Wiretapping for the Protection of Our National Security

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 5, 1954

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following statement reflecting my views for supporting legislation providing for wiretapping for the protection of our national security:

MAKE WIRETAPPING EVIDENCE ADMISSIBLE FOR DEFENSE OF THE UNITED STATES AGAINST SPIES, SABOTEURS, AND TRAITORS

Imagine the frustration of the FBI, the Attorney General, and the intelligence agencies of the Department of Defense to know of spies and traitors in our country and be unable to introduce the evidence on hand that would surely convict them.

A most important bill is coming up in the United States House of Representatives this week to untie the restrictions that handicap those Federal agencies that have the responsibility of protecting our national security.

It will "authorize the admission into evidence in certain criminal proceedings of information intercepted in national security investigations" in order to defend the United States against treason, espionage, sabotage, sedition, and seditious conspiracy.

It will shock many people to know that we have clear and conclusive evidence against Communists and their agents which cannot be introduced under present laws to establish their guilt.

We are a Nation governed by laws.

To accuse is not enough.

There must be proof beyond reasonable doubt.

But when we have proof—obtained by wiretapping—that cannot be presented as evidence, then we are courting disaster.

No one denies the right of our society to protect itself against criminals. When that criminal, which is the international conspiracy called communism, is working in clever secrecy to destroy our form of government and murder those freedoms that give life to 160 million Americans, then we must have laws that will enable us to ferret out these silent, secret destroyers and bring them to the bar of justice.

The proposed law will be confined to the protection of our national security. It will not invade the privacy of law abiding citizens; it will not permit wiretapping evidence to be introduced in the prosecution of other crimes; and it will not permit the introduction of such evidence to confuse, embarrass, or pressure any person because of any indiscretion, unpopular opinion, or the inherent right of nonconformity and dissent.

It is directed clearly and solely against those who plot and plan and work to overthrow our Government by force and violence.

Do not underestimate the enemy.

Although he may not have many agents or dupes in this country, those who have wormed their way into sensitive positions have already done much damage to our security.

He has succeeded in hypnotizing a few gullible Americans into committing the most hideous of all crimes—treason.

If, God forbid, this enemy had a large supply of hydrogen bombs and a massive long-range airfleet to deliver them, he would not hesitate one moment to attack us without warning and destroy us completely in a single day or night.

Even now, it may be possible for single agents to smuggle deadly bombs into this country.

To cope with this boring from within, we must give our Federal security agencies those powers, under law to apprehend these wreckers and present the evidence that will take them out of circulation.

Communism has conquered other nations by subversion.

To combat this threat we must be able to expose and prosecute Communists and traitors by the hard-to-get evidence that is sometimes obtained only by wiretapping, because the enemy is so expert in camouflaging his secret operations.

Up to now Communists have been using our laws and our freedoms to get away with murder.

This loophole must be closed by an act of Congress.

Untie the hands of the FBI and related agencies.

Make intercepted messages in matters endangering our national security admissible as evidence so that we can prosecute and convict known spies and traitors.

There will be no civilian defense of any kind until this first step is taken to permit the roundup of all those who conspire and engage in the plot to exterminate the Government of the United States and chain its people in slavery.

I freely and confidently predict that the United States House of Representatives this week will vote overwhelmingly to authorize wiretapping evidence for the protection of our national security.

SENATE

TUESDAY, APRIL 6, 1954

(Legislative day of Monday, April 5, 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, in whose peace our restless spirits are quieted: The fierce storms sweeping across our world in this violent day have left us weary with watching and waiting for signs of a blue sky. These testing times have found out our every weakness. While the tempest still is high, in the midst of the global struggle between darkness and light, we turn to the infinite calm of Thy changeless love that we may find inner sustenance, wells of living water springing up, courage in battling for truth and serenity under strain. Give us a readiness for the austere disciplines of self-control, so that our minds and bodies may be the channels for kindling thoughts and soaring ideals and power to match great needs with great deeds. We ask it in the Redeemer's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. KNOWLAND, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Monday, April 5, 1954, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States submitting nominations were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Chaffee, one of its clerks, announced that the House had passed, without amendment, the following bills and joint resolution of the Senate:

S. 1456. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to authorize a permanent annual appropriation for the maintenance and operation of the Gorgas Memorial Laboratory," approved May 7, 1928, as amended;

S. 2405. An act to authorize the exchange, upon terms fully protecting the public interest, of the United States Public Health quarantine station at Marcus Hook, Pa., for a new quarantine station; and

S. J. Res. 143. Joint resolution providing for the observance of April 9, the 12th anniversary of the fall of Bataan, as Bataan Day.

The message also announced that the House had passed the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 63) authorizing the District of Columbia to enter into interstate civil-defense compacts, with an amendment, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message further announced that the House had passed the following bills, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. R. 2225. An act to provide for sundry administrative matters affecting the Federal Government, particularly the Army, Navy, Air Force, and State Department, and for other purposes;

H. R. 3986. An act to authorize the appropriation of additional funds to complete the International Peace Garden, North Dakota;

H. R. 4690. An act to provide for the erection of appropriate markers in national cemeteries to honor the memory of members of the Armed Forces missing in action;

H. R. 5420. An act to amend section 161, title 35, United States Code, relating to the patenting of plants;

H. R. 6374. An act to revise certain laws relating to warrant officers of the Army, Navy, Air Force, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard, and for other purposes;

H. R. 6711. An act to further amend section 13 of the Federal Farm Loan Act, as amended, to authorize the Federal land banks to make a bulk purchase of certain remaining assets of the Federal Farm Mortgage Corporation;

H. R. 6870. An act to amend the act of February 13, 1900 (31 Stat. 28), by approving existing railway installations and authorizing further railway installations on the batture in front of the Public Health Service hospital property in New Orleans, La.;

H. R. 6896. An act to extend the period for the filing of certain claims under the War Claims Act of 1948 by World War II prisoners of war;

H. R. 6988. An act to amend an act approved December 15, 1944, authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to convey certain land in Powell townsite, Wyoming, Shoshone reclamation project, Wyoming, to the University of Wyoming;

H. R. 7110. An act to provide that title to certain school lands shall vest in the States

AUTHENTICATED U.S. GOVERNMENT INFORMATION GPO

under the act of January 25, 1927, notwithstanding any Federal leases which may be outstanding on such lands at the time they are surveyed;

H. R. 7125. An act to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act with respect to residues of pesticide chemicals in or on raw agricultural commodities;

H. R. 7308. An act to repeal section 307 of title III of the Federal Civil Defense Act of 1950, as amended;

H. R. 7329. An act to repeal section 1174 of the Revised Statutes, as amended, relating to the cooperation of medical officers with line officers in superintending cooking by enlisted men;

H. R. 7380. An act to authorize the Secretary of Commerce to reconvey certain property which the city of Boulder, Colo., donated to the Secretary of Commerce for the establishment of a radio propagation laboratory;

H. R. 7774. An act to establish a uniform system for the granting of incentive awards to officers and employees of the United States, and for other purposes; and

H. R. 8539. An act to extend the period of election under the Uniformed Services Contingency Option Act of 1953 for certain members of the uniformed services.

ENROLLED JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the enrolled joint resolution (S. J. Res. 143) providing for the observance of April 9, the 12th anniversary of the fall of Bataan, as Bataan Day, and it was signed by the Vice President.

BOARD OF VISITORS TO MILITARY ACADEMY

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair appoints the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS] as a member of the Board of Visitors to the Military Academy, in the place of the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], excused.

BOARD OF VISITORS TO NAVAL ACADEMY

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair appoints the Senator from Delaware [Mr. FREAR] as a member of the Board of Visitors to the Naval Academy, in the place of the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], excused.

COMMITTEE MEETING DURING SENATE SESSION

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I have been informed by the chairman of the Finance Committee—and the matter has been discussed with the minority, and it is agreeable to them—that the committee desires to be permitted to meet this afternoon, during the session of the Senate. I now ask unanimous consent to that effect.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, consent is given.

ORDER FOR TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

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

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

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

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the roll.

The Legislative Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business, to act on nominations beginning with the new reports.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

The VICE PRESIDENT 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.)

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF A COMMITTEE

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. WILEY, from the Committee on Foreign Relations:

George P. Baker, of Massachusetts, to be the representative of the United States on the Transport and Communications Commission of the Economic and Social Council of the U. N.; and

Edward B. Lawson, of the District of Columbia, a Foreign Service officer of the class of career minister, now Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary to Iceland, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to Israel.

By Mr. AIKEN, from the Committee on Foreign Relations:

Executive B, 83d Congress, 2d session, International Sugar Agreement; without reservation (Ex. Rept. No. 4).

The VICE PRESIDENT. If there be no further reports of committees, the clerk will proceed to state the nominations on the calendar, beginning with the new reports.

