should also like to ask the Senator from Georgia:

Second. Does the Senator from Georgia believes his amendment would permit future Presidents to take proposals like the human rights covenant, put them in the form of executive agreements, and make them effective—to use a phrase of uncertain parentage and meaning—as "internal law," by getting a simple majority of both Houses of Congress to implement them? Then I should like to ask the distinguished Senator: If not, why not?

I should also like to ask the distinguished Senator from Georgia:

Third. (a) In view of the administration's objections to the amendment offered by the Senator from Georgia, is the Senator willing to add to his amendment either or both of the provisos suggested by the Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND]? If so, what are the texts of the provisos?

(b) Does not the Senator from Georgia believe that his amendment with these provisos added would ultimately result in an expansion, rather than a contraction, of executive power?

(c) Does not the Senator from Georgia believe that with either of the provisos added his amendment would confirm the holding in the Pink case?

Then I should also like to ask the distinguished Senator from Georgia:

Fourth. Who shall have the ultimate authority to decide which of the thousands of executive agreements each year should have legitimate effect as State law and should be implemented—we are speaking now of the President, the Secretary of State, and the various agents and officers the length and breadth of the globe—and who, the President or Congress, would bear the burden or onus for not implementing those agreements?

Fifth. Since there have been no hearings at all on this type of proposal, or on any variations of it, does not the Senator from Georgia believe that the Committee on the Judiciary should hold hearings and get expert testimony on the possible results and implications?

Mr. President, at this time I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD an article from page 3 of the New York Times of Saturday, November 18, 1933. It contains the text of communications accompanying our recognition of Russia, known as the Litvinov assignment. It relates to some of the correspondence which I have read and to other portions of the agreement.

There being no objection, the page from the New York Times was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WIDE RANGE OF TOPICS WAS COVERED BY THE ROOSEVELT-LITVINOV NEGOTIATIONS—TEXT OF THE COMMUNICATIONS ACCOMPANYING OUR RECOGNITION OF RUSSIA

WASHINGTON, November 17.—The communications between President Roosevelt and Commissar Litvinov, of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, which preceded the resumption of normal diplomatic relations, were as follows:

THE PROBLEM OF CLAIMS

WASHINGTON, D. C., *November 13, 1933.*

Mr. FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT,
President of the United States of America,
The White House.

MY DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: Following our conversation, I have the honor to inform you that the Government of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics agrees that, preparatory to a final settlement of the claims and counterclaims between the Governments of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and the United States of America and the claims of their nationals, the Government of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics will not take any steps to enforce any decisions of courts or initiate any new litigations of the amounts admitted to be due or that may be found due it, as the successor of prior Governments of Russia, or otherwise from American nationals, including corporations, companies, partnerships, or associations, and also the claim against the United States of the Russian Volunteer Fleet, now in litigation in the United States Court of Claims, and will not object to such amounts being assigned and does hereby release and assign all such amounts to the Government of the United States, the Government of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics to be duly notified in each case of any amount realized by the Government of the United States from such release and assignments.

The Government of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics further agrees, preparatory to the settlement referred to above, not to make any claim with respect to—

(a) Judgments rendered or that may be rendered by American courts insofar as they relate to property, or rights, or interests therein, in which the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics or its nationals may have had or may claim to have an interest.

(b) Acts done or settlement made by or with the Government of the United States or public officials in the United States or its nationals, relating to property, credits or obligations of any government of Russia or nationals thereof.

I am, my dear Mr. President,
Very sincerely yours,
MAXIM LITVINOV,
People's Commissar for Foreign Affairs, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.

OUR REPLY ON CLAIMS

THE WHITE HOUSE,
WASHINGTON, D. C., *November 13, 1933.*

Mr. MAXIM M. LITVINOV,
People's Commissar for Foreign Affairs, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.

MY DEAR MR. LITVINOV: I am happy to acknowledge the receipt of your letter of November 13, 1933, in which you state that:

(Here the text of the letter of November 13 is quoted in full.)

I am glad to have these undertakings by your Government and I shall be pleased to notify your Government in each case of any amount realized by the Government of the United States from the release and assignment to it of the amounts admitted to be due, or that may be found to be due, the Government of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, and of the amount that may be found to be due on the claim of the Russian Volunteer Fleet.

I am, my dear Mr. Litvinov,
Very sincerely yours,
FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.

Mr. HENNINGS. Mr. President, unless Senators desire to ask me some questions, I now yield the floor.

CONTINUATION OF AUTHORITY TO MAKE FUNDS AVAILABLE FOR LOANS AND GRANTS UNDER TITLE V OF THE HOUSING ACT OF 1949

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, when the Housing Act of 1949 was passed, we recognized the need for financial assistance to both farm and city families living in substandard homes if these families were to have an opportunity to obtain decent and adequate housing.

Title V of the act specifically authorized loans to farm owners to enable them to build, modernize or repair their homes and farm service buildings needed to operate their farms profitably. The original act authorized annual appropriations for 4 fiscal years, beginning July 1, 1949. Although the law was amended in 1952 to extend the appropriation authorities for an additional year, no provision for loan appropriations was made beyond the 1954 fiscal year.

The bill I have introduced would extend, and place on a continuing basis, the authorities of Title V of the Housing Act of 1949. Recognizing that loan authorization for farm housing purposes are dependent, in part, upon economic conditions and other budgetary considerations, this bill authorizes appropriations and borrowing authority in such amounts as Congress may from time to time determine.

The original act authorized appropriations of $275 million for farm-housing purposes. Only about a third of this amount was actually made available. The general curtailment of nondefense Government expenditures associated with the Korean campaign as well as certain building-material shortages that existed in past years are the principal reasons why the farm-housing program did not reach its anticipated volume. The amount available for the 1954 fiscal year was $19 million. The demand for these loans was so great that almost all of the funds were committed within 6 months. The Farmers' Home Administration has received thousands of applications that now are unsatisfied because the farm-housing funds were exhausted at such an early date.

Nineteen thousand and eighty-two farm families have benefited from the $94,356,000 of farm-housing funds that have been made available. With these funds they built or repaired over 16,000 farm homes, almost 14,000 farm service buildings, and 7,200 water systems. In my home State of Alabama, 724 families have received farm-housing loans to

build new and modern homes and 208 additional families repaired and modernized their homes. In addition, 368 farm service buildings and 623 water systems have been financed with farm-housing funds. Through December 31, 1953, $5,509,475 had been loaned to Alabama farmers for these purposes.

This is a mere beginning in solving the problems of substandard housing on our Alabama farms, but it does demonstrate the effectiveness of the farm-housing loan authorities in meeting a critical need for farm families for construction credit.

That Alabama farmers want better housing is shown by the fact that the demand for these loans was so great during the past year that 80 percent of the funds allotted to Alabama were obligated within 2 months.

The cost of these new homes has been exceptionally low. To a person accustomed to the price of city homes, it seems almost unbelievable that farm families should be able to build good, substantial homes at an average cash outlay of less than $6,500. While these homes are modest in design, they do meet all the generally accepted requirements of decent, safe, and sanitary living.

Low-cash cost when compared with similar urban homes results from a number of reasons. One is the fact that there is no land cost involved. Another is that the borrower and his family ordinarily are able to contribute a substantial amount of labor, and a third is that in many cases borrowers have been able to utilize such materials as timber, sand, gravel, or stone from their own farms or else obtain such materials from local sources at a low cost.

Low cost, however, does not mean low quality. Each of these homes is required to meet the construction standards of the Farmers' Home Administration. These standards protect the borrower against faulty construction and the Government against an unsound investment. The standards are flexible enough to permit a farmer to use his skills and ingenuity to build at minimum cost the kind of a home of which he and his family are justifiably proud.

In addition to providing financing for farm homes, the farm-housing program offers farm families an opportunity to build or improve service buildings needed to put their farms on a paying basis, and to operate them more efficiently.

A fourth of the farm-housing funds have been used for purposes such as building dairy barns and milking parlors, general purpose barns, poultry houses, and for installing water systems. While this has not been the largest field of activity of the housing program it has been a highly significant one. Through it some farmers have been able to put their units on a paying basis; others have been able to make necessary changes in their farm buildings to meet the changing requirements of our present-day agriculture; and others have needed to change their building facilities to use more efficiently their family labor and their land.

The nature of the farming business, one in which the family home and income-producing activities are inseparably joined, makes this authority an important phase of our farm-housing program.

The level of living of farm families depends upon the productivity of their farm. When through the addition or modernization of farm-service buildings farm families of moderate means, such as the one to whom farm-housing loans are made, are able to increase their income, they are better able to pay the cost of a decent home.

These housing loans to farm families who are unable to obtain their credit from the usual sources are sound investments. During the 4 years that the farm housing program has been in operation, borrowers have established a commendable repayment record. As of January 31 of this year, less than 5 percent of the borrowers had not paid in full the amounts that had become due on their loans. Approximately one-third had paid more than was due.

I am particularly proud of the repayment record established by the borrowers in Alabama. Of the almost 1,000 farm-housing borrowers who had payments due at the end of 1953, less than 1 percent had not paid the full amount due on their loan by January 31, 1953. These few are the families who did not have sufficient resources to meet the credit requirements of conventional lenders for a construction loan. However, as soon as they make sufficient financial progress to qualify for a loan from another source they will be required to refinance their Government loans with private or cooperative lending institutions. They only need adequate credit on reasonable terms and an opportunity to prove that they are good credit risks When the construction work is finished and the loans become seasoned, private credit agencies can and will carry the remaining debt.

The farm housing program is not in competition with private and cooperative credit, but rather it is an integral part of our total credit system that will enable farm families to have homes comparable to those enjoyed by city residents. I think we will all agree that a high percentage of our city families are well housed today because they have been aided in their home purchase or improvement through Government financed, insured, or guaranteed programs.

I take considerable pride in the fact that it was an Alabama World War II veteran who received the first farm housing loan made under the Housing Act of 1949. I wish all of you could have seen the transformation that took place on his farm when the ramshackle and dilapidated house that was too worn out to repair was replaced by a modern six-room home complete with running water, bath, and up-to-date kitchen.

Both the appearance of the farmstead and the efficiency of the farming operations were further improved by the addition of a new barn and the installation of a pressure water system.

All this was done with a $4,300 farm-housing loan coupled with careful planning to use most advantageously the materials that could be salvaged from the worn-out buildings that were replaced.

I mention this first farm-housing loan because it is both a typical example of the shocking condition of many of our farm homes, and a dramatic demonstration of how such a condition can be remedied by a soundly conceived and efficiently administered farm-housing program.

Although the inadequacy of farm homes has been less conspicuous and perhaps less publicized than the slums in the cities, a far greater percentage of our farm families are living in substandard houses than is true of urban families. Nationwide 1 out of every 5 farm families is living in a house that is so dilapidated that it either needs to be replaced or else needs major repairs. In Alabama only 1 farm family out of 12 has the commonly accepted convenience of a private toilet, bath and hot running water. One out of 4 families live in homes having less than four rooms. A high percentage of Alabama farm homes are not only inadequate but 1 out of every 3 needs major repairs or needs to be replaced.

The economic and social problems associated with inadequate housing on a fifth of our Nation's farms are too great to be brushed aside. The idea that privation and hardship necessarily are a part of farm life was commonly accepted during the years when our country was being settled, but today farm families want, and I believe they are entitled to it, the same conveniences that city people enjoy.