UNITED STATES ATTORNEY

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Edwin M. Stanley, of North Carolina, to be United States attorney for the middle district of North Carolina.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

UNITED STATES MARSHALS

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of B. Ray Cohoon, of North Carolina, to be United States marshal for the eastern district of North Carolina.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Ray H. Schoonover, of Wisconsin, to be United States marshal for the western district of Wisconsin.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

SUBVERSIVE ACTIVITIES CONTROL BOARD

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Thomas J. Herbert, of Ohio, to be a member of the Subversive Activities Control Board for the term of 3 years expiring April 9, 1957.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Robert Bernerd Anderson, of Texas, to be Deputy Secretary of Defense.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Charles Sparks Thomas, of California, to be Secretary of the Navy.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

IN THE ARMY

The Chief Clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Army.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the nominations in the Army be confirmed en bloc.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the Army nominations are confirmed en bloc.

UNITED STATES AIR FORCE

The Chief Clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the United States Air Force.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Air Force nominations be confirmed en bloc.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nominations in the Air Force are confirmed en bloc.

IN THE NAVY

The Chief Clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Navy.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the nominations in the Navy be confirmed en bloc.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nominations in the Navy are confirmed en bloc.

NAVAL RESERVE

The Chief Clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Naval Reserve.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the nominations in the Naval Reserve be confirmed en bloc.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nominations in the Naval Reserve are confirmed en bloc.

THE MARINE CORPS RESERVE

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Karl S. Day to be major general.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of John D. Macklin to be brigadier general.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Bertrand T. Fay to be major general.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I understand there are at the desk certain routine Army and Navy nominations below the rank of general officer or flag officer. Is that correct?

The VICE PRESIDENT. That is correct.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that those Army and Navy nominations be confirmed en bloc.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nominations in the Army and in the Navy are confirmed en bloc.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I now ask unanimous consent that the President be immediately notified of the confirmation of these nominations.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I move that the Senate resume the consideration of legislative business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate resumed the consideration of legislative business.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

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

DEPOSIT OF SAVINGS FOR ENLISTED MEMBERS OF ARMED FORCES

A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to provide for the deposit of savings of enlisted members of the Army, Navy, Air Force, and Marine Corps, and for other purposes (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Armed Services.

IMPROVEMENT OF PROGRAM OF EMERGENCY LOANS

A letter from the Acting Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the act of April 6, 1949, as amended by the act of July 14, 1953, to improve the program of emergency loans, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

REPORT ON COLORADO RIVER STORAGE PROJECT AND PARTICIPATING PROJECTS—DEVELOPMENT OF UPPER COLORADO RIVER BASIN

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report and findings on the Colorado River storage project and participating projects, providing for the development and utilization of the water and related resources of the upper Colorado River Basin (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

REPORT ON BACKLOG OF PENDING APPLICATIONS AND HEARING CASES, FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

A letter from the Chairman, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on backlog of pending applications and hearings cases in that Commission, as of February 28, 1954 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

REPORT OF TORT CLAIMS BY DEPARTMENT OF INTERIOR

A letter from the Administrative Assistant to the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of tort claims paid by the Department of the Interior for the fiscal year 1953 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

GRANTING OF APPLICATIONS FOR PERMANENT RESIDENCE FILED BY CERTAIN ALIENS

A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, transmitting, pursuant to law, copies of orders granting the applications for permanent residence filed by certain aliens, together with a statement of the facts and pertinent provisions of law as to each alien, and the reasons for granting such applications (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SUSPENSION OF DEPORTATION OF ALIENS

Two letters from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, transmitting, pursuant to law, copies of orders suspending deportation of certain aliens, together with detailed statements of the facts and pertinent provisions of law as to each alien, and the reasons for ordering such suspension (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PROPOSED BUILDING FOR SMITHSONIAN INSTITUTION

A letter from the Secretary, Smithsonian Institution, Washington, D. C., transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize the construction of a building for the Smithsonian Institution and to authorize an appropriation therefor (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Public Works.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

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

By the VICE PRESIDENT:

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of California; to the Committee on Armed Services:

"Assembly Joint Resolution 7

"Joint resolution relative to the establishment of the Air Force Academy in California

"Whereas the Congress of the United States is now considering the location for the new Air Force Academy; and

"Whereas the mild salubrious climate of California is particularly suited to flight training operations; and

"Whereas California has available large areas of land, safely removed from congested metropolitan areas, which are eminently suited as the location of the Academy; and

"Whereas the workers of California are highly skilled and experienced in large construction projects of this nature; and

"Whereas the materials and supplies required for the construction and operation of such an institution including the cement, the steel, the fuel, the food, and even the planes are produced by California's manufacturers, refiners, and farmers; and

"Whereas the transportation system of California is efficient and has the facilities to meet any demand made upon it by such a school; and

"Whereas the California educational and research institutions, which are the finest in the world, are ready to aid and cooperate with such an institution; and

"Whereas California offers greater and more varied recreational opportunities for the off-duty relaxation of the personnel of such an Academy than are to be found in any other State: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved by the Assembly and Senate of the State of California (jointly)*, That the Legislature of the State of California respectfully memorializes the Congress of the United States to locate the new Air Force Academy in California, the State best fitted for such an institution and the State where such an institution may be constructed and operated with the least burden on the taxpayers of the United States; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That the chief clerk of the Assembly be hereby directed to prepare and to transmit suitable copies of this resolution to the President and Vice President of the United States, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and to each Senator and Representative from California in the Congress of the United States."

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of California; to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

"Assembly Joint Resolution 5

"Joint resolution relative to Congress appropriating funds for the construction, operation, and maintenance of the western land boundary fence along the border between the United States and Mexico

"Whereas the fence constructed by the United States several years ago along the border between the United States and Mexico to prevent diseased livestock from straying across that border into California and other States is now in a bad state of repair; and

"Whereas in order to properly protect our livestock from exposure to such diseases as southern cattle tick fever, foot-and-mouth disease, and dourine, the construction, operation, and maintenance of an effective fence is urgently needed; and

"Whereas animals straying into this country from Mexico have infected domestic livestock with disease and continue to threaten our livestock industry; and

"Whereas the cost and inconvenience resulting from control and eradication of disease of livestock are great; and

"Whereas should such disease again be carried into California or other western areas, economic loss would result not only from the disease but also from quarantine restrictions; and

"Whereas the United States Section, International Boundary and Water Commission, United and Mexico, has agreed to supervise the construction of a fence if funds are provided therefor; and

"Whereas there is now pending before the Congress legislation, S. 114 (83d Cong., 1st sess.), authorizing an appropriation for the construction, operation, and maintenance of the western land boundary fence between the Republic of Mexico and the United States of America: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved by the assembly and the senate of the State of California (jointly)*, That the Congress of the United States is hereby urged and memorialized to give favorable consideration to the legislation mentioned, or comparable legislation, to permit early repair, construction, operation, and maintenance of the western land boundary fence; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That the chief clerk of the assembly is directed to transmit copies of

this resolution to the President of the United States, the President of the Senate, and the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and to each Senator and Representative from California in the Congress of the United States."

Two joint resolutions of the Legislature of the State of California; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs:

"Senate Joint Resolution 2

"Joint resolution relative to memorializing Congress to provide adequate fire and flood protection in the national forests of southern California

"Whereas the national forest watersheds of southern California have suffered enormous fire losses during 1953 which were in part due to the extremely dry weather conditions; and

"Whereas these drought conditions are extending through the 1953–54 winter months which are producing a grave danger of 1954 being the most disastrous fire season in recorded history; and

"Whereas flood and debris damage resulting from such destruction of the watershed would endanger many human lives and would cause millions of dollars of property damage, both public and private, to the communities and countryside below these watersheds; and

"Whereas the urgent need for immediate action has been officially recognized by the California State Board of Forestry and the governing bodies of the counties of Los Angeles, San Bernardino, Riverside, Orange, San Diego, Santa Barbara, Ventura, and San Luis Obispo: Now, therefore be it

"Resolved by the Senate and Assembly of the State of California (jointly), That the Legislature of the State of California respectfully memorializes the President and the Congress of the United States to take immediate steps to provide an adequate fire protection and flood prevention system for the national forests in southern California; and be it further

"Resolved, That the secretary of the senate is hereby requested to transmit copies of this resolution to the President and Vice President of the United States, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and to each Senator and Representative from California in the Congress of the United States."

"Senate Joint Resolution 3

"Joint resolution relative to securing the land comprising Forts Baker, Barry, and Cronkhite for State park purposes

"Whereas Forts Baker, Barry, and Cronkhite were established in Marin County for the defense of the San Francisco Harbor area; and

"Whereas the 2,000 acres of land occupied by these forts are especially valuable for park purposes; and

"Whereas the use of this land would not only provide recreation for millions of people in this State but would contribute substantially to the development of other lands in the vicinity: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Senate and Assembly of the State of California (jointly), That the Legislature of the State of California respectfully memorializes the Congress of the United States to take immediate steps to investigate the feasibility of conveying the lands occupied by these forts to the county of Marin in the State of California for development of park, recreational and other purposes; and be it further

"Resolved, That the secretary of the senate is directed to transmit copies of this resolution to the President and Vice President of the United States, to the Secretary of Defense, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives and to each Senator and Representative from California in the Congress of the United States."

Two joint resolutions of the Legislature of the State of California; to the Committee on Public Works:

"Senate Joint Resolution 10

"Joint resolution relative to survey of small-craft harbors

"Whereas there is an urgent demand for the development of small boat harbors as harbors of refuge and home ports for fishing boats and other small craft along the coast and in the navigable waters of the State of California; and

"Whereas the improvement and development of such harbors will be useful in augmenting the Nation's food supply by facilitating the further exploration of the food resources of the ocean by small craft, as well as providing harbor facilities for the use of the Armed Forces in the event of hostilities; and

"Whereas in 1945 and 1946 the Congress of the United States authorized preliminary examinations and surveys with the view to the establishment of such harbors, which surveys were recommended by preliminary examinations by the United States Army Corps of Engineers; and

"Whereas in 1950 funds were provided to initiate such surveys but with the outbreak of hostilities in Korea, President Truman issued a directive that no further studies be made unless they had a direct bearing on national defense, with the result that work on these important surveys was discontinued. and

"Whereas there are great stretches of the California coast which are at present devoid of harbors of refuge but within which are situated places which are adapted by nature to ready development at nominal cost into useful ports; and

"Whereas there is a joint interim committee of the California Legislature studying the subject of small craft harbors and planning to lend all possible aid in the improvement and development of such harbors; and

"Whereas such legislative committee wishes to be guided in its activities by such surveys and recommendations as are made by the United States Corps of Engineers; and

"Whereas in addition to the aid to navigation and the benefit to the general economy of the State, the development of such harbors will aid in flood control and prevention of beach erosion; and

"Whereas the United States of America is not now engaged in active hostilities: Therefore be it

"Resolved by the Senate and Assembly of the State of California (jointly), That the Legislature of the State of California respectfully petitions the President of the United States to take such steps as may be necessary to permit these important surveys to be completed in order that a comprehensive plan may be evolved for the development of these natural resources which are now dormant; and be it further

"Resolved, That the secretary of the senate is hereby directed to forward copies of this resolution to the President of the United States, the President of the Senate, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, the Secretary of Defense, and to each Senator and Representative from California in the Congress of the United States."

"Assembly Joint Resolution 6

"Joint resolution relative to memorializing Congress to appropriate the necessary funds to widen and deepen the entrance channel to Mission Bay Harbor

"Whereas Mission Bay Harbor, located in San Diego County, Calif., is, without doubt, potentially one of the finest and most beautiful small-boat harbors in the United States; and

"Whereas the development of this magnificent anchorage is being stymied by the exceedingly treacherous condition of the entrance channel into the harbor; and

"Whereas the dangerous condition of the channel is extremely perilous to the lives of even the most skilled mariners; and

"Whereas the cost of alleviating this grave threat to navigation is infinitesimal in comparison to the sum spent thus far by the United States on the Mission Bay project; and

"Whereas $6,535,000 spent on the project by the United States will have been completely wasted unless prompt action is taken to widen and deepen the harbor entrance channel; and

"Whereas, the soil removed from the channel can be immediately used to halt erosion at Ocean Beach, located south of the channel; and

"Whereas the dredging of the channel will stimulate private enterprise, create new jobs, provide a cushion for defense employment cutbacks, and bring added enjoyment and pleasure not only to the people of San Diego but also to the thousands of guests from every State in the Union and from other nations who annually visit the area: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Assembly and Senate of the State of California (jointly), That the Legislature of California respectfully memorializes the Congress of the United States to appropriate the funds necessary to widen and deepen the entrance channel to Mission Bay Harbor to permit pleasure craft traffic once more to move freely into and out of the bay; and be it further

"Resolved, That the chief clerk of the assembly be hereby directed to prepare and to transmit suitable copies of this resolution to the President and the Vice President of the United States, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and to each Member of the United States Congress from California."

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of California; ordered to lie on the table:

"Senate Joint Resolution 4

"Joint resolution relative to granting the Territory of Hawaii statehood in the United States

"Whereas for many years the people and the Governments of the State of California and the Territory of Hawaii have enjoyed the most close and friendly business, personal, and cultural relationships; and

"Whereas the people of the Territory of Hawaii, regardless of racial descent, at all times have demonstrated their complete loyalty to the United States and during World War II, particularly, served with great valor and distinction in the Armed Forces of the United States; and

"Whereas in April of 1950 a convention drafted a constitution, which was approved by the voters in the 1950 general election and also the Territorial legislature; and

"Whereas it is important for the Territory of Hawaii in its present status to enjoy the sovereignty to which it is entitled and to develop its resources most advantageously: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Senate and Assembly of the State of California (jointly), That the Congress and the President of the United States be, and they are hereby, urged and memorialized to enact at this session of the Congress such laws as will grant the present Territory of Hawaii the status of statehood in the United States and create the State of Hawaii as the 49th State of our country; and be it further

"Resolved, That the Secretary of the Senate be and he is hereby directed to transmit copies of this resolution to the President of the United States, to the President of the Senate, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and to each Senator and Representative from California in the Congress of the United States."

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of Pennsylvania (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Finance:

"Resolution urging congressional action against injurious foreign imports

"Whereas the increased importation of numerous products that come into competition with the output of factories, farms, and mines of Pennsylvania, replacing the products of Pennsylvania's industries, is a constant menace to the State's continuing economic stability; and

"Whereas the lower wages paid abroad make it impossible for many of our smaller and medium-sized producers to compete with imports without resorting to ruinous price cutting, which in turn would result either in financial losses or heavy pressure for wage reductions and outright unemployment; and

"Whereas our national obligations have reached such extreme proportions that the national income must be maintained at its present unprecedented high level, or close thereto, lest we become insolvent; and

"Whereas pressure that comes from imports of residual fuel oil, having risen from an average of 50 million barrels in the 1946–48 period to more than 125 million in 1952, or the equivalent of 31 million tons of coal; from imports of pottery, watches and parts, glassware, lace, carpets and other textiles, hats and millinery, chemicals, scientific apparatus, cutlery, dairy products, wallpaper, luggage and leather goods, and many other articles, will render the upholding of the economy at its high levels most uncertain and difficult, unless all import trade is placed on a fair competitive basis and the potential injury therefrom thus contained; and

"Whereas a maximum of such trade results from a prosperous domestic economy freed from the threat of a breakdown resulting from unfair import competition: Therefore be it

"Resolved (if the house of representatives concurs), That the General Assembly of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania hereby memorialize the Congress of the United States that adequate safeguards be provided in tariff and trade legislation against the destruction or lowering of our American standard of living, the labor standard of our workmen, and the stability of our economy by unfair import competition and that the existing trade agreements legislation be amended accordingly; and be it further

"Resolved, That copies of this resolution be transmitted to the President of the United States, the Vice President of the United States, the Secretary of State, the Secretary of Commerce, the Secretary of Labor, the Secretary of Agriculture, the Chairman of the United States Tariff Commission, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and each Senator and Representative from Pennsylvania in the Congress of the United States.

"G. HAROLD WATKINS,
"Secretary, Senate of Pennsylvania.
"Approved the 28th day of July A. D. 1953.
"JOHN S. FINE,
"Governor."

By the VICE PRESIDENT:

The petition of Helen L. Lichtweis, of Peoria, Ill., praying for a redress of grievances; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

The petition of David Darrin, Washington, D. C., praying for a redress of grievances (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

A resolution adopted by the executive board of Local Sugar Union 804, Guayama, P. R., condemning the action of certain persons in trying to assassinate Members of the House of Representatives; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

The petition of Gerald W. Smith, and sundry other citizens of the State of Connecticut, relating to a "declaration of conscience" made in the address of Mrs. SMITH of Maine in 1950; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

REVISION OF IMMIGRATION AND NATIONALITY ACT—RESOLUTION OF CITY COUNCIL OF PHILADELPHIA, PA.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, the City Council of Philadelphia, Pa., on March 18, adopted a resolution calling for drastic revision in the so-called McCarran-Walter Act, the Immigration and Nationality Act of 1952. The terms of this brief resolution express so well the need for the revision of this act that I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD, and appropriately referred.

This resolution was introduced in the city council by James A. Finnegan, president of the council, who is to be congratulated on the drafting and sponsorship of this fine expression of a purpose which I hope will soon be achieved.