Farm families for one reason or another frequently have deferred home improvements until they had paid for their farms. The idea has prevailed among both farmers and lenders that the house was something to be improved out of savings and that it was not prudent for the farmer to borrow to give his family a decent home. This postponement of home improvements frequently extended beyond the years of greatest family need—the years when the children were at home. Particularly during these years, the household duties of farm wives meant hard labor and drudgery without such commonly accepted conveniences as electricity, running water, and efficiently designed and equipped kitchens.

This postponement of home improvements was largely because of economic necessity and not by choice. All too frequently farm families never did accumulate enough money to build a decent home. The possibilities of obtaining a long-term amortized loan to build a new home were exceedingly scarce; consequently, many of these families were forced to patch and continue to live in run-down and inadequate homes.

Today, farm families no longer accept the notion that because they chose farming as a way of life they need to live in homes that are inconvenient and inadequate. To the extent that private and cooperative credit sources can meet the building credit needs of farm families they should be encouraged to do so. Government loan guaranties and insurance have encouraged private capital to finance improved housing for our city families on a substantial scale. When private credit was not available direct

Government loans have been provided. What farm families want and need is a like opportunity to finance farm building improvements.

The farm housing section of the Housing Act of 1949 gives this opportunity to the farm families who cannot obtain their financing from private or cooperatives sources. The limited funds that have been made available under this act have proved its effectiveness in helping farm families of modest means improve their homes. We need to extend these authorities. They are an essential part of our national housing program which has as its objective the progressive improvements of our housing standards with the eventual realization of a decent home and suitable living environment for every American family.

On behalf of myself, the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BURKE], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CLEMENTS], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. HENNINGS], my colleague, the senior Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. HUNT], the Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON], the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER], the Senator from New York [Mr. LEHMAN], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. MAYBANK], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN], the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. NEELY], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. LENNON], and the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY] I ask unanimous consent to introduce for appropriate reference a bill.

I request that at any time during the remainder of the day the names of other Senators may be added, because several Senators have expressed interest in the bill to that effect.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the bill will be received and appropriately referred, and the request of the Senator from Alabama to add the names of other Senators is granted.

The bill (S. 2949) to continue authority to make funds available for loans and grants under title V of the Housing Act of 1949, as amended, introduced by Mr. SPARKMAN (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

AMENDMENT TO THE CONSTITUTION RELATING TO TREATIES AND EXECUTIVE AGREEMENTS

The Senate resumed the consideration of the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 1) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to the making of treaties and executive agreements.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded and that further proceedings under the call be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. KNOWLAND. What is the pending question before the Senate?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment proposed by the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON] for himself, the Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND], the Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN], and the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] to the committee amendment, inserting on page 3, line 5, after the word "treaty", the words "or other international agreement."

The yeas and nays have been ordered. The clerk will call the roll.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Green	Mansfield
Anderson	Griswold	Martin
Barrett	Hayden	Maybank
Bennett	Hendrickson	McClellan
Bricker	Hennings	Monroney
Bridges	Hickenlooper	Morse
Burke	Hill	Murray
Bush	Hoey	Neely
Butler, Md.	Holland	Pastore
Butler, Nebr.	Humphrey	Payne
Byrd	Hunt	Potter
Carlson	Ives	Purtell
Clements	Jackson	Russell
Cooper	Jenner	Saltonstall
Cordon	Johnson, Colo.	Smathers
Daniel	Johnson, Tex.	Smith, Maine
Dirksen	Johnston, S. C.	Smith, N. J.
Douglas	Kennedy	Sparkman
Duff	Kerr	Stennis
Dworshak	Kilgore	Symington
Eastland	Knowland	Thye
Ellender	Kuchel	Upton
Ferguson	Langer	Watkins
Flanders	Lehman	Welker
Frear	Lennon	Williams
Fulbright	Long	Young
George	Magnuson	
Gore	Malone	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A quorum is present.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, in explanation of my vote, I wish to say that I am going to vote against the amendment proposed by the distinguished Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON], because I am opposed to writing on the floor of the Senate, and without the most careful and painstaking study, any constitutional amendment on a subject of such fundamental importance. Therefore, I am going to vote against the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON] for himself and other Senators to the committee amendment.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I wish to say that I shall vote against the amendment, because I am satisfied in my own mind, on the basis of the record made so far in the debate, that there is no clear showing that any amendment whatsoever is needed.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment again be stated, and then that the section as proposed to be amended be read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment.

The CHIEF CLERK. In the committee amendment on page 3, line 5, after the word "treaty" it is proposed to insert "or other international agreement", so as to make the section read:

SECTION 1. A provision of a treaty or other international agreement which conflicts with this Constitution shall not be of any force or effect.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, I am going to vote against the amendment, because I do not think it is necessary. It is the present law, and an amendment is not needed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment proposed by the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON], for himself and other Senators, to the committee amendment.

On this question, the yeas and nays have been ordered; and the Secretary will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN] is absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Maryland [Mr. BEALL], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE], and the Senator from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART], the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. MCCARTHY], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT], the Senator from Kansas [Mr. SCHOEPPEL], and the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] are necessarily absent.

If present and voting the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BEALL], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER], the Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT], and the Senator from Kansas [Mr. SCHOEPPEL] would each vote "yea."

Mr. CLEMENTS. I announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ] is necessarily absent.

The Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN], and the Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER] is absent because of illness.

I announce further that on this vote the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER] is paired with the Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON]. If present and voting, the Senator from Tennessee would vote "nay," and the Senator from Virginia would vote "yea."

I announce also that if present and voting, the Senator from Iowa [Mr.

GILLETTE] and the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN] would each vote "yea."

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, how am I recorded?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oklahoma is recorded as voting in the negative.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, how am I recorded?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Washington is recorded as voting in the negative.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. Mr. President, how am I recorded?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maryland is recorded as voting in the affirmative.

The result was announced—yeas 62, nays 20, as follows:

YEAS—62

Aiken	Ferguson	Malone
Anderson	Flanders	Mansfield
Barrett	Frear	Martin
Bennett	George	Maybank
Bricker	Gore	McClellan
Bridges	Griswold	Payne
Burke	Hendrickson	Potter
Bush	Hickenlooper	Purtell
Butler, Md.	Hoey	Russell
Butler, Nebr.	Holland	Saltonstall
Byrd	Hunt	Smathers
Carlson	Ives	Smith, Maine
Clements	Jenner	Smith, N. J.
Cordon	Johnson, Colo.	Stennis
Daniel	Johnson, Tex.	Thye
Dirksen	Johnston, S. C.	Upton
Douglas	Kerr	Watkins
Duff	Knowland	Welker
Dworshak	Kuchel	Williams
Eastland	Lennon	Young
Ellender	Long	

NAYS—20

Cooper	Jackson	Morse
Fulbright	Kennedy	Murray
Green	Kilgore	Neely
Hayden	Langer	Pastore
Hennings	Lehman	Sparkman
Hill	Magnuson	Symington
Humphrey	Monroney	

NOT VOTING—14

Beall	Goldwater	Mundt
Capehart	Kefauver	Robertson
Case	McCarran	Schoeppel
Chavez	McCarthy	Wiley
Gillette	Millikin	

So the amendment offered to the committee amendment by Mr. FERGUSON (for himself and other Senators) was agreed to.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND], the Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] and myself, I offer the amendment which I send to the desk and ask to have stated. It is designated "2–4–54–B."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment offered by the Senator from Michigan for himself and other Senators will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 3, it is proposed to strike out all of line 10 to 15, inclusive, and insert in lieu thereof the following:

SEC. 3. On the question of advising and consenting to the ratification of a treaty the vote shall be determined by yeas and nays, and the names of the persons voting for and against shall be entered on the Journal of the Senate.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays on this amendment.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I do not believe that this amendment will require extended debate. At the present time the Constitution requires that a treaty be ratified by the advice and consent of two-thirds of the Senators present. In the past, upon certain occasions we have seen treaties ratified when very few Senators have been in the Chamber. There has been no requirement for a yea-and-nay vote.

There is another provision in the Constitution which requires, with respect to action upon a veto message, what we are asking with respect to treaties. The Constitution provides that when the President of the United States vetoes a bill, the vote on the question of overriding the veto shall be taken by the yeas and nays, and the names of the persons voting for and against the bill shall be entered on the Journal of the Senate.

I am aware of the fact that some may say that the desired purpose can be accomplished by a rule of the Senate. But, Mr. President, if it is accomplished by rule, the Senate can, by unanimous consent, suspend the rule and vote as it has voted in the past. If we place the proposed amendment in the Constitution of the United States, where I believe it should be, the Senate cannot modify the provision by unanimous consent. The Senate will be required to follow the Constitution and vote by the yeas and nays, following a call for a quorum, as is the custom in the Senate; and the name of each Senator voting on a question so important as advising and consenting to the ratification of a treaty shall be entered on the Journal, so that everyone may know who voted for or against ratification.

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

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I should like to inquire of the distinguished senior Senator from Michigan whether this amendment could be described as the atom-bomb amendment, because it would be like using an atom bomb to kill mosquitos.

Mr. FERGUSON. My answer to that is, that I believe this provision would be beneficial, not only to the Senate, but to the Nation as a whole. It would be beneficial to require a yea and nay vote on the question of the Senate advising and consenting to the ratification of a treaty.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, the amendment of the distinguished Senator from Michigan is similar to a resolution which I submitted last year, requiring that a rule be adopted which would provide for a quorum call and a yea-and-nay vote on any treaty coming before the Senate. So obviously I am not opposed to the purpose of the proposed amendment.

I hope that under any circumstances the provision will be made, by rule or otherwise, that no treaty may be considered by this body except after a quorum call, and that the question of advising and consenting to the ratification of the treaty shall be determined by a yea-and-nay vote.

However, notwithstanding the fact that I was the author of the resolution, and notwithstanding the fact that I am completely in sympathy with the purpose of the proposed amendment, I feel constrained to vote against it, for the reasons I gave a few minutes ago.

I think it would be a highly dangerous thing under any circumstances for this body to attempt to write an amendment to the Constitution of the United States on the floor of the Senate, and without the most careful and painstaking consideration of all the aspects and implications of the amendment. I must vote against every such proposal relating to a constitutional amendment. I think we are proposing to do something which is greatly dangerous and which has never been done before, so far as I know, in the entire history of the Nation—something which I hope and pray will never be done in the history of the Nation.

I therefore feel constrained to vote against the pending amendment, notwithstanding the fact that I agree with its purposes.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, as the distinguished Senator from Michigan has pointed out, this amendment is similar to the provision which now appears in the Constitution and has appeared in the Constitution since the very inception of our Government. With respect to a presidential veto the Constitution provides:

If after such reconsideration two-thirds of that House shall agree to pass the bill, it shall be sent, together with the objections, to the other House, by which it shall likewise be reconsidered, and if approved by two-thirds of that House, it shall become a law. But in all such cases the votes of both Houses shall be determined by yeas and nays, and the names of the persons voting for and against the bill shall be entered on the Journal of each House respectively.

I think the reason for that provision is very clear. When the President vetoes an act of the legislative body a serious situation arises when the Congress wishes to pinpoint the responsibility by overriding the Presidential veto.