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

Resolution memorializing the United States Congress with respect to the modification of the provisions of the National Immigration Act

Whereas on December 24, 1952, the new Immigration and Nationality Act of 1952 became effective; and

Whereas the plan to codify and consolidate the immigration and naturalization laws presented our lawgivers with an excellent opportunity to remove from our laws pertaining to this important field various features generally felt to be inconsistent with our democratic tradition and to enact a truly modern immigration and naturalization law; and

Whereas the said 1953 National Immigration Act does make an important contribution to human relations within the United States by eliminating all racial barriers in naturalization proceedings; and

Whereas the new law has unfortunately missed the opportunity to remove discrimination among would-be emigrants to the United States by asserting, in effect, through the quotas established therein, that immigrants from northern Europe are more desirable to the United States than immigrants from southern and eastern Europe; and

Whereas the 1952 National Immigration Act violates the American ideal of complete equality of all citizens before the law by providing special tests and penalties for naturalized citizens which do not apply to native-born citizens; and

Whereas both the Republican and Democratic Parties, in the election campaign of 1952, felt impelled to call for a revision of the 1952 National Immigration Act, since the new enactment has been generally described as a "racist, discriminatory, and retrogressive measure," and there is every evidence of concerted belief that the law should be rewritten and a law presented to strike an "intelligent, unbigoted balance between the immigration welfare of America and the prayerful hopes of the unhappy and the oppressed"; and

Whereas although it is necessary and proper that our immigration laws contain provisions to prevent the entry into our country of persons who might engage in espionage and other subversive activities, they should not be used as a device for erecting an iron curtain around our shores and excluding many people who might well contribute greatly to the strengthening of our country: Therefore

Resolved by the Council of the City of Philadelphia, That the Congress of the United States is hereby memorialized to revise the 1952 National Immigration Act, and to provide a modern and democratic immigration system.

Resolved, That a certified copy of this resolution be transmitted to the President of the United States, to the Presiding Officers of the United States Senate and the House of Representatives, to the two Senators from Pennsylvania, and to the Members of the House of Representatives from Philadelphia.

JAMES A. FINNEGAN,
President of City Council.

PRICE SUPPORTS FOR HONEY—LETTER FROM WISCONSIN STATE BEEKEEPERS ASSOCIATION

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I present a letter which I have received today from Cornelius C. Meyer, secretary of the Wisconsin State Beekeepers Association, relative to the significant problem of price supports on honey.

It is not generally realized by the public but bees and honey play an extremely crucial role in our agricultural economy.

I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Meyer's letter be printed in the RECORD and referred to the Agricultural Committee.

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

WISCONSIN STATE
BEEKEEPERS ASSOCIATION,
Appleton, Wis., April 2, 1954.

Senator ALEXANDER K. WILEY,
United States Senate, Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR WILEY: The Fox Valley district of the Wisconsin State Beekeepers Association recently met in Appleton. The whole State, which has approximately 10,000 beekeepers, was represented, to some extent, at this meeting. The gathering went on record as favoring a mandatory price support on honey, and as secretary, I have been asked to contact our 10 Congressmen and 2 Senators on this matter.

After the last war the honey market was in a very demoralized condition, with much cutthroat competition, which was forcing many beekeepers into bankruptcy. This was at a time when agricultural authorities were urging more bees for pollination purposes. They have found that some 50 farm crops, especially the legumes, are wholly or in part dependent on the honeybee for pollination of the blossoms to assure a seed crop. These same authorities claim that bees are at least 20 times more valuable to the farmers for this reason than for the honey and wax they produce, which in an average season amounts to about $2 million in this State.

Since honey went under price support several years ago, the market has been much more orderly, and at a price at which most beekeepers could stay in business despite the present high overhead expenses.

Therefore, anything you can do in our favor concerning any new legislation to replace the Agricultural Act of 1949, will be greatly appreciated.

Very truly yours,

CORNELIUS C. MEYER,
Secretary.

REDUCTION OF DAIRY SURPLUSES—DAIRY FARM PROBLEMS—RESOLUTIONS FROM AGRICULTURE COMMITTEE OF WISCONSIN LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I was pleased to receive today two important resolutions adopted by the agriculture committee of the Wisconsin Legislative Council, which met at Madison on April 1.

The committee devoted its attention to several extremely significant phases of America's dairy problem.

It addressed itself, for example, to the vital subject of eradicating diseases of dairy cattle, elimination of barriers which interfere with milk distribution across the country, as well as considering other important issues.

I personally have long urged a program of intensive research against brucellosis and other diseases which ravage the livestock industry and which cost such tremendous sums to our dairy farmers. In addition, I have urged the elimination of phony barriers which prevent Wisconsin milk, for example, from entering into other regions of our country.

I know that the resolutions adopted by the agriculture committee will be of great interest to my colleagues in the Senate, and I ask unanimous consent that they be printed in the RECORD at this point and appropriately referred.

There being no objection, the resolutions were referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESOLUTION ADOPTED BY THE AGRICULTURE COMMITTEE OF THE WISCONSIN LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL AT THE STATE CAPITOL IN MADISON ON APRIL 1, 1954, AND DIRECTED TO THE SECRETARY OF AGRICULTURE, THE CHAIRMEN OF THE SENATE AND HOUSE AGRICULTURE COMMITTEES, AND TO THE ENTIRE WISCONSIN DELEGATION IN CONGRESS

RESOLUTION RELATING TO THE REDUCTION OF DAIRY SURPLUSES

Whereas the Nation now has approximately a 9 billion pound milk equivalent surplus; and

Whereas the estimates indicate that there will be about 3 percent more cows in the next year and a resulting milk equivalent surplus equal to 9 billion pounds; and

Whereas the honorable Secretary of Agriculture has suggested that one device for the reduction of the surplus cows and milk production be the elimination of low-producing animals; and

Whereas there are in the dairy industry animals which tests show react positively to brucellosis, and which, for reasons of the health of the Nation, ought to be eliminated, since it is transmissible to human beings as undulant fever; and

Whereas to this point the Federal Government has considered it in the public interest to expend Federal funds for the purpose of encouraging the elimination of such animals; and

Whereas there is evidence that the Federal Government has now embarked on a policy of reducing the funds for such purpose with the apparent intent to eliminate them entirely in the budgets currently under consideration: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That in order to reduce the existing and anticipated surplus of dairy products and cows and in order to assure the production of milk from disease-free animals in accordance with the present market requirements, the committee on agriculture of the legislative council of the Wisconsin Legislature requests the Secretary of Agriculture and the members of the Wisconsin delegation to Congress to work toward the appropriation of adequate funds to finance a disease-eradication program as a realistic device to reduce surpluses.

Senator WILLIAM E. OWEN, *Chairman.*
Assemblyman FRED RUST, *Vice Chairman.*
Assemblyman RUSSELL PAULSON, *Secretary.*
Senator CHESTER E. DEMPSEY.
Senator PHILIP DOWNING.
Assemblyman CHARLES H. SYKES.
Assemblyman EARL D. HALL.
Assemblyman MARTIN O. MONSON.

RESOLUTION ADOPTED BY THE AGRICULTURE COMMITTEE OF THE WISCONSIN LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL AT THE STATE CAPITOL IN MADISON ON APRIL 1, 1954, AND DIRECTED TO THE SECRETARY OF AGRICULTURE, THE CHAIRMEN OF THE SENATE AND HOUSE AGRICULTURE COMMITTEES, AND TO THE ENTIRE WISCONSIN DELEGATION IN THE CONGRESS

RESOLUTION RELATING TO THE PROBLEMS OF THE WISCONSIN DAIRY FARMER

Whereas the present class 1, 2, and 3 system of buying milk from the farmers has artificially stimulated the production of milk in certain sections of the country and thereby created unnatural competition for the Wisconsin milk producer; and

Whereas this same policy has raised the price of milk to the consumer in such areas so high that many people have been eliminated as consumers; and

Whereas the potential maximum consumption of milk has by no means been reached nor have the full values of milk to the health of our people been realized; and

Whereas the pricing policies of the Federal Government have artificially stimulated the production of milk in certain areas of the United States to the detriment of the stable production of Wisconsin; and

Whereas the unnecessarily restrictive controls on the interstate shipment of milk under the guise of health regulations have reacted adversely on the sale of Wisconsin milk and the reputation of the Wisconsin farmer: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Committee on Agriculture of the Legislative Council of the Wisconsin Legislature, That the Honorable Ezra Taft Benson, Secretary of Agriculture, be, and he hereby is, requested to direct his energies toward the abolition of the Federal price controls in the milk markets of the United States which are artificially stimulating milk production in certain areas to the detriment of the long-established dairy industry of Wisconsin; and be it further

Resolved, That the Secretary be urged to make every effort to remove the unnecessarily restrictive controls over milk production under the guise of health which are inhibiting the legitimate distribution of the milk produced in Wisconsin; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be sent to the Honorable Ezra Taft Benson and to each member of the Wisconsin delegation in the Congress of the United States.

Senator WILLIAM E. OWEN, *Chairman.*
Assemblyman FRED RUST, *Vice Chairman.*
Assemblyman RUSSELL PAULSON, *Secretary.*
Senator CHESTER E. DEMPSEY.
Senator PHILIP DOWNING.
Assemblyman EARL D. HALL.
Assemblyman MARTIN O. MONSON,
Assemblyman CHARLES H. SYKES.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. DUFF, from the Committee on Armed Services, without amendment:

S. 22. A bill to validate certain payments for accrued leave made to members of the Armed Forces who accepted discharges for the purpose of immediate reenlistment for an indefinite period (Rept. No. 1187);

S. 1754. A bill to amend the Dependents Assistance Act of 1950, as amended, so as to provide punishment for fraudulent acceptance of benefits thereunder (Rept. No. 1188);

H. R. 5416. A bill to authorize the advancement of certain lieutenants on the retired list of the Navy (Rept. No. 1189); and

H. R. 5627. A bill to amend Public Law 472, 81st Congress, approved April 11, 1950, entitled "An act to promote the national defense and to contribute to more effective aeronautical research by authorizing professional personnel of the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics to attend accredited graduate schools for research and study" (Rept. No. 1192).

By Mr. HENDRICKSON, from the Committee on Armed Services:

H. R. 7512. A bill to provide for the conveyance of the federally owned lands which are situated within Camp Blanding Military Reservation, Fla., to the armory board, State of Florida, in order to consolidate ownership and perpetuate the availability of Camp Blanding for military training and use; with amendments (Rept. No. 1191).

By Mr. MUNDT, from the Committee on Government Operations, without amendment:

S. 3197. A bill to authorize the acceptance of conditional gifts to further the defense effort (Rept. No. 1193);

H. R. 232. A bill to provide for the conveyance to the State of Indiana of certain surplus real property situated in Marion County, Ind. (Rept. No. 1194); and

H. R. 3477. A bill to extend to the Canal Zone government and the Panama Canal Company provisions of the act entitled "An act to facilitate the settlement of the accounts of certain deceased civilian officers and employees of the Government," approved August 3, 1950 (Rept. No. 1195).

GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEES FRINGE BENEFITS—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, from the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, I report favorably, with amendments, the bill (S. 2665) to amend the Classification Act of 1949, as amended, and the Federal Employees Pay Act of 1945, as amended, and for other purposes, and I submit a report (No. 1190) thereon. The bill was unanimously approved by the members of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

Mr. President, I urge the Members of the Senate to familiarize themselves with the bill and the report and sincerely hope that we can secure early consideration of the bill by the Senate.

The proposed legislation is of vital importance to 2¼ million Federal employees. It provides for classified workers many benefits and privileges such as are now provided by private industry. Included among the provisions of the bill are the repeal of the so-called Whitten amendment, which has for more than 3 years imposed restrictions on Federal personnel management.

The so-called crafts, protective, and custodial schedule under the Classification Act would be abolished and 69,000 CPC employees would come under the terms of the Wage Board to be paid on the basis of prevailing wage rates. Forty-seven thousand would be transferred to the general schedule of the Classification Act, and in the majority of cases there will be an increase in basic compensation, but in no event will there be a reduction in compensation.

The Civil Service Commission is authorized to recruit persons for hard-to-fill position in the Federal service and establish pay rates for such positions at higher than the minimum rate for the grade.

The bill would further provide overtime pay at a time-and-one-half rate for employees up to $5,810 per annum as contrasted with the present limitation of $2,890 per annum. In addition, special premium pay has been provided for fire fighters and law-enforcement agents who are either required to be on duty on a standby basis or whose hours of duty cannot be controlled administratively.

The bill as approved by the committee will improve and simplify the administration of the Government's incentive awards program. Also, it provides for the establishment of 300 additional grades under the Classification Act whose rates of compensation are between $12,000 and $14,000 per annum.

The bill also authorizes the departments and agencies to provide a $100 uniform allowance for all employees in such departments or agencies who are required to wear uniforms provided the Congress by appropriation acts authorizes such expenditures.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The report will be received, and the bill will be placed on the calendar.

AMENDMENT OF HOME OWNERS' LOAN ACT OF 1933—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, from the Committee on Banking and Currency, I report favorably, with an amendment, the bill (S. 975) to amend the Home Owners' Loan Act of 1933, as amended, and I submit a report (No. 1186) thereon, together with my additional views. I ask unanimous consent that the report be printed, including the additional views.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The report will be received, and the bill will be placed on the calendar; and, without objection, the report will be printed, as requested by the Senator from Connecticut.

ENROLLED JOINT RESOLUTION PRESENTED

The Secretary of the Senate reported that on today, April 6, 1954, he presented to the President of the United States the enrolled joint resolution (S. J. Res. 143), providing for observance of April 9, the 12th anniversary of the fall of Bataan, as Bataan Day.

BILLS INTRODUCED

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

By Mr. SALTONSTALL (by request):

S. 3260. A bill to authorize certain construction at military and naval installations and for the Alaska Communications System, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. EASTLAND (for himself and Mr. STENNIS):

S. 3261. A bill for the relief of Lt. Col. Thomas E. Rhodes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. WILEY (by request):

S. 3262. A bill to encourage the disposal of agricultural surpluses and to improve the foreign relations of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

CHANGE OF REFERENCE

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, on March 31, 1954, I introduced the bill (S. 3226) to provide for the return to the former owners of certain lands acquired in connection with the Fort Randall Dam project, the Oahe Dam project, the Gavins Point Dam project, of mineral, oil, or gas interests in such lands, which at that time was referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. I am advised by the Parliamentarian and by the acting minority leader, with whom I have conferred, that the bill should have been referred to the Committee on Public Works.

I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs be discharged from further consideration of the bill and that it be referred, instead, to the Committee on Public Works.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

HOUSE BILLS REFERRED OR PLACED ON CALENDAR

The following bills were severally read twice by their titles, and referred, or placed on the calendar, as indicated:

H. R. 2225. An act to provide for sundry administrative matters affecting the Federal Government, particularly the Army, Navy, Air Force, and State Department, and for other purposes;

H. R. 6374. An act to revise certain laws relating to warrant officers of the Army, Navy, Air Force, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard, and for other purposes;

H. R. 7308. An act to repeal section 307 of title III of the Federal Civil Defense Act of 1950, as amended;

H. R. 7329. An act to repeal section 1174 of the Revised Statutes, as amended, relating to the cooperation of medical officers with line officers in superintending cooking by enlisted men; and

H. R. 8539. An act to extend the period of election under the Uniformed Services Contingency Option Act of 1953 for certain members of the uniformed services; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 3986. An act to authorize the appropriation of additional funds to complete the International Peace Garden, N. Dak.;

H. R. 4690. An act to provide for the erection of appropriate markers in national cemeteries to honor the memory of members of the Armed Forces missing in action; and

H. R. 6988. An act to amend an act approved December 15, 1944, authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to convey certain land in Powell townsite, Wyoming, Shoshone reclamation project, Wyoming, to the University of Wyoming; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H. R. 5420. An act to amend section 161, title 35, United States Code, relating to the patenting of plants; and

H. R. 6896. An act to extend the period for the filing of certain claims under the War Claims Act of 1948 by World War II prisoners of war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 6711. An act to further amend section 13 of the Federal Farm Loan Act, as amended, to authorize the Federal land banks to make a bulk purchase of certain remaining assets of the Federal Farm Mortgage Corporation; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

H. R. 6870. An act to amend the act of February 13, 1900 (31 Stat. 28), by approving existing railway installations and authorizing further railway installations on the batture in front of the Public Health Service hospital property in New Orleans, La.; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H. R. 7125. An act to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act with respect to residues of pesticide chemicals in or on raw agricultural commodities; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

H. R. 7774. An act to establish a uniform system for the granting of incentive awards to officers and employees of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 7110. An act to provide that title to certain school lands shall vest in the States under the act of January 25, 1927, notwithstanding any Federal leases which may be outstanding on such lands at the time they are surveyed; and

H. R. 7380. An act to authorize the Secretary of Commerce to reconvey certain property which the city of Boulder, Colo., donated to the Secretary of Commerce for the establishment of a radio propagation laboratory; placed on the calendar.

LIMITATION OF SCOPE AND DEFERMENT OF HEARINGS BY THE WATER TRANSPORTATION SUBCOMMITTEE

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. Mr. President, with regard to the hearing to be held this Thursday afternoon by the Senate Water Transportation Subcommittee on the matter of private financing of ship construction, it has been found desirable to limit the testimony to 3 instead of to the 4 bills originally announced.

The bills to be considered, therefore, will be S. 3219, S. 1905, and S. 2407, in the order named.

Hearings on S. 1879 have been deferred, in view of the fact that the interested Government agencies have requested that the hearing be put off until they have completed their reports on this important bill, introduced by the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON].

ADDRESSES, EDITORIALS, ARTICLES, ETC., PRINTED IN THE RECORD

On request, and by unanimous consent, addresses, editorials, articles, etc., were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

By Mr. PAYNE:

Statement entitled "Robert E. Peary and the Discovery of the North Pole," prepared

by him in commemoration of the 45th anniversary of the discovery of the North Pole.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, has morning business been concluded?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there further morning business? If not, the morning business is concluded.

Mr. WILLIAMS obtained the floor.