I believe that if the debate on the Bricker amendment has done nothing more, it has brought home to the Senate and to the American people the importance of treaties and what treaties may do so far as internal law in this country is concerned. Once and for all we should be able to give assurance to the American people that never again will there be situations in which the Senate votes to give advice and consent to the ratification of a treaty when only a relatively few Members of the Senate are present in the Chamber.

The argument has been used that in the case of treaties a yea-and-nay vote might be taken by custom. That is true. We are now pursuing that course by custom. Nevertheless the Senate might in the future change the custom.

It has been argued that it might be provided by rule. That is likewise true; but also the Senate might change the rule. The adoption of the amendment before the Senate will give assurance to the American people that they will have the same safeguard in the matter of the ratification of a treaty which they now have with respect to the overriding of a veto by the President of the United States.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, will the Senator from California yield?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Does the Senator from California believe that a treaty is of greater dignity or more importance than a statute?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I believe the discussions which have been had on the floor of the Senate, and the very real concern which has been expressed throughout the country, make it extremely important that provision be made in the Constitution for a yea-and-nay vote so far as treaties are concerned.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Does the Senator from California believe that a treaty is of greater importance or of greater dignity than a statute passed by Congress?

Mr. KNOWLAND. No; I do not believe that a treaty is necessarily of greater validity.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I did not believe the Senator wanted to leave that impression. That is why I asked him the question.

Mr. KNOWLAND. The difference is that in the case of a statute both Houses of Congress have an opportunity to pass on it. If a mistake is made in one House, the other House can correct the mistake. With respect to a treaty it is only the Senate, one arm of Congress, which acts on it.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Why does not the Senator agree that all of our votes ought to be by the yeas and nays, because a statute is of equal importance with a treaty?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I believe the debate which has taken place on the subject of treaties and the fact that only one House of Congress acts upon treaties, and thus, with the President, is in a position to make law for the Nation, which, under the Constitution, becomes the supreme law of the land, suggest ample reasons for adding this additional safeguard to the Constitution.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The point I wish to make is that if a requirement for a yea-and-nay vote is a good thing for treaties, it would also be a good thing for statutes, because they are of equal importance, so far as their effect on the country is concerned.

Mr. KNOWLAND. The Senator from Arkansas of course is perfectly free to pursue that argument at this time. We are now discussing the treatymaking provision of the Constitution.

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

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield.

Mr. LEHMAN. Did I not correctly understand the distinguished majority leader when he stated that the Constitution already provides for a two-thirds vote in connection with the ratification of a treaty?

Mr. KNOWLAND. That is correct. That provision is already in the Constitution. But the Constitution does not require a yea-and-nay vote. As the distinguished Senator from New York knows, in the past, certainly during the time the Senator from California has been a Member of the Senate, for 8 years, there have been instances of treaties being ratified by a two-thirds vote when there were relatively few Senators present on the floor and participating in the vote.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator from California yield further?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield.

Mr. LEHMAN. That is perfectly true. However, if the Constitution requires a two-thirds vote of those present, obviously the question as to whether two-thirds of the Members were voting in confirmation of a treaty could be ascertained only by a yea-and-nay vote. Therefore, I believe that point is already safeguarded. I feel strongly that a quorum call should be had before a treaty is ratified, and every assurance should be provided that a quorum is present and a yea-and-nay vote is taken.

I believe the distinguished majority leader and the distinguished minority leader, in reply to questions of mine relating to the resolution which I submitted last year, did give assurance that in the future it would be ascertained, by means of a yea-and-nay vote, whether two-thirds of the Members of the Senate voted to ratify a treaty. Is that correct?

Mr. KNOWLAND. The Senator is correct. We have been following that procedure this year.

Mr. LEHMAN. I wish to make it very clear, as I have previously, that I believe the question of the ratification of treaties, by a two-thirds vote of the Senate is already clearly established in the Constitution. If the custom of having a yea-and-nay vote is not pursued then of course the Senate is derelict. The Senate should not be derelict. I am quite certain that it will not be derelict in that regard, if we adopt a rule or pass a statute which will require such procedure.

I do not believe the question should be brought up at a time when we are considering on the floor what I believe to be important beyond description for the welfare of the country, namely, the limitation of the President's treatymaking power by a constitutional amendment. It is very unfortunate that the amendment submitted by the distinguished senior Senator from Ohio or any other proposal in the form of a suggested constitutional amendment should be considered in this manner, and I shall vote against the Ferguson amendment.

Mr. KNOWLAND. What does the Senator from New York believe the framers of the Constitution had in mind when they required in the case of the submission of proposed constitutional amendments a two-thirds vote of each House of Congress? Does he believe they supposed that the Senate and the House of Representatives would merely rubber stamp a proposed constitutional amendment which was reported by a committee?

The Senator from New York says that the Senate cannot write a constitutional amendment on the floor. We are not expected to take merely the recommendation of only 13 Senators, who happen to be members of the Committee on the Judiciary, or of any other committee of Congress. Each of us has a responsibility. Each of us has taken an oath to uphold the Constitution of the United States. A part of our legislative function, if we believe that a constitutional amendment is not in the shape we think it should be, is to propose amendments from the floor.

The pending amendment is not a new proposal. It was submitted last July, so it is not something that has come in recently. It has been the subject of a great deal of discussion.

I do not subscribe to the theory that Members of the Senate or of the House of Representatives, when a constitutional amendment is reported, are foreclosed from making suggestions or offering amendments. To do so would be to abdicate the responsibility of 96 Senators to 13 Senators on a committee. I do not believe that was the intent of the framers of the Constitution.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I wish to point out again that since the Bricker amendment has been debated on the floor from the opening of this session of Congress, 3 or 4 other constitutional amendments have been proposed. They differ very greatly in their intent and in the effect they would have on the country.

I say to the distinguished majority leader that Members of the Senate and the people of the country as a whole are so confused on the issue that for us to attempt to write on the floor of the Senate a constitutional amendment which may affect the whole life of the Nation for generations, if not for hundreds of years to come, would be the height of folly. After all, we have gone along for 165 years under the present Constitution. I do not believe that any substantial number of people, if any, have ever been hurt by reason of any provision in the Constitution without the Bricker amendment. They have been fully and successfully protected by the provisions of the Constitution which we now seek to destroy.

We have heard about the Pink case. It has been debated day after day. I was Governor of the State of New York at the time the Pink case came before the courts. I can say to my colleagues the evidence shows that every citizen of the United States who had any claims against the Russian-owned insurance company was paid in full through the liquidation of that company. I do not believe one person in the State of New York was ever hurt because of the recognition of the Russian Government so far as it applied to the matters involved in the Pink case.

So, Mr. President, I feel that for us to attempt to rewrite the Constitution on the floor of the Senate, when there is great confusion in this House and among millions of people of the Nation, would be highly unwise.

I agree that we do not need on the floor of the Senate to agree to anything that a committee recommends. There have been many instances in which we have repudiated the recommendations of a committee. But we are considering a constitutional amendment. It will almost be impossible of repeal if it shall prove to be bad. It required 16 years to repeal the prohibition amendment and the country was almost split in two because of dissension and dispute. I fervently hope we shall not undertake to

rewrite the Constitution on the floor of the Senate.

Mr. GREEN. Mr. President, before the Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND] took his seat, I attempted several times to ask him a question. It is a very short question, and I should like to ask it at this time.

As I understood his argument, it was that the provisions with respect to ratifying a treaty and with respect to voting on a Presidential veto are different in the Constitution as drafted, and that they should be the same. I should like to ask the Senator why he thinks the Founding Fathers made the provisions different in the Constitution.

Mr. KNOWLAND. If the Senator is propounding that question to me, I assume that the Founding Fathers thought the situation would never arise where there would be a mere handful of Senators on the floor when a treaty was being debated, considered, and ratified. But the Senator knows that over the years, through custom or practice, unfortunately that type of a situation did develop. If the Founding Fathers had thought such a situation would develop, I think they would have written in a provision covering it. I have no way of knowing. I think it is a good safeguard for the Senate of the United States and for the American people to require the yeas and nays with each Senator recorded on a question so important as a treaty, which can have a far-reaching effect upon the lives and property of the American people.

Mr. GREEN. As I read the record of the Convention which drafted the Constitution, it seems to me the Founding Fathers devoted much more time to a discussion of the different provisions of the Constitution than we can devote to the thoughts and views of individual Senators. Those who drafted the Constitution paid infinite attention to the various provisions of that great document. I agree with my distinguished colleague from New York [Mr. LEHMAN], who says that all changes proposed by way of amendment to the Constitution ought to be considered very carefully. The requirement as to voting on a proposal to amend the Constitution and a proposal as to voting on a Presidential veto need not be the same as the requirement relating to the ratification of a treaty.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, the amendment now provides for striking out on page 3 all of lines 10 to 15, inclusive, and inserting in lieu thereof certain language.

I ask to modify the amendment by striking out the words "strike out all in lines 10 to 15, inclusive," and inserting between lines 15 and 16 this amendment, so we shall be voting not on an amendment to strike out, but simply on the placing of the amendment in the Bricker amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair will inform the Senator that since the yeas and nays have been ordered, it will require unanimous consent to modify the amendment. Is there objection?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I should like to say a word regarding the proposed amendment.

I do not object to its purpose, but I do not think it should be made a part of a proposed constitutional amendment. The same result can be accomplished either by an amendment to the rules or by statute. It occurs to me that the only real purpose of inserting it is to try to give an otherwise objectionable amendment some strength, because no one objects to a yea-and-nay vote on an important treaty. I think that is true on its face. I do not know of any Member of this body who would object to being recorded on a treaty. But the purpose of this particular proposal is to give strength to an amendment which otherwise would have a very difficult time passing this body. Therefore, Mr. President, I shall vote against it, not because I object to its purpose, but because the objective should not be reached in this way.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, what is before the Senate?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The request of the Senator from Michigan is before the Senate. The Chair has heard no objection.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, what is the modification?

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, the modification is to eliminate from my amendment the portion which would strike out lines 10 to 15, inclusive, and the language of the amendment in the Bricker amendment between lines 15 and 16 on page 3.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, the amendment, then would be the insertion of a new section; is that correct?

Mr. FERGUSON. That is correct.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. It would not affect sections 3 and 4?

Mr. FERGUSON. The amendment would read——

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Michigan yield?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I should like to ask the Senator from Michigan a simple question. He speaks in terms of treaties. I think we should have some legislative history in connection with this amendment. What is the difference, in the Senator's mind, between a treaty and an agreement? I remember an occasion on the floor of the Senate when we were considering for 3 weeks a minor agreement. Some of us had worked on it for many weeks. It was an economic agreement. I would not want to call in the entire Senate to vote on such an agreement. I think we should know what is the difference between a treaty and an agreement. Is it what the Executive sends here and calls an agreement, or is there some legal or legislative definition?

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I wish I could answer that question.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I wish I could, too. I might vote for the Senator's amendment, if I could.

Mr. FERGUSON. Under the Constitution, a treaty is that which the President of the United States——

Mr. MAGNUSON. Calls a treaty.

Mr. FERGUSON. Negotiates and calls a treaty, and sends to the Senate as a treaty. That is a treaty, under the Constitution. It is that to which the amendment refers.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Let me ask another question. Suppose the President of the United States negotiates and sends to us a treaty regarding Germany. Suppose he calls it an agreement. Where are we then?