ATOMIC ENERGY PROGRAM—THE QUEBEC AGREEMENT

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Delaware yield to me?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Iowa, with the understanding that I shall not lose the floor.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I thank the Senator for yielding. I have a statement to make which will require 2 or 3 minutes. I shall make an extemporaneous statement at this time, and in the immediate future I shall amplify the statement with documentary facts and figures.

Mr. President, an astounding statement has just come over the teletype. The statement is credited to former President Truman. I shall read the news item as it came over the teletype.

Speaking of the statement by Sir Winston Churchill, Prime Minister of Great Britain, before the Parliament yesterday, that the so-called Quebec agreement, which was entered into secretly between Mr. Churchill and President Roosevelt in 1943, had been canceled and rescinded by mutual agreement between the British Labor Government and the American Government, Mr. Truman made a startling statement, according to the news reports. I read from the teletype account:

Mr. Truman said the agreement still is in effect.

He said ranking members of the Foreign Relations Committees of both United States Houses of Congress knew of the agreement which grew out of Britain's discovery the atom-development project would be so costly that the United States was the only nation that could afford to carry on with it.

As a result of the meeting between former President Roosevelt and Prime Minister Winston Churchill at Quebec in August 1943, Mr. Truman said, the United States took over the entire program of developing the atom.

"The British shared their secrets with us," Mr. Truman said. Before they gave up development of the atom, the British had spent twenty million on the project.

Mr. Truman, in declaring the agreement to still be in effect and said it referred only to atomic development and not to the hydrogen bomb.

The former President said he renewed the Quebec agreement with former Prime Minister Clement Attlee and Canadian Prime Minisled Mackenzie King in Washington late in 1945, shortly after the Potsdam conference—as soon as he could get here.

Mr. Truman said that again both of our Foreign Relations Committees were aware of the renewal. He said he even believed congressional floor leaders knew of it.

He emphasized that the agreement applied only to atomic fission and did not have any bearing on the H-bomb.

The reason the late Senator Brien McMahon, author of the act forbidding the United States to share atomic secrets with foreign governments, did not know about the 1943 agreement, Mr. Truman said, was because he did not hold any position in the Senate, which entitled him to know about it.

James Hagerty, Presidential press secretary, told reporters in Washington yesterday that the 1943 agreement is not in effect at the present time.

The purpose for which I now rise is to say that either Mr. Truman is utterly and grossly misinformed, and does not know the circumstances in connection with the rescission of the Quebec Agreement, or those of us who happen to serve on certain committees—and I serve on the Foreign Relations Committee as well as on the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy—and are entitled to know these things, in the public interest, have not been told the truth by those in Government whose duty it is to tell us the truth.

I have considerable personal knowledge about the Quebec Agreement, entered into between Mr. Churchill and Mr. Roosevelt in 1943. I personally learned about it in 1947. I immediately took steps to object to it, because of the commitments which the United States had made unwarrantedly, in my opinion. To me it was an obnoxious agreement.

Thereafter I enlisted the assistance of the late Senator Vandenberg, who was not only a member of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, of which I was then chairman, but was also chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations at that time. The two of us worked almost incessantly, insisting upon the rescission of the obnoxious and nefarious agreement made in Quebec in 1943. This was in 1947. The result was that in 1948—at the moment I cannot give the exact date, because I had not expected to make a statement at this time—through the strenuous efforts of Undersecretary Lovett and Secretary of the Navy Forrestal, in conjunction with Senator Vandenberg and myself, a mutual agreement was entered into between the British Government and the Government of the United States to rescind and cancel the Quebec Agreement; and it was so rescinded and canceled.

If any such agreement was renewed after 1947, I know nothing about it, although I have inquired repeatedly. So the statement attributed to former President Truman, to the effect that the Quebec Agreement of 1943 is still in effect, is to my own personal knowledge not a correct statement of the fact, because I have seen the documents which rescinded the agreement, and I have seen the signatures on those documents, putting them into effect.

I feel that it is now incumbent upon me, at a little later date, to give the Senate the benefit of a more detailed statement on this subject, showing the history, the chronology, and the facts surrounding the agreement.

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

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I am glad to yield to the Senator from California.

Mr. KNOWLAND. The distinguished Senator from Iowa was formerly chairman of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, and is now vice chairman of that committee and the ranking Republican member of the committee. I ask the Senator if it is not correct that the original Quebec agreement gave to Great Britain, in effect, a veto over the use of the atomic weapon by the United States.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. That was one of the most astounding and obnoxious parts of the Quebec agreement. President Roosevelt agreed with Mr. Churchill that we would not use the atomic bomb under any circumstances without Britain's approval—not merely during World War II, but at any time in the future. In that 1943 agreement we sold the control of the use of the atomic bomb into the hands of Great Britain. That was one of the major reasons why I was objecting so strenuously, and why Senator Vandenberg objected when he learned of the situation. The efforts of Mr. Lovett and Mr. Forrestal were directed toward the correction of that situation.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from Iowa yield further?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. So that the record may be very clear, is it not the Senator's understanding that the veto power which was given by President Roosevelt to Great Britain at that time related to the use of the weapon under any and all circumstances, and was not tied to the use of the weapon in planes flying from British bases? In other words, it was a general veto power, was it not?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. That is correct. I shall furnish the language of that agreement; but in brief, and to paraphrase the agreement, it was to the effect that the weapon would not be used against any third party without the mutual consent and assent of both Great Britain and the United States at the time. It was not limited to World War II or any other time.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I believe the Senator from Iowa has made a very significant statement on the floor today. In the interest of historical accuracy, and for the information of the Senate and the American people, I hope he will make a more detailed report, so far as security will permit, as to what the original Quebec agreement provided, how it tied the hands of the Government of the United States, the steps which were taken under the leadership of the distinguished Senator from Iowa and the late Senator from Michigan, Mr. Vandenberg, and the other members of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, to rescind that agreement, and what the effect of the agreement has been.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I thank the Senator from California, and I thank the Senator from Delaware. I shall amplify my statement with more details and facts and records at a later date.

RFC LOAN TO RELIANCE HOMES, INC.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, today I wish to discuss—

First. How the Reconstruction Finance Corporation poured approximately $4 million of the taxpayers' money into the Reliance Homes, Inc., of Lester, Pa., a corporation which unquestionably was insolvent on the date the loan was approved;

Second. That there is strong indication, as supported by a report from the

Office of the Comptroller General, which I shall incorporate in the RECORD later, that the financial statement upon which the loan was approved was false. The Comptroller General's report indicates that the inventories listed on the financial statement of March 31, 1949, upon which a $3,838,786 loan was approved were overstated by about $232,000;

Third. That prior to its approval on June 27, 1949, this $3,838,786 loan had been adversely recommended at five different levels:

(a) Agency Examiner Arthur A. Gretz, decline May 17, 1949.

(b) Agency review committee, decline.

(c) Agency Manager Ben J. Kelley, decline May 20, 1949. The Philadelphia Agency recommendations were received in Washington May 23, 1949.

(d) Washington Examiner W. L. Rollins, decline.

(e) Chief, Housing Branch, Richard C. Dyas, approve.

(f) Washington Review Committee, J. C. Kitt, T. E. Parks, and R. G. Rhett, decline.

The agency examiner summed up the adverse recommendations with this quote:

> The financial condition of the company, as reflected by the statements submitted, does not warrant the loan requested, since, according to our analysis, the total debt is substantially disproportionate to the net worth, and the current position would not be sufficiently strengthened to insure the successful continuance of the business.

(g) The loan applications and the above reports were submitted to the Board on June 20–23, 1949, and the adverse recommendations overruled and the loan approved on June 27, 1949. The Board was composed of the following members: Mr. Harley Hise, chairman, present; Mr. Walter Dunham, present; Mr. Harvey Gunderson, present; Mr. William E. Willett, present; Mr. Mulligan, absent.

Fourth. That the directors of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, after having ignored the adverse recommendations of the various field and review boards—

(a) Ignored a later warning that the company was actually insolvent and the financial statement upon which the loan had originally been approved might have been false.

(b) Approved this $3,838,786 loan on June 27, 1949, based upon a financial statement dated March 31, 1949. The first disbursement of $501,468 was made on July 15, 1949. On July 31, 1949, a second financial statement was prepared by Reliance Homes and submitted to the Reconstruction Finance Corporation. This July 31, 1949, financial statement showed total assets of only $960,482.93 against total liabilities of $1,718,271.63, thereby definitely establishing that as of that date the company was insolvent to the extent of over three-fourths of a million dollars; $1,328,030 of this indebtedness represented loans from the Reconstruction Finance Corporation and the Federal Housing Authority. In the face of this definite notice of the insolvency of the company the Reconstruction Finance Corporation on August 26, 1949, 26 days later, ordered a second disbursement in the amount of $832,948.

Fifth. That in 1950 and again in 1952, when I questioned the propriety of loans to this company I was reassured by officials of both agencies that the loans had been regularly approved, and there is no evidence that either agency gave the slightest attention to the warning.