Mr. FERGUSON. This amendment would not apply in that event.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Is an economic arrangement an agreement or a treaty, or a combination of both? That is what I do not understand.

Mr. FERGUSON. It could be, as history shows, a combination.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Is it not always a combination?

Mr. FERGUSON. Politically, it is that which the President sends to the Senate. That is why the first amendment proposed provided that a treaty which was in conflict with the Constitution would have no force or effect.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Would the Senator from Michigan object to an amendment, which I should be glad to propose or to have the Senator from Michigan propose, to include both treaties and agreements? I think some economic agreements are more important in our world relations than are some treaties, which broadly have been referred to as political agreements. Would the Senator from Michigan object to an amendment which would apply also to all agreements?

Mr. FERGUSON. Yes; I would object.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Then the Senator from Michigan will have to define what is a treaty and what is an agreement.

Mr. FERGUSON. I do not believe there should be included in this particular amendment, which relates to the requirement of a two-thirds vote of the Senate, a definition of an agreement.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I am perfectly willing to have my votes recorded. I wish all Senators could have been present during the time the whaling agreement was under consideration. There was a very interesting discussion of whales.

Mr. President, if we are going to act on this matter, let us do so in a proper manner, and not go half way. What is a treaty? What is an agreement? Let the amendment apply to both.

Some Senators who have been speaking about the desirability of being present have not been present in the Chamber when some of these matters have been under discussion previously. Let us be honest about the matter.

Mr. GILLETTE. Mr. President, before I make a very brief remark with reference to the amendment, I wish to say, in answer to the question asked by the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] that a few years ago, when I thought I knew something about the subject, I spoke at some length concerning it on the floor. I had addressed a question to the State Department, ask-

ing them to define, as clearly as they could, for my benefit, and for the benefit of all the Senate, what they thought constituted a treaty and what they thought constituted an executive agreement.

Their reply, as I read it on the floor of the Senate, was that a treaty was something they had to send to the Senate in order to get approval by a two-thirds vote. An executive agreement was something they did not have to send to the Senate.

At that time I stated to the Senate that the reply of the State Department reminded me of the time when I was a boy on the farm, and asked the hired man how to tell the difference between a male and a female pigeon. He said, "You put corn in front of the pigeon. If he picks it up, it is a he; if she picks it up, it is a she." [Laughter.]

With reference to the pending amendment, I am in thorough accord with its purpose. But when the Constitution was adopted, and when the Founding Fathers placed all the legislative power in the hands of a Congress composed of two branches, they did not place Congress in a straitjacket, so far as rules are concerned. They provided, by constitutional enactment, that each House should adopt its own rules.

While I am in thorough accord with what Senators are trying to do, does it make any sense, when we stop to think, that before such an amendment to the Constitution could become effective, it would have to be adopted by a two-thirds vote of the Senate and a two-thirds vote of the House of Representatives, and then would have to be ratified by three-fourths of the States. A thousand treaties could be submitted to the Senate for consideration and ratification before such a constitutional amendment might be ratified.

The only way to proceed in this matter is as provided by the Constitution. The objective which is sought by the Senators who have proposed the amendment relating to a yea-and-nay vote could be achieved by amending our own rules. It is not necessary to wait until three-fourths of the States have ratified an amendment to the Constitution before the Senate can provide for a yea-and-nay vote on treaties. All that is necessary to be done is to amend the rules of the Senate.

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

Mr. GILLETTE. Of course, I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Has the Senator from Iowa in recent history taken part in an effort to change the rules of the Senate?

Mr. GILLETTE. Oh, yes; I may say in answer to the distinguished Senator from California, the minority leader. [Laughter.] I did not speak carelessly, Mr. President. The Senator from California has been the leader of an evanescent majority.

Sometimes it has been very difficult to make a change in the rules. Sometimes, as in a matter of this kind, where there can be no difference of opinion, it would be very, very easy.

The Senator from New York [Mr. LEHMAN] now has an amendment pending. The Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN] and I have offered an amendment to the rules of the Senate to effectuate what is sought to be done by the constitutional amendment under consideration. The amendment offered by the Senator from Arizona and myself could be adopted by a majority vote. It could be before the Senate within the next 10 days.

While it is necessary to accomplish what the eminent Senators who have offered the amendment are trying to do, why, in the name of all that is sensible, is it sought to be done by an amendment to the Constitution? Such a provision in order to become effective would have to wait until the proposed constitutional amendment were ratified by two-thirds of the Senate, two-thirds of the House, and then by three-fourths of the States.

Almost anything could happen. The eminent Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND], the equally eminent Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON], and the very ineffective junior Senator from Iowa could well be in our graves before such ratification could be accomplished.

I would not vote against the proposal, because its purpose is clear; but I cannot conceive of anything more ridiculous than an attempt to make a correction of this kind through an amendment to the Constitution.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I have been discussing with the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] his objection to the request of the Senator from Michigan. I understand that he will not object now. It seems to me that if the request of the Senator from Michigan were agreed to, if unanimous consent could be obtained merely to insert the modification proposed by the Senator from Michigan between lines 15 and 16 in Senate Joint Resolution 1, rather than to strike out lines 10 to 15, inclusive, as was originally proposed, the proposal would be placed before the Senate in a clear, uncomplicated manner.

It has been the general, customary practice, as a matter of comity in the Senate, in a case of this kind, to permit a Senator to modify his amendment. The only reason why unanimous consent is now necessary is that the yeas and nays have been ordered.

I appreciate the position which has been taken by the Senator from Minnesota. I think what has been requested by the Senator from Michigan is fair and equitable. It is a request of the type that any Senator might make in a similar situation. I hope unanimous consent will be given.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, the majority leader has discussed the matter with me. I wish to say that I do not view the Ferguson modification as a modification only. It has substantially altered the whole form of the proposed amendment known as Senate Joint Resolution 1. But I realize the desire of the Senator from Michigan is to have an up and down vote, so to speak, on a clean amendment, without its being attached to or eliminating other parts of the joint resolution now before the Senate.

I note that on January 27, a similar amendment, designated 1–27–54d, was offered by the distinguished majority leader, the Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND], for himself and the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON]. It is because the majority leader could call up his own amendment, if he so desired, which would accomplish the same purpose as that of the Senator from Michigan, that I am more than willing to withdraw my objection. I wish to cooperate with the majority leader. We have been most cooperative before. I withdraw my objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Minnesota has withdrawn his objection.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I said a while ago that there was the utmost confusion with respect to the provisions of the proposed amendment.

With great respect for my colleagues in the Senate, may I point out that what has happened in the Senate in the last half hour is most dramatic proof of what I have said. The Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON] and his colleagues have proposed an amendment, which has been lying on the desk for some little time. Yet within the last 5 minutes the Senator from Michigan has changed and very materially revised the amendment. He has taken out of the amendment certain provisions and he has greatly changed the purpose and intent of the amendment. His new amendment has not been printed or even read in the Senate.

Certainly, if action of that kind could have happened on the floor of the Senate this afternoon, it is, a clear indication of the great confusion that exists in the minds of Senators, and of the danger of proceeding with the consideration of any constitutional amendment through revisions, amendments, adjustments, compositions, or compromises on the floor of the Senate. That is exactly what is happening. It is a dangerous procedure.

I respect the position of other Members of the Senate, because I know they are just as sincere in their support of the Bricker amendment as I am in my opposition to it; but it nonetheless shows the danger in trying to write, on the floor of the Senate, a constitutional amendment which it will be practically impossible to repeal, and which may affect the lives of the people of the United States for a 100 years or more.

I have no objection to the purpose of the proposal. As Senators know, I originally suggested it. However, I certainly have very deep objection to being compelled to vote for the pending amendment or for any other provision of a constitutional amendment which changes the treatymaking powers of the Executive in such a manner as now proposed.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois will state it.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Is it the present proposal to retain sections 3 and 4 of Senate Joint Resolution 1 as printed on page 3? Is it true that the amendment is merely an addition and in no wise deletes any language?

Mr. FERGUSON. The Senator is correct. It would be a new section, between lines 15 and 16.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I should like to ask the Senator from Michigan why he inserts a new section, 5, and skips section 2, section 3, and section 4, and jumps to the end of the so-called amendment.

Mr. FERGUSON. There are other sections being offered. At the end of the voting the section numbers can be rearranged as they appear in the RECORD.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I have participated briefly in the debate, but I desire the RECORD to show that I believe the Senate should vote by the yeas and nays on treaties and on agreements, if possible. I agree with my colleague, the Senator from New York [Mr. LEHMAN] that this is a bad way to do it. I hope I shall be able to support the amendment to the rules offered by the Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE] and the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN]. I therefore intend to vote against the amendment, because I think, as does the Senator from New York, that this is the worst way in which we can proceed to try to determine the advice-and-consent powers of the Senate on treaties or agreements.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the modification offered by the Senator from Michigan. Is there objection?

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I should like to ask the distinguished Senator from Michigan if he has ever put down on a piece of paper what I am sure is a very worthy effort on his part to clarify that which was confusing, so that one who has had a little trouble in obtaining a clear mental image of what the Senator has in mind from what he has said would be able to look at the proposal and determine whether or not he would desire to object to the unanimous-consent request.

Mr. FERGUSON. I do not think I understand the question of the Senator.

Mr. KERR. Has the Senator put the requested amendment down on a piece of paper so that one may look at it?

Mr. FERGUSON. There are two parts to the amendment. One is to strike out all of lines 10 to 15, inclusive, and insert in lieu thereof certain language. In its modified form the amendment would not strike out lines 10 to 15, but would be inserted as a new section between lines 15 and 16 on page 3 of Senate Joint Resolution 1.

Mr. KERR. Reserving the right to object, I now repeat the question to the distinguished Senator from Michigan. Has the proposed requested amendment been put down on a piece of paper so that another Senator can look at it and try to visualize what the amendment proposes to do?

Mr. FERGUSON. I have one here——

Mr. KERR. Is the answer "Yes" or "No"

Mr. FERGUSON. The answer to the question of the Senator is "No."

Mr. KERR. Then, Mr. President, reserving the right to object, will the distinguished Senator write his proposal on a piece of paper so that it might be looked at in an effort by another Senator to get a clear picture, if possible, of what the distinguished Senator from Michigan has in his mind?

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask that the clerk state, for the information of the Senate, the proposed modification of the Senate joint resolution.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the proposed modification.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 3, between lines 15 and 16, it is proposed to insert the following:

SEC. 3. On the question of advising and consenting to the ratification of a treaty the vote shall be determined by yeas and nays, and the names of the persons voting for and against shall be entered on the Journal of the Senate.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, am I to understand that the Senator from Michigan is now proposing to strike out language which proposed to strike out a portion of the text, and that he is proposing certain language on the theory that two negatives make a positive?

Mr. FERGUSON. No, not at all.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, did I understand the Senator from Michigan to say he would put the proposed language down on a piece of paper?

Mr. FERGUSON. Yes. I sent it to the desk.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Oklahoma yield to the Senator from New York?

Mr. KERR. If the Senator from New York will wait just a moment——

Mr. LEHMAN. I shall be very glad to wait. I thought the Senator from Oklahoma was through.

Mr. KERR. It may be that I am. [Laughter.] But before it is made official, Mr. President, I should like to be in as favorable a position with reference to the pending request as the clerk seems to be, because evidently somebody has provided the clerk with a piece of paper upon which the amendment was written.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oklahoma has the floor.

Mr. KERR. I desire to thank the distinguished Senator from Michigan for yielding to me.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Michigan yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Michigan yield to the Senator from New York?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield to the Senator from New York.

Mr. LEHMAN. I think the question raised by the distinguished Senator from Oklahoma was very appropriate. Yielding to the request of the Senator from Oklahoma, the Senator from Michigan did scribble down on a piece of paper——

Mr. FERGUSON. No; the Senator from Michigan wrote it. He never scribbles.

Mr. LEHMAN. I beg the Senator's pardon. The Senator "wrote"—I will withdraw the word "scribble"—the proposed amendment, and it was read by the clerk. But I wonder how many Members of the Senate really understand or know what was in the proposed change?

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, is the Senator asking a question?

Mr. LEHMAN. I am frank to say I did not hear it, and I do not yet know what the proposed change is.

Mr. FERGUSON. Is the Senator asking a question?

Mr. LEHMAN. I should like to finish my statement.

Mr. FERGUSON. Is it a question?

Mr. LEHMAN. No; but I will reduce it to a question. I shall be very glad to.

Reserving the right to object [laughter]——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Michigan has yielded for a question.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I reserve the right to object to the modification.

I think this is a most dramatic demonstration of what is happening on this all-important question. I do not think a more important question has come before the Senate for many, many years than the proposal to adopt an amendment to the Constitution which would limit the treatymaking powers of the President.

After the amendment was proposed, a complete revision of it was hurriedly written on a piece of paper and sent to the desk. Frankly, I do not yet know what the change is.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from New York yield at this point?

Mr. LEHMAN. I prefer to finish my statement, and then I shall be very glad indeed to yield to the distinguished majority leader.

Mr. President, the procedure we have witnessed today is a clear demonstration of the manner in which this body, which is supposed to be the greatest deliberative body in the world, is approaching this all-important question. All of us recall what happened here only three-quarters of an hour ago.

No Member of the Senate has really given consideration to the newly proposed amendment. So far as I am concerned, I shall vote against it; and I shall have no hesitation—as I hope many of my colleagues and many of my fellow citizens of the United States will have none—in bringing the entire situation and the danger inherent in any of the proposed constitutional amendments as clearly and as forcefully as possible to the attention of the American people.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from New York yield at this point?

Mr. LEHMAN. I am glad to yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. With all due respect to my friend, the Senator from New York, there is nothing either dramatic or unusual about the request which has been made. On the contrary, the course requested has been followed time and time again in the normal legislative procedure in this body. All the Senator from Michigan is endeavoring to do is to have the Senate vote solely on the proposal whether a yea-and-nay vote shall be required on the question of having the Senate approve a treaty, so that question will stand on its own feet, unencumbered. That would be done by striking out the language appearing in the amendment as it came from the Ju-

diciary Committee, thus permitting those sections to be acted upon separately, and to stand on their own feet, as it were.

So the proposal is simply one to bring the matter before the Senate in an unencumbered manner, and thus to simplify the procedure, by having the Senate vote directly on the one particular question.

Thus, Mr. President, I see nothing unusual or horrible about the procedure. On the contrary, I think the Senate is performing its proper function, in taking up these matters item by item, in dealing with them one at a time.

Mr. LEHMAN. I realize full well that it is not ordinarily unusual for a Member of the Senate to revise or withdraw or change completely an amendment previously offered. However, the matter we are discussing today is not an ordinary one.

I am convinced that the distinguished Senator from California, for whom I have an extremely high regard, will agree with me that the question before us is one of the most important questions to come before the Senate or before the American people at any time within our lifetime. Therefore, I think it most improper for us to attempt to write a constitutional amendment on the floor of the Senate. Such an attempt is the height of folly, Mr. President.

I have called attention to the situation in order to show that the procedure which has been followed is a clear and dramatic demonstration of the evil and folly to which I have pointed.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I may say to the distinguished Senator from New York that the amendment submitted by the Senator from Michigan to the amendment previously offered does not change a word in that amendment, insofar as it deals with the question of requiring that a yea-and-nay vote be taken. The proposal is only one relating to the Senate procedure in facing the issue.

There is nothing complicated about the proposal. At this time the attendance in the Senate is about as large as any I have observed at this session, except when an actual yea-and-nay vote was in progress.

So I think we are performing our highest function as Members of the Senate of the United States. I think we are constructively contributing to the debate and the procedure when we simplify the procedure and have before us the sole issue of whether the taking of a yea-and-nay vote on such a question shall be provided in the Constitution.

Senators may vote for or against the proposal; but at least the issue will be clearly before them, without being encumbered by any other proposal.

So it seems to me we are performing in a perfectly proper way our duties as legislators and as Members of the United States Senate, who under the Constitution are charged with some responsibility in connection with the process of amending the Constitution.

I repeat that I do not believe it was ever intended by the framers of the Constitution that Senators should sit mute and should not offer amendments and should not discuss amendments, but should act as rubber stamps in connection with a proposal submitted to them by either the Judiciary Committee or any other Senate committee.

On the contrary, it is the highest function of Senators of the United States to listen to the debate, make suggestions, and then vote them either up or down.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I agree with the Senator from California when he says that it is the highest function of the Senate to give consideration to proposed legislation which is presented in an orderly fashion. On the other hand, when an amendment to the Constitution of the United States is proposed, and when 3 or 4 alternative amendments to the Constitution are then proposed, the result is confusion in connection with a matter of such outstanding importance to the Nation as is the Bricker amendment.

So far as I am concerned, I cannot emphasize too strongly that I believe the matter now before us is more important than any other matter which has come before the Congress or the American people within my memory. I am deeply convinced that it is extremely dangerous to attempt to write such a constitutional amendment on the floor of the Senate. An amendment, once made a part of the Constitution, may last for generations to come.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I should like to inquire of the Senator from Michigan or the Senator from California whether the pending amendment contains any provision to the effect that a quorum of the Senate shall be present at the time when the two-thirds affirmative vote is required.

Mr. KNOWLAND. In that respect the amendment follows the language of the Constitution applying to the overriding of a presidential veto.

As the distinguished Senator from Arizona knows—and there is scarcely a Member of the Senate who has a better knowledge than his of the rules and procedures of the Senate—no responsible Senator in charge of such a measure would bring it to the floor of the Senate, for vote, unless he knew a quorum was present; for if a quorum were not present, then, under the requirement for a yea-and-nay vote, the absence of a quorum would be disclosed, and it would not be possible to have the measure acted upon by the Senate until a quorum was present.

Therefore, I do not believe that any Member of the Senate would bring up a measure which would require the concurrence of two-thirds of the Members present and voting unless he knew a quorum was present. Precisely the same procedure is followed under the constitutional provision relating to the overriding of a presidential veto.

Mr. HAYDEN. Nevertheless, the advocates of the Bricker amendment have been, throughout the Nation, severely criticizing the Senate for ratifying a treaty one one occasion when only two Senators were present. The Senator from Minnesota [Mr. THYE] and the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN] are mentioned in that connection as the two Senators who are supposed to have ratified the treaty. In view of all the discussion throughout the Nation about that matter, would not it be wise to provide that a quorum be present?

Mr. KNOWLAND. The Senator from Arizona well knows that if a yea-and-nay vote were taken and if the vote disclosed the absence of a quorum, the Senate would be unable to transact any business until a quorum was developed.

Mr. HAYDEN. Nevertheless, there has been widespread criticism to the effect that on at least one occasion only two Members of the Senate approved a treaty.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arizona yield to me?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. As I understand the situation, if the proposed new section should become a part of the Constitution, in case a yea-and-nay vote were taken on a treaty, and the vote disclosed the absence of a quorum, the Senate could not transact any business until a quorum was developed. Automatically, there would be a quorum call, so a quorum would be voting. That is the rule.

Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. FERGUSON. What would be the procedure in the Senate when a vote was taken if there were a provision in the Constitution that on the question of advising and consenting to the ratification of a treaty the vote must be determined by the yeas and nays and the names of the persons voting for and against must be entered on the Journal of the Senate? There is another part of the Constitution which requires a two-thirds vote of the Senators present and voting. Suppose the vote developed the fact that a quorum was not present. What would be the procedure then?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Does the language read merely "two-thirds"?

Mr. FERGUSON. Two-thirds of the Senators present and voting.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. The Constitution says "provided two-thirds of the Senators present concur."

The only requirement is that two-thirds of the Senators present must concur.

Mr. FERGUSON. That is correct.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Michigan is advised that in the case which he has cited the Chair would rule that a quorum had not voted, and, therefore, the clerk would be directed to call the roll.

Mr. FERGUSON. For a quorum?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. To develop a quorum. No proceedings could be conducted until a quorum was present.

The Senator is further advised that after a quorum had been developed, another vote would be taken.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, to me the situation seems very simple. Reserving the right to object—and I shall object—I suggest to the distinguished Senator from Michigan that all we have to do is to vote the amendment down. Then the distinguished Senator from Michigan can offer 2 amendments, taking care of the 2 different provisions.

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. KILGORE. The Presiding Officer has just stated what the ruling would be under certain circumstances. However, that statement is based only upon precedent, and not upon the Constitution or upon the Rules of the Senate. Is that correct?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from West Virginia is advised that under the Constitution the Senate cannot transact business without a quorum. Therefore, it is necessary to develop a quorum.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, the Presiding Officer has, of course, made a correct statement. The constitutional requirement for a quorum is found in section 5 of article I, which makes it very clear that a majority of each House is a quorum, and that business cannot be transacted without such majority, but that a smaller number may adjourn each House from day to day, and may compel the attendance of other Members, until a quorum is obtained.

I invite attention to the fact that in no respect does this amendment depart from the wording of the constitutional provision relating to the overriding of a presidential veto.

The present provision of the Constitution with reference to concurring in a treaty is found in section 2 of article II:

He—

Meaning the President—

shall have power, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, to make treaties, provided two-thirds of the Senators present concur.

Nothing is said about a quorum. However, the earlier provision with respect to a quorum applies to this provision and to every other provision of the Constitution.

I hope we may be allowed to go ahead and vote. I am not a supporter of the Bricker amendment as it was originally drawn or as it was reported from the committee. But now, it seems to me, we have before us a confidence-inspiring provision which ought to be in any amendment which is submitted if an amendment is finally to be submitted.

The point made by the distinguished Senator from New York [Mr. LEHMAN] was made under a misapprehension of fact. He made the statement that such a thing as rewriting an amendment to the Constitution has never taken place on the floor of the Senate. He is completely inaccurate in that statement. The very last amendment which was submitted and ratified, the 22d amendment, with reference to presidential terms, was rewritten entirely from beginning to end, in the debate on the floor of the Senate. The Senator from Florida had some part in that debate at that time.

So the point is not well taken. It seems to the Senator from Florida that objection to voting on this amendment comes with very ill grace from a Senator who himself has recognized the need for such a provision by submitting a resolution precisely the same as the pending amendment, which resolution provided for an amendment to the Senate rules.

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

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield gladly.