Sixth. That this $3,838,786 loan and a previous loan in the amount of $375,000 were both marked in default within 7 days after the final disbursement had been made by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation and all operations of the company had been discontinued for all practical purposes. Four months later the company was in bankruptcy.

All the facts which I shall put in the RECORD here today can be verified by the files of the agencies involved—from files and reports which have been in the possession of these 2 agencies for nearly 4 years.

While it is true that the loan to which I refer dates back nearly 5 years and that even if established, the statute of limitations for criminal prosecution against the officers of the company for the submission of a false financial statement has lapsed, nevertheless the fact that a question as to the propriety of this loan was raised with the Reconstruction Finance Corporation 4 years ago, or 2 years before the statute of limitations expired, and nothing was done, merits its review.

I am referring this case to the Department of Justice, with the request that they review the whole files in an effort to determine whether or not there might be some transgression during the later years which would make it possible even at this late date to reopen the case and prosecute those responsible for the fraud. This report is likewise being referred to the Senate Committee on Banking and Currency, under whose jurisdiction the activities of this agency came.

At least, even though it develops that the statute of limitations does bar criminal prosecution the whole case should be placed before the public along with the names of every Government official who is responsible.

The history of the case is as follows:

Reliance Homes, Inc., Lester, Pa., was established August 3, 1946, with the following officers: Harry S. Nagin, president; Leon Nagin, vice president; Charles Brait, treasurer; Samuel A. Blank, secretary; Max Pincus, director; Krooth and Altman, counsel; Jacob Market, director.

In June 1950 this case was first called to my attention. At that time it was alleged that in June 1949 this company had received a loan from the Reconstruction Finance Corporation in the amount of approximately $4 million, and it was further alleged that the company not only was insolvent on the date the loan was approved but also was insolvent and steadily losing money throughout the period of the loan's disbursement.

On June 23, 1950, I submitted to Mr. Harley Hise, chairman of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, certain questions to determine the accuracy of this allegation.

At this point I ask unanimous consent to have incorporated in the RECORD a copy of my letter of June 23, 1950, addressed to Mr. Harley Hise requesting certain information regarding this corporation.

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

UNITED STATES SENATE,
Washington, D. C., June 23, 1950.

Mr. HARLEY HISE,
Chairman, Board of Directors,
Reconstruction Finance Corporation,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. HISE: Will you please furnish me with the following information concerning loans made by your corporation to Reliance Homes, Inc., of Lester, Pa. I would also like the same detailed information for any loans made to any subsidiaries of the parent corporation.

1. The names of the officers and owners of the corporation and date of its organization.

2. How much has been loaned by the RFC, giving dates and amounts of each loan.

3. Please furnish a copy of the financial statement of the recipient corporation both at the time the application was made and the time the loan was granted.

4. How much does this corporation owe the Government at the present time?

If the Reliance Steel Products Co., of McKeesport, Pa., has borrowed from the RFC, please furnish the same information for this company; 1 to 4, inclusive.

Yours sincerely,

JOHN J. WILLIAMS.

Mr. President, on July 5, 1950, I received a reply from the Reconstruction Finance Corporation signed by Mr. Harley Hise as Chairman, confirming that the Reconstruction Finance Corporation had made two loans to this company, the first loan having been approved September 9, 1948, in the amount of $375,000 and the second loan having been approved June 27, 1949, in the amount of $3,838,786, making total commitments by this agency to the Reliance Homes, Inc., of $4,213,786.

Accompanying that letter were the two financial statements upon which the aforementioned loans were approved, June 30, 1948, and March 31, 1949.

The financial statement in question, dated March 31, 1949, upon which the application for the second loan had been based did not confirm the allegation that the company was insolvent on the date of the loan. On the contrary in that financial statement the net worth for Reliance Homes, Inc., as of March 31, 1949, was claimed to be $253,947.

At this point I ask unanimous consent to have incorporated in the RECORD a copy of the letter signed by Mr. Harley Hise, Chairman of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, dated July 5, 1950, along with the two financial statements referred to above.

There being no objection, the letter and financial statements were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RECONSTRUCTION FINANCE CORPORATION,
Washington, July 5, 1950.

Hon. JOHN J. WILLIAMS,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR WILLIAMS: This will acknowledge receipt of your letter of June 23, 1950, in which you request certain detailed information with reference to the loans made by this Corporation to Reliance Homes, Inc., of Lester, Pa. In this connection please be advised as follows:

1. Reliance Homes, Inc., was established August 3, 1946. The following are the of-

ficers and principal stockholders: Harry S. Nagin, president; Leon Nagin, vice president; Charles Brait, treasurer; Samuel A. Blank, secretary; Max Pincus, director; Jacob Market, director; and Krooth and Altman, counsel.

2. The Reconstruction Finance Corporation has made commitments totaling $4,213,786 to this company. The first loan in the amount of $375,000 was approved September 9, 1948. The second loan in the amount of $3,838,786 was approved June 27, 1949.

3. Attached are financial statements of the borrower dated June 30, 1948, and March 31, 1949. These statements were submitted in connection with the two loan applications dated July 27, 1948, and April 26, 1949, respectively, and were used as a basis of approving the loans on the dates indicated in the preceding paragraph.

4. We have not made any loans to any subsidiaries of Reliance Homes, Inc., or to the Reliance Steel Products Co., of McKeesport, Pa.

I trust that the foregoing answers to the questions contained in your letter above mentioned give you the information desired. However, if you wish any further data we shall be glad to furnish it to you.

Sincerely yours,

HARLEY HISE,
Chairman.

Financial statement of Reliance Homes, Inc., Lester, Pa.

JUNE 30, 1948

Assets:	
Cash	$26,708
Inventories	46,588
Other current assets	510
Total current assets	73,806
Net fixed assets	49,431
Other assets	79,530
Total assets	202,767
Liabilities:	
Notes payable	19,430
Accounts payable	3,358
Accrued expenses	1,785
Total current liabilites	24,573
Capital	132,319
Surplus	45,875
Net worth	178,194
Total liabilities	202,767

MAR. 31, 1949

Assets:	
Cash	$64,926
Receivables	25,447
Inventories	715,900
Other current assets	101,703
Total current assets	907,976
Net fixed assets	211,386
Other assets	305,919
Total assets	1,425,281
Liabilities:	
Notes payable	7,000
Accounts payable	191,541
Accrued expenses	34,047
Total current liabilities	232,588
Customers' deposits	16,500
FHA loan	762,530
RFC loan	159,716
Total debt	1,171,334
Capital	215,920
Surplus	38,027
Net worth	253,947
Total liabilities	1,425,281

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, it should be noted at this point that this correspondence was dated approximately 1 year after the second loan had been approved and 2 years before the statute of limitations would expire on any possible criminal charges.

In 1952 this loan was again called to my attention, at which time my informant still insisted that the approval of the loan in question had been based upon a false financial statement and that notwithstanding the information which I had received from the agency, the loan itself had been disbursed to the corporation during its insolvency. On May 19, 1952, I again requested from the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, which at that time was under the chairmanship of Mr. Harry A. McDonald, certain additional information regarding the status of the aforementioned loans.

Under date of May 28, 1952, I received a reply stating that their files relating to this loan had been turned over to the Housing and Home Finance Agency and suggested that I contact Mr. Raymond Foley, Administrator.

At this point I ask unanimous consent to have incorporated in the RECORD the two aforementioned letters.

There being no objection, the letters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNITED STATES SENATE,
Washington, D. C., May 19, 1952.

Mr. HARRY A. MCDONALD,
Administrator, Reconstruction Finance Corporation, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. MCDONALD: This is in further reference to my letter of June 23, 1950, addressed to Mr. Harley Hise, Chairman of the Board of Directors of RFC and his reply thereto of July 5, 1950, with reference to loans made by the RFC to Reliance Homes, Inc., of Lester, Pa. Copy of Mr. Hise's letter is enclosed for your ready information.

In this connection, I would like up-to-date information on the two loans outlined in the enclosed letter, as well as complete information on any subsequent loans made to Reliance Homes, Inc., or any subsidiary thereof.

If any loans to Reliance have been foreclosed, will you please advise the status of the loans at the time of foreclosure; the names of the receivers; details of sale by RFC, if any, after foreclosure; and the names and positions of the parties to whom the property was sold.

Your continued cooperation is very much appreciated.

Yours sincerely,

JOHN J. WILLIAMS.

RECONSTRUCTION FINANCE CORPORATION,
Washington, D. C., May 28, 1952.

Hon. JOHN J. WILLIAMS,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR WILLIAMS: Receipt is acknowledged of your letter dated May 19 to which you attached a copy of a letter dated July 5, 1950, addressed to you by Mr. Harley Hise, former Chairman of the Board of Directors of the RFC, concerning RFC loans to Reliance Homes, Inc., Lester, Pa.