Mr. LEHMAN. I said previously, and wish to repeat, that not only am I strongly in favor of the purpose of the pending amendment, but I made the original suggestion that this point be covered by a rule of the Senate. I hope some provision may be made, in one form or another, because I believe that in the consideration of any treaty, or any other important matter coming before the Senate, there should be a quorum present, and there should be a yea-and-nay vote. I think we have been far too lax and careless in conforming to that principle. So there is no question whatsoever with regard to my point.

Mr. HOLLAND. I thank the distinguished Senator.

Mr. LEHMAN. I still feel, with all the conviction that lies within me, that when a constitutional amendment of such importance is proposed—and I think the Senator from Florida will agree that there have been very few, if any, constitutional amendments, save those contained in the first 10 amendments, which are of as great importance as the pending proposal, or of greater importance—the way we are proceeding, by trying to rewrite, to compromise, and to adjust, is bad for the interests of the people of the country and bad for our relationships with foreign countries. I think such a proposal would impede our foreign relations. I think it would cause a stagnation, or at least a partial stagnation in the functioning of government. That is why I am against the pending amendment. It is not because I am against the purpose. I will acknowledge to my respected friend from Florida that I am in a very anomolous position in opposing a proposal similar to the one which I myself have made, and which I have advocated. I believe that the question of the manner in which we now propose to legislate on this amendment is so paramount in importance that I can allow nothing else to stand in my way.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, it had been my hope—and still is—to obtain a vote on the pending amendment this evening, and then move that the Senate take a recess until tomorrow. Merely in the interest of orderly parliamentary procedure, once again I should like to propound a unanimous-consent request, namely, that the request of the Senator from Michigan to modify his amendment to the extent of inserting certain language between lines 15 and 16 on page 3, be granted by the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, let me say to the Senator from California that I have an amendment to propose to the amendment of the Senator from Michigan. I am wondering if the granting of the unanimous-consent request would change the language so that I would lose my opportunity to propose my amendment.

Mr. KNOWLAND. The language would not be changed. Whatever rights the Senator from Washington now has he would continue to have, regardless of the particular change now proposed, which is merely to insert new language as a section between lines 15 and 16 on page 3, rather than to strike out certain lines.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I have no objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I did not understand the answer to the parliamentary inquiry a moment ago, in which the Chair stated that no business could be transacted in the Senate unless a quorum were present. A statement has just been made by the distinguished Senator from Arizona, who perhaps knows more about the rules of the Senate than any other Senator, or just as much as any other Senator, that a treaty had been ratified with only two Senators on the floor. I do not quite reconcile the statement of the Senator from Arizona with the statement made by the Chair. I should like to ask the Chair for a clarification of his statement that no business can be conducted by the Senate without a quorum being present.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. In the case referred to a quorum was presumed to be present, and the contrary had never been shown.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I did not say "presumed." A moment ago the Chair stated that a quorum was present. The Senator from Arizona said that only two Members of the Senate were present. I want to know what was the fact, not the presumption.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair is advised that the only way in which the absence of a quorum can be established is by a quorum call, or by a yea-and-nay vote.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Then the Chair does not believe it to be possible to presume that a quorum is present under those circumstances. Is that correct?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair states that that is in accordance with all the precedents of the Senate.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The Chair recognizes the fact, however, that a great deal of business is conducted by the Senate without a quorum being present. Is that correct?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Not on the record.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I did not say "on the record." I said the Chair does say so as a fact, does he not?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is advised that the Presiding Officer cannot count to see whether a quorum is present.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I did not ask the Presiding Officer that question. I asked whether it is not a fact that a great deal of business is conducted by the Senate without a quorum being present.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Not on the record.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I wish to ask the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON] if he would object to modifying his amendment by including all agreements, not merely treaties. The reason I ask it is that if the amendment offered by the senior Senator from Georgia is adopted, it is very likely that in the

future there will not be any treaties, and everything will be brought to Congress in the form of an agreement, in order to take advantage of the majority rule. Does not the Senator from Michigan feel, if such an amendment as he proposes should be adopted, it should be applicable to all agreements?

Mr. FERGUSON. I believe the amendment should be left as it is. If the George amendment becomes a part of the proposed constitutional amendment, then a section dealing with executive agreements can be taken care of. The pending amendment is purely intended to cover treaties, in connection with which a two-thirds vote is required to ratify.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President——

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I still have the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arkansas has the floor.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I did not understand the Senator's answer. Does he mean that he anticipates that if the George amendment is adopted, another amendment will be offered?

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, if the Senator from Arkansas will permit me to say so, if he will look at the Bricker amendment, as reported by the Committee on the Judiciary, he will note a section in it dealing with the question of executive agreements. If the distinguished Senator from Arkansas desires to have a yea-and-nay vote required for Executive agreements, it seems to me that that is the section he should seek to amend.

What we are trying to do in this section is to cover the matter of ratification of treaties, which under the Constitution only the Senate acts upon, not the House, and which does require a two-thirds vote. We are dealing with a treaty section.

I plead with the distinguished Senator from Arkansas to let the Senate come to a vote on this issue. Then, if he desires to provide for a yea-and-nay vote in a section dealing with executive agreements, he can offer such an amendment to that section, either to the amendment reported by the Committee on the Judiciary or to any other amendment dealing with executive agreements which may be offered from the floor.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I have no objection to voting on the pending amendment. I was trying to clarify the situation. I would not object to the amendment. I have already stated my position, which is that the objective sought should be accomplished by a change in the rules of the Senate or by the passage of a statute. I shall vote against it, not because I object to its merits, but because I believe the only purpose of offering it now is to try to strengthen and make more palatable a constitutional amendment, whether it be the Bricker amendment or the George amendment.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arkansas yield?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. If the Senator from Arkansas will read section 3 of the Bricker amendment, lines 10 through 15 on page 3, he will note the words:

> All such agreements shall be subject to the limitations imposed on treaties by this article.

The article refers to the ratification of treaties by a two-thirds vote of the Senate.

It seems to me that the Ferguson amendment, since it does not strike out lines 10 through 15, as it originally proposed to do, but leaves in that part of the Bricker amendment which includes executive agreements, should be amended to apply to executive agreements.

What the Senator from Minnesota is saying is that the Ferguson amendment originally was intended to strike out the reference to executive agreements. The Senator from Michigan has asked to modify his amendment, but leaves intact the language pertaining to executive agreements.

Yet, when it comes to his amendment as it is applied to the Bricker amendment, it refers only to treaties. Therefore the discussion with reference to executive agreements and a yea and nay vote seems to be very germane and very pertinent.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, the Senator will have an opportunity to vote on striking out the language which was previously included under the amendment.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I happen to be one of the Senators who intend to cast their votes in favor of a yea-and-nay vote in connection with the ratification of treaties.

I am not at all impressed by the argument with reference to statutes, because the majority leader made it quite clear that a treaty is ratified by only one House of Congress, and I believe he made a very good point in that connection.

However, I must say to my good friend from Michigan that I believe in his haste to modify his amendment he failed to take into consideration the fact that he was striking out lines 10 to 15, which basically related to executive agreements, and now ends up with an amendment which touches only the treatymaking functions and leaves in the original proposal—by striking out the provision to eliminate lines 10 to 15—affecting treaties only, when the real problem is executive agreements.

Therefore I believe he has gone to the mountain and the product which has been delivered is hardly related to all the effort involved.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I should like to ask the distinguished Senator from Michigan a question. If we do not agree to the Senator's unanimous-consent request and vote on the pending amendment as it is, would it deal only with treaties?

Mr. FERGUSON. That is correct.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Whereas if we leave it as it is, the second sentence, by referring to the proposed amendment, will apply both to treaties and executive agreements.

Mr. FERGUSON. If that part were to remain in the amendment; that is correct.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I am not sure that I correctly understand the Senator. I am a little confused about what would be the effect of the amendment and whether it would apply to agreements.

Mr. FERGUSON. If the language in lines 10 to 13, inclusive, as I read it—"All such agreements shall be subject to the limitations imposed upon treaties by this article"—were to remain in the amendment, it would apply. However, I do not anticipate that the language will remain in the amendment.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President——

Mr. FULBRIGHT. How will that language in section 3 be eliminated?

Mr. FERGUSON. On a motion to strike it out.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I do not quite understand.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, we previously had a presumption by the Chair; now we are having assumptions on the floor of the Senate. What right has any Member of the Senate to assume that we will strike out any part of an amendment? We should proceed on the basis of amending an amendment in line with what is before us, not on what may happen. When we leave the Chamber some kind of accident may happen and we may be dead. We cannot afford to assume that we will strike section 3 or 4 or 5, or any other section.

I wish to say to the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] that while the Senator from New York was making his strong objection I felt he was possibly being too obstinate, which is very difficult for me to say about my friend from New York. But, now, Mr. President, I find he was dead right. The Senator from Michigan does not really know what the amendment means. The Senator from Michigan started out with a clean amendment to strike out certain language and add in lieu thereof the language of his amendment. The difficulty is that when he started to adjust it, what he did was to propose an amendment to the whole language of the Bricker amendment, which, in my opinion, does not relate to the core of the problem.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arkansas yield in order that I may make a response to the Senator from Minnesota?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. The facts of the situation are simply these: It is true that the original amendment offered by the Senator from Michigan on behalf of himself and other Senators did propose to strike out certain language between lines 10 and 15, but at the request of a number of Senators who wanted to vote on this issue standing alone and not be deprived of the opportunity of voting on whether they wanted to retain the language as reported from the Judiciary Committee, the Senator from Michigan sought to modify the amendment in conformity with such request. The Senator from Michigan asked to modify his amendment. It was an attempt to oblige Members of the Senate so that they might be able to vote on a single issue.

I quite agree with the Senator that no one has a right to assume that the Senate will do or will not do a certain thing; but unless we can arrive at a vote, we shall not know what the final answer will be.

All the majority leader is trying to do is to get the amendment to the point where a vote can be taken on it tonight. I would then propose that the Senate take a recess until tomorrow and consider the other amendments in order, so that Senators who desire either to retain certain sections or eliminate them will have an opportunity to debate and vote on them in turn.

It seems to me, Mr. President, that is the orderly and sensible procedure and one which both the Senate and the Nation will thoroughly understand.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, why is it not more orderly to wait until section 3 is deleted before an amendment is offered? If the Senator from Michigan anticipates that section 3 will be eliminated, let us eliminate it and then go on with the amendment.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Let me say to the Senator from Arkansas that under the general procedure of the Senate perfecting amendments are first in order. The Senator from Michigan has 3 perfecting amendments, 1 has been adopted, 1 is now pending, and he has 1 which he had hoped to bring up today, but which it is now proposed to hold over until tomorrow. The distinguished Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER] has an amendment which he has presented to the Senate and which is at the table. The distinguished Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] has a substitute which is at the table. The Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER] has an amendment in the nature of a substitute, which is at the table.

It seems to me, Mr. President, that if we can vote on them in that order, we shall at least have an opportunity to get the expression of the Senate.

Each Member has his own ideas as to whether we should try to amend the Constitution on the floor of the Senate. We have previously discussed that situation. We have been debating this matter for several weeks. No Senator is being foreclosed from voting. We shall consider the joint resolution all week if the Senate so desires, but we are now at a point where I think the Senate understands the issue, and we are merely trying to get a vote at this time.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I would rather vote on the first proposal of the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw the amendment lettered "B."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, is a request now being made to withdraw the amendment?

Mr. KNOWLAND. To withdraw the Ferguson amendment which has been offered.