The program for making loans under section 102 to aid in developing a method of manufacturing prefabricated houses and the loans made thereunder have been transferred by Executive order to the Housing and Home Finance Agency. The two loans authorized by the RFC to Reliance Homes, Inc., were included in those transferred and RFC has no information concerning the present status of such loans.

It is suggested that you communicate with Mr. Raymond M. Foley, Administrator of Housing and Home Finance Agency, for information concerning those loans.

Sincerely,

HARRY A. MCDONALD,
Administrator.

Mr. WILLIAMS. On June 2, 1952, I directed my inquiry to Mr. Raymond Foley, Administrator of the Housing and Home Finance Agency in Washington, enclosing the complete file of my previous correspondence with the Reconstruction Finance Corporation concerning these loans and requested the present status as well as any additional information they might have concerning the transaction.

At this point I again call attention to the fact that all the correspondence referred to above took place within the 3-year statutory period for criminal prosecution had any fraud been uncovered in regard to either of the loans.

The second loan, No. 2483, which was in question, was approved June 27, 1949, for $3,838,786, based upon a financial statement dated March 31, 1949.

This correspondence establishes that the company was at that time in bankruptcy and that the Government was then estimating their loss as being in excess of $3 million.

At this point I ask unanimous consent to have incorporated in the RECORD my letter of June 2, 1952, addressed to Mr. Raymond Foley along with his reply thereto under date of June 26, 1952.

There being no objection, the letters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNITED STATES SENATE,
Washington, D. C., June 2, 1952.

Mr. RAYMOND M. FOLEY,
Administrator, Housing and Home Finance Agency, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. FOLEY: I am enclosing herewith the complete file of correspondence I have had with the Reconstruction Finance Corporation concerning loans made to Reliance Homes, Inc., and would appreciate it if you would advise me of the present status of these loans as requested in my letter of May 19, 1952, to the Administrator of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation. You will note from their reply to this letter under date of May 28, 1952, that I have been referred to you for information concerning the loans in question.

Thank you very much for your cooperation.

Yours sincerely,

JOHN J. WILLIAMS.

HOUSING AND HOME FINANCE AGENCY,
OFFICE OF THE ADMINISTRATOR,
June 26, 1952.

Hon. JOHN J. WILLIAMS,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR WILLIAMS: We are in receipt of your letter of June 2, 1952, together with the enclosed file of your correspondence with Reconstruction Finance Corporation regarding that corporation's loans to Reliance Homes, Inc., and submit the following information requested in your letter of May 19, 1952, to Mr. Harry A. McDonald, Administrator, Reconstruction Finance Corporation.

Pursuant to Reorganization Plan No. 23 of 1950 (64 Stat. 1279) there were transferred

to this Agency by RFC the following obligations of Reliance:

	Principal balance	Accrued interest	Total indebtedness
Loan No. 2386 (approved Sept. 9, 1948)	$357,000.00	$4,968.67	$361,968.67
Loan No. 2483 (approved June 27, 1949)	3,796,098.76	54,186.39	3,850,285.15
Total	4,153,098.76	59,155.06	4,212,253.82

The transfer to this Agency was effective September 7, 1950. At the time of the transfer, operations of Reliance had been discontinued for all practical purposes and the loans were in default. Loan No. 2386, which had matured on August 14, 1950, had been fully disbursed. Some $3,796,098.76 of the $3,838,786 authorized under loan No. 2483 had been disbursed. No further disbursements were made by this Agency. Some advances from cash collateral were made to Reliance, however, for care and preservation of collateral for the loans.

We immediately had one of our engineers make an exhaustive study of the company, its product, management, and future prospects. Meanwhile conversations were had with Reliance on a proposal for recasting the loans held by the Government if Reliance would inject a substantial sum of new money into the company.

A proposed plan for reorganization, calling for additional loans by this Agency aggregating $2,500,000, was rejected by this Agency on December 14, 1950, as unacceptable for several reasons, including the limited investment to be made from private sources, the substantial additional funds required from the Government, and our determination that even after the proposed reorganization was effected the financial condition of Reliance would be unsound.

On January 5, 1951, other creditors of Reliance filed an involuntary petition for reorganization under chapter X of the Bankruptcy Act, as amended. These proceedings in the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Pennsylvania, in Bankruptcy, No. 23391, were dismissed on January 30, 1951. An involuntary petition in bankruptcy was filed immediately by creditors in the same court, in Bankruptcy, No. 23405, and on February 15, 1951, Reliance was adjudicated a bankrupt as of January 30, 1951.

Collateral for the Reliance loans transferred to this Agency consisted of chattel mortgages on machinery and equipment, warehouse receipts for inventory, and a pledge of certain accounts receivable, secured, and unsecured.

Shortly after the bankruptcy, the United States Navy, lessor of the Reliance plant, sought possession thereof for defense purposes, necessitating the prompt disposal of all Reliance's personalty located thereon. This consisted of: (1) machinery and equipment; (2) inventory in the warehouse; and (3) personal property outside the warehouse exclusive of machinery and equipment.

Both this Agency and the receivers of the bankrupt asserted prior liens against all of this property. With a view to promptly making the premises available to the Navy and of effecting all possible economies in the sale of such assets, this Agency by stipulation consented to the sale by the receivers of such assets at public auction, subject to entry of appropriate court order.

This stipulation provided that the proceeds of the sale of assets of the first two classes, less auctioneer's commission thereon, were to be paid directly to the United States, free from costs of the bankruptcy unless it should be determined by the court that the liens on such assets asserted by this Agency were invalid. On the other hand, sales proceeds derived from the third class should constitute general assets of the bankrupt estate unless otherwise determined by the court. Costs of the sale besides commissions were to be prorated between the parties.

On March 14, 1951, the Bankruptcy Court ordered the receivers to sell these assets at public sale, subject to aforesaid stipulations. This sale was held at the office and plant of Reliance Homes, Inc., at Lester, Pa., on May 7, 8, and 9, 1951, by Affiliated Auctioneers, 1219 Vine Street, Philadelphia 7, Pa., and was confirmed by order of the court dated May 10, 1951.

Subsequently a compromise was effected between this Agency and the trustees in bankruptcy of their claims against each other, pursuant to which this Agency retained the proceeds of the sale of the assets of the first two classes ($258,962.45) and the trustees retained the proceeds of the sale of the assets of the third class ($127,542.11), each subject to its proportionate share of the costs of sale. The compromise provided that the trustees would release all their claims against all assets pledged by Reliance as security for its loans made by RFC, with this Agency releasing any lien of hypothecation to assets of the third class, but reserving its right to file a claim against the bankrupt estate for any deficiency arising after application of collateral to Reliance's indebtedness. This Agency also agreed to pay the trustees $5,000 in settlement of charges for use and occupancy costs incurred during the pendency of the bankruptcy proceedings and chargeable against this Agency. The Bankruptcy Court entered an order approving said compromise on July 9, 1951. The net amount received by this Agency from the proceeds of the sale was $239,515.66.

On July 11, 1951, this Agency filed a proof of claim in the bankruptcy proceedings in the then aggregate amount of Reliance's indebtedness, $3,480,769 (a copy of which is attached hereto for your examination). On January 4, 1952, by amendment of this proof of claim, the amount thereof was reduced to $3,046,253.29, by crediting Reliance with the net proceeds from the public sale of assets in the amount of $239,515.66, and the estimated value (as of July 11, 1951) of other collateral for the indebtedness held by this Agency (accounts receivable, secured and unsecured), in the amount of $195,000, which was fixed by this Agency and concurred in by the trustees in bankruptcy. Accordingly, on January 18, 1952, the referee in bankruptcy, by an amended final offer of distribution, ordered payment to this Agency of an additional $27,555.31 in final distribution of the assets of the bankrupt estate. Since the closing of the bankruptcy proceedings the remaining collateral transferred to this Agency has been in process of liquidation.

The current status of the loans, then, shows:

Loan No. 2386 (unpaid principal balance)	$181,503.68
Loan No. 2483 (unpaid principal balance)	3,305,815.98
Accounts receivable reimbursable (charges against both loans)	10,619.50
Total indebtedness	3,497,939.16
Less:	
Net proceeds of sale of assets	239,515.66
Payment by referee in bankruptcy	27,555.31
Estimated recovery value of other collateral (approved by bankruptcy court)	195,000.00
Total credits	462,070.97
Estimated loss on both loans	3,035,868.19

With the foregoing statement of background, we answer the specific questions raised in the last paragraph of your letter of May 19, 1952, as follows:

1. Neither of the Reliance loans was foreclosed by this Agency, but after Reliance's bankruptcy, the collateral pledged to secure these loans was sold by the bankruptcy court, as indicated above, except for assigned accounts receivable, secured and unsecured, which are being liquidated by this Agency.

2. The status of the loans at the time of the bankruptcy of Reliance is indicated above.

3. In the bankruptcy proceedings Messrs. John V. Lovitt and Harry A. Rutenberg were appointed receivers in bankruptcy. Subsequently these two persons