Mr. KERR. Does that refer to this specific document which the Senator from California so kindly furnished me?

Mr. KNOWLAND. It applies to that specific document.

Mr. KERR. I shall not object, but I would remark that we could have saved some two hours of time had the request been made earlier in the afternoon when the understanding of Senators would probably have been clearer.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Have not the yeas and nays been ordered?

Mr. KNOWLAND. Yes, Mr. President; but the order can be rescinded by unanimous consent.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Reserving the right to object, I want to say to the majority leader that I realize what is desired with reference to the amendment. When the Senator explained it to me I was perfectly willing to cooperate, and I am at this time. The truth is that this amendment might have been quickly modified on the floor of the Senate without full understanding of the situation. The first amendment was the one upon which we should have voted, because it applied to treaties. We ended up, however, by considering an amendment which applies to treaties attached to a provision applying to agreements.

I think the Senator from New York [Mr. LEHMAN] made a distinct contribution this afternoon when he said we were legislating without full understanding. At the time I thought he was incorrect, and I so indicated to a colleague of mine. If the Senator from Michigan wants to propose his original amendment, which is a clear amendment, we can vote it up or down, or we can follow along the line suggested by the Senator from Arkansas.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The present situation is just what the Senator has described.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The majority leader is asking unanimous consent to withdraw the entire amendment.

Mr. KNOWLAND. That is the situation.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I know the majority leader has been most patient, but, frankly, we are in rather a ridiculous position. We went up the hill and now we are coming down.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, if the Senator will permit me a moment, all I am trying to do is to move along so that the Senate can proceed in an orderly manner.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Why not vote?

Mr. KNOWLAND. It will undoubtedly require two rollcalls. I am going to make a suggestion. The hour is almost 6 o'clock. If permission is granted, the amendment will be withdrawn, a new amendment will be drafted, which will not be taken up tonight. It will be printed and lie on the table, and Senators will have an opportunity to study it, and we shall then have an opportunity to proceed with a fresh look at the situation at noon tomorrow.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I think the Senator's proposal is eminently fair. I should not want to be in the position of objecting to an orderly procedure such as he has outlined. Some of us did not participate in the debate for the purpose of obstruction.

Mr. KNOWLAND. The majority leader has not charged any obstruction.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Oh, no; there are no charges at all. It is a matter of the record being quite complete.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I wish to point out that I was perfectly willing to vote on the original amendment at the beginning. I made no delaying requests. I think it is better for the Senate to know whether the requirement for the yeas and nays is to apply only to treaties or to agreements, or to both. I think we should know that. If yea-and-nay votes are to be required only on treaties, though if I correctly understood the Senator from Michigan, the amendment would probably be made to apply later on to agreements, it seems to me we should know whether it applies to both.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, the Senator from Michigan did not say that. He said it depended on whether that particular section was left in the resolution or was eliminated by the Senate. No one can guarantee that section will be kept in or left out.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Do I gather that the Senator from Michigan thinks it will be left out?

Mr. KNOWLAND. That is my personal opinion. But, after all, there are 96 Senators, and until they have voted, we will not know.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I do not see what would be wrong with determining to what the requirement for the yeas-and-nays will apply. We shall have to wait to decide that question until the Senate determines whether the section is to remain in the resolution. That seems very logical to me. But I do not wish to interfere with the program of the majority leader. I still think it would be perfectly proper to vote on the original amendment.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, reserving the right to object——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from California yield to the Senator from Washington?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I reserved the right to object. Probably I helped start this discussion, but I did so without having in mind any delay.

I asked the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON] what I thought was a simple question. I think before the Senate passes on any of these amendments, there should be some legislative history as to what is considered to be a treaty and what is considered to be an executive agreement. I failed to get an answer, so I have prepared an amendment, which I wish to offer. I propose it in all seriousness. I think the Senate should vote on all these questions. So if the amendment under consideration is withdrawn, I now serve notice on the Senate that I shall propose an amendment to add, "and/or executive agreements." Unless there can be definitions of treaties and executive agreements, I cannot see any objection to the amendment which I shall propose.

Mr. FERGUSON. Of course, the Senator from Washington can offer what he wishes.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I understand, but I should like to have a definition.

Mr. FERGUSON. I cannot define the terms for the Senator from Washington, because of the conflict that now exists between the Constitution, the Supreme Court decisions, and the practice of the State Department. I cannot give a definition of or draw a line of demarcation between an executive agreement and a treaty. If I could, I believe many of the problems confronting us would be solved.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Then I wish to ask the Senator from Michigan if the Executive head of the Government should send to the Senate an agreement or a treaty, or both, and should say, "This is an executive agreement," would the Executive be the determining power, or would the Senate decide whether it was a treaty on which it was asked to vote by the yeas-and-nays, or was an executive agreement on which it would not be required so to vote?

Mr. FERGUSON. I should say the answer would depend somewhat on the form of the proposal; but I believe in the majority of cases the Senate could consider it as a treaty, if the Senate desired to ratify the proposal in that form.

Mr. MAGNUSON. How would that be determined?

Mr. FERGUSON. By a vote of the Senate.

Mr. MAGNUSON. That being the case, and since there is so much confusion about what is a treaty and what is an executive agreement, and where the line is to be drawn, would the Senator from Michigan object to my amendment, which would simply add "and/or executive agreements"?

Mr. FERGUSON. Yes; I would object. I should be glad to discuss the question on the floor, but I would object now.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I do not object to withholding the amendment now, but I may say to the Senate that when the Senator from Michigan reoffers his amendment I intend to offer an amendment adding the words "and/or executive agreements," because I believe the Senate should vote on all such matters, since executive agreements sometimes become more important than treaties.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the unanimous-consent request of the Senator from California?

Mr. NEELY. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, please let me invite attention to the formulary proposed a little while ago by the distinguished Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE] for the ascertainment of the meaning, if any, of the innumerable, confused and conflicting amendments to the bitterly controversial Bricker amendment now before the Senate. The beloved Iowa statesman proposed that we seek surcease of our present distress, not by means of a Shakespearean invocation of a must of fire, or a Miltonic supplication for the illumination of what is undoubtedly dark and the elevation of what is unquestionably low, but by simply adopting the method used by a certain farmer to determine whether his pigeons were of the masculine or feminine gender. Said the farmer, "Simply observe the pigeons while they are eating corn, and rest assured that every male that eats will be a 'he' and every female that eats will be a 'she'." Let me for a moment endeavor to rise to the height of the great argument which for weeks has been raging in the Senate over an attempt to alter the Constitution to an extent that would render it impossible for Washington, Jefferson, Madison, and Webster, severally or jointly, to recognize it if it were encountered in the silent land. Let me enlarge the suggestion made by the Senator from Iowa so as to include another species of the animal kingdom as a possible source from which to obtain wisdom and discretion sufficient to enable us appropriately to dispose of the Bricker amendment whether in its present stark naked imperfection or in a more or less modified form.

In this case, we should not follow the scriptural advice to the sluggard to go to the ant for wisdom, because we would not wish to be guilty of offending this industrious, praiseworthy little insect by attempting to associate it with anything we have heard here today. However, it is suggested that instead of going to the ant or to the birds, as proposed by the Senator from Iowa, we go to the friendless insect, whose power of discrimination was immortalized by the renowned Roland Young, in his matchless and inimitable lines:

> And there's the bounding little flea:
> You cannot tell a female from a he;
> The sexes look alike you see,
> But he can tell, and so can she.

[Laughter.]

Mr. President, will not the eminent Republican leader, Mr. KNOWLAND, postpone the vote on the pending ponderous matter until tomorrow in order that we may have an opportunity to go to the birds, as suggested by the Senator from Iowa, and to the flea, as suggested by Mr. Young, for guidance in the performance of our official duty in this time of unparalleled confusion which prevails not only at the other end of the Avenue but also on Capitol Hill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the unanimous-consent request of the Senator from California? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I send to the desk an amendment, which I ask to have stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 3, between lines 15 and 16, it is proposed to insert:

> On the question of advising and consenting to the ratification of a treaty the vote shall be determined by yeas and nays, and the names of the persons voting for and against shall be entered on the Journal of the Senate.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. KNOWLAND. As I understand, the amendment I have just offered is now the pending question before the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct. The amendment is the pending question.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from California has the floor.

Mr. KNOWLAND. The hour being 6 o'clock, I ask that the amendment be printed for the information of the Senate and lie on the table. I understand it will be printed in the RECORD, thus affording an opportunity for all Senators to read the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I wish to add, in line 2, after the word "treaty", so that it may become the pending question also, the phrase "and/or executive agreements." I offer that language as an amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Washington is advised that his amendment is out of order at this time.

Mr. MAGNUSON. May I ask why?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Because the amendment of the Senator from Washington is an amendment in the third degree, and thus would not be in order at this time.

The Senator from California has the floor.

Mr. ANDERSON. Is the amendment of the Senator from California a new amendment?

Mr. KNOWLAND. It is a new amendment.

Mr. ANDERSON. If that be true, how could it have become the pending question, since it has not laid over a day?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I know of no rule of the Senate which would prevent the amendment from becoming the pending question.

Mr. MAGNUSON. The Senator from California has offered a new amendment. Has the Senator withdrawn his old amendment?

Mr. KNOWLAND. That is correct. I have offered this amendment in lieu thereof.

Mr. President, unless some Senator desires to present matters for insertion in the RECORD, I am about to move that the Senate stand in recess.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I have not finished with the matter yet.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield to the Senator from Washington. I have no desire to foreclose the distinguished Senator from anything he may wish to say, but I desired to advise the Senate what the program would be for the remainder of the week.

Mr. MAGNUSON. As I understand, the Ferguson amendment is an amendment to the so-called Bricker amendment. I desire to ask the Chair if under the rules of the Senate there is any way by which I can propose an amendment to the new amendment which has just been offered by the Senator from California. May I offer a substitute amendment?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I may say to the Senator from Washington that I think there is no question that the Senator can offer a substitute amendment, but the substitute amendment could be acted

upon only after the Bricker amendment had been acted upon by the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Washington is reminded that the amendment just offered by the Senator from California is an amendment in the second degree, it being an amendment to the committee amendment. The amendment intended to be proposed by the Senator from Washington would be an amendment in the third degree, and would not be in order at this time.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I offer as a substitute for the amendment which is the pending question the same language I proposed earlier, namely, to add, in line 2, after the word "treaty", the words "and/or executive agreements."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Washington is advised that that amendment also is out of order, for the same reason. The proposed substitute amendment is not in order.

Mr. MAGNUSON. May I make this inquiry: After the amendment offered by the Senator from California has been voted on, if I proposed another amendment, would that amendment be out of order? Would it be in the same degree, because of the addition of four words?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If the amendment were offered to modify the committee amendment, at that time it would be in order.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Whether the pending amendment should be voted up or down?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It would have to be on amendment to some part of the committee amendment which is not affected by an amendment previously agreed to.

Mr. MAGNUSON. For example, if the Ferguson amendment should be agreed to tomorrow by the Senate, could I offer a substitute which would add two words? Could I offer a new amendment which would add two words?

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair is presently considering the parliamentary inquiry of the Senator from Washington.

The Senator from Washington is advised that he may offer an amendment to any part of the committee amendment which has not been previously amended.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Am I correct in my understanding that if the Ferguson amendment is agreed to, I may not offer my amendment?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. MAGNUSON. The word "foreclosed" would be correct in that instance.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct. The Senator could not offer an amendment under those circumstances.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to offer an amendment, which would add, in line 2 of section 3, after the word "treaty", the words "and/or an executive agreement."

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I must object because, as I understand, the Senator from Washington will not be foreclosed.

I should like to make a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. KNOWLAND. As I understand, the amendment of the Senator from Washington is not in order because it is an amendment in the third degree which would further amend the committee amendment, which has already been amended by the Senate; but if the proposed language were applicable to another section which had not been amended, the Senator would then be in a position to offer his amendment to that particular section. Do I understand correctly?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from California has stated the situation correctly, as did the Chair previously.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I do not desire to amend another section. I wish to offer an amendment to the section under discussion, and I ask unanimous consent that I be allowed to do so.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, in order to preserve the rules of the Senate—and I think orderly procedure would indicate that that should be done—I make the point that amendments in the third degree are not in order. The distinguished Senator is in a position to offer his amendment to another section dealing with executive agreements.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I do not desire to offer the amendment to another section; I wish to offer it to the treatymaking section, because the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON] could not define the difference between executive agreements and treaties.

Mr. KNOWLAND. If the Senator from Washington desires to offer the amendment tomorrow, and the Senate does not adopt the Ferguson amendment, the Senator from Washington will be in a position to offer his amendment. The issue will then be before the Senate. Under the circumstances, it seems to me the proper procedure would be for the Senator to debate the question tomorrow.

Mr. MAGNUSON. If the Senate adopts the Ferguson amendment, then we are foreclosed from bringing executive agreements into the provision.

Mr. KNOWLAND. The Senator is correct. That is a long-standing rule of the Senate. The rule deals with questions of amendment in the third degree.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I agreed with the distinguished majority leader to withdraw the amendment. I could have kept my amendment pending. I thought the majority leader would not object to a unanimous-consent request to add executive agreements to the provision and let the Senate vote on it. The debate has been on that question.

Mr. KNOWLAND. A very basic issue is involved.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I agree that it is basic. That is why I am debating the question.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I understand that there is a pending amendment before the Senate. The distinguished Senator from Washington is not foreclosed from offering his amendment to another section, nor is he foreclosed from offering it to this section if the Senate does not adopt the Ferguson amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from California is correct.

Mr. KNOWLAND. That is precisely the parliamentary situation in which we find ourselves.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I still ask unanimous consent to offer my amendment, and I ask it because I think it is only fair. For the past 2 hours, we have been discussing the serious question as to whether there is a difference between treaties and executive agreements. I agreed with the Senator from New York [Mr. LEHMAN] that the Senate should vote on all such agreements. Therefore, I am making a suggestion which I think the people of the country will understand. If we are to vote on all such agreements we should not be limited by the decision of the Executive as to whether a particular agreement is a treaty or an executive agreement. The parliamentary procedure would not allow us to act at the present time with regard to executive agreements. The Executive could call a treaty an executive agreement and foreclose the Senate from voting on it. In other words, his discretion would be flexible. I suggest that we close the door. I believe we should have an opportunity to vote on all these questions.

We know how the Senate sometimes becomes tied up in parliamentary procedure. If the parliamentary situation in which we find ourselves is as has been described, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate be allowed to vote on the question of whether or not executive agreements should be included in the provision requiring a yea-and-nay vote. I stand on my unanimous-consent request.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, for the reasons I have stated, I must object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

RECESS

Mr. KNOWLAND. I move that the Senate take a recess until tomorrow at 12 o'clock noon.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 6 o'clock and 6 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Tuesday, February 16, 1954, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate February 15 (legislative day of February 8), 1954:

WAR CLAIMS COMMISSION

The following-named persons to be members of the War Claims Commission, to which office they were appointed during the last recess of the Senate:

Raymond T. Armbruster, of New York.
Whitney Gillilland, of Iowa.
Mrs. Pearl Carter Pace, of Kentucky.

DIRECTOR OF LOCOMOTIVE INSPECTION

Charles H. Grossman, of New Mexico, to be Director of Locomotive Inspection, to which office he was appointed during the last recess of the Senate.

VIRGIN ISLANDS

Archie A. Alexander, of Iowa, to be Governor of the Virgin Islands.

UNITED STATES COURT OF CLAIMS

Don N. Laramore, of Indiana, to be judge of the United States Court of Claims, vice Evan Howell, resigned.

IN THE ARMY

Maj. Gen. John Alexander Klein, O7536, Army of the United States (brigadier general, U. S. Army), for appointment as the Adjutant General, United States Army, and as major general in the Regular Army of the United States, under the provisions of section 206 of the Army Organization Act of 1950 and section 513 of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947.

IN THE AIR FORCE

The officers named herein for appointment as Reserve commissioned officers in the United States Air Force under the provisions of the Armed Forces Reserve Act of 1952:

TO BE MAJOR GENERALS

Brig. Gen. Wallace Harry Graham, AO343-889, Air Force Reserve.

Maj. Gen. Thomas Oates Hardin, AO170727 (brigadier general, Air Force Reserve), United States Air Force.

Maj. Gen. Chester Earl McCarty, AO235959 (brigadier general, Air Force Reserve), United States Air Force.

Maj. Gen. Thomas Randall Rampy, AO922-780 (brigadier general, Air Force Reserve), United States Air Force.

TO BE BRIGADIER GENERALS

*Col. Frederick Griswold Atkinson, AO910-458, Air Force Reserve.

*George Abbott Brownell, AO142136 (formerly brigadier general, Air Force Reserve).

Brig. Gen. William Porter Farnsworth, AO922626 (colonel, Air Force Reserve), United States Air Force.

*Col. John Henderson Foster, AO284572, Air Force Reserve.

*Col. William Judson Fry, AO266683, Air Force Reserve.

*Col. John Spence Gulledge, AO265793, Air Force Reserve.

*Charles Augustus Lindbergh, AO215724 (formerly colonel, Air Corps Reserve).

*Col. Joseph Stacey Marriott, AO104544, Air Force Reserve.

*Col. Frank Thomas McCoy, Jr., AO310412, Air Force Reserve.

Maj. Gen. Kern Delos Metzger, AO914698 (colonel, Air Force Reserve), United States Air Force.

Brig. Gen. Walter Irwin Miller, AO913582 (colonel, Air Force Reserve), United States Air Force.

*Col. Clayton Stiles, AO269341, Air Force Reserve.

*Col. Felix Louis Vidal, AO943500, Air Force Reserve.

Maj. Gen. Leigh Wade, AO403535 (colonel, Air Force Reserve), United States Air Force.

*Col. Will Walter White, AO272508, Air Force Reserve.

IN THE NAVY

The following-named (Naval R. O. T. C.) to be ensigns in the Navy, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

Charles P. Andersen
Thomas R. McCalla
Gordon R. Papritz
Ernest E. Ritchie
Gerald K. Seiple

Daniel W. Urish (Naval R. O. T. C.) to be an ensign in the Civil Engineer Corps of the Navy, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law.

The following-named (Naval Reserve aviators) to be ensigns in the Navy, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

Cecil C. Davis
Lee H. Sherman

The following-named officer to be a lieutenant (junior grade) in the Medical Corps of the Navy, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

Charles K. Deeks

The following-named officers to be lieutenants (junior grade) in the Chaplain Corps of the Navy, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

Donald F. Kingsley, Jr.
Arthur J. Wartes
Jack H. Zoellner

The following-named officer to be a lieutenant in the Dental Corps of the Navy, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

Marvin H. Scott

The following-named officers to be lieutenants (junior grade) in the Dental Corps of the Navy, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

Ernest M. Pennell, Jr.
Paul A. Koppes
Julius E. Lueders

*Subject to physical examination.

SENATE

TUESDAY, FEBRUARY 16, 1954

(Legislative day of Monday, February 8, 1954)

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

The Right Reverend Monsignor Louis J. Mendelis, D. D., LL. D., pastor of St. Alphonsus Lithuanian Roman Catholic Church, Baltimore, Md., offered the following prayer:

In the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Ghost. Amen.

Let us pray. Almighty and eternal God, divine governor of heaven and earth, look with favor and mercy upon this body of men to whom Thou, the source of all true authority, hast entrusted the framing of laws by which a free people consents to abide; do Thou grant them the tenderness of conscience to be ever mindful of the account they must render to Thee for the discharge of their sacred duties; give them a wholesome fear of tyranny and the alertness to sense every encroachment upon human rights and freedom; and impart to them the courage and the determination to preserve for us the liberty and the dignity with which Thou hast been pleased to invest Thy rightful children. Through Jesus Christ, Thy Son, our Lord, who with Thee and the Holy Spirit livest and reignest, one God forever and ever. Amen.

In the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Ghost. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. KNOWLAND, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Monday, February 15, 1954, was dispensed with.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Bartlett, one of its clerks, announced that the House had passed without amendment the following bills of the Senate:

S. 68. An act for the relief of Mrs. Rebecca Godschalk;

S. 123. An act for the relief of Anni Wilhelmine Skoda;

S. 205. An act for the relief of Evdoxia J. Kitsos;

S. 236. An act for the relief of Amir Hassan Sepahban;

S. 296. An act conferring United States citizenship posthumously upon Henry Litmanowitz (Litman);

S. 305. An act for the relief of Antonio Vocale;

S. 313. An act for the relief of Isaac D. Nehama;

S. 323. An act for the relief of Rose Cohen;

S. 353. An act for the relief of Li Ming;

S. 506. An act for the relief of Horst F. W. Dittmar and Heinz-Erik Dittmar;

S. 569. An act for the relief of Lina Anna Adelheid (Adam) Hoyer;

S. 606. An act for the relief of Hannelore Netz and her two children;

S. 730. An act for the relief of Winfried Kohls;

S. 801. An act for the relief of Eugenio S. Roiles;

S. 825. An act for the relief of Karin Rita Grubb;

S. 973. An act for the relief of Dr. Jawad Hedayaty;

S. 982. An act for the relief of Helena Lewicka;

S. 1009. An act for the relief of Zoltan Weingarten;

S. 1018. An act for the relief of George Ellis Ellison;

S. 1226. An act for the relief of Stefan Virgilius Issarescu;

S. 1281. An act for the relief of Emmanuel Aristides Nicoloudis;

S. 1323. An act for the relief of Lydia L. A. Samraney;

S. 1443. An act for the relief of Jose Deang; and

S. 2689. An act to retrocede to the State of Ohio concurrent jurisdiction over certain highways within Wright-Patterson Air Force Base, Ohio.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 1160) for the relief of Cornelio and Lucia Tequillo.

The message further announced that the House had disagreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 2846) authorizing the President to exercise certain powers conferred upon him by the Hawaiian Organic Act in respect of certain property ceded to the United States by the Republic of Hawaii, notwithstanding the acts of August 5, 1939, and June 16, 1949, or other acts of Congress; asked a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. SAYLOR, Mr. D'EWART, Mr. HOSMER, Mr. REGAN, and Mr. ASPINALL were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

The message also announced that the House had disagreed to the amendments of the Senate to the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 238) granting the status of permanent residence to certain aliens; asked a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. GRAHAM, Miss THOMPSON of Michigan, and Mr. WALTER were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

ORDER FOR TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that immediately following the quorum call there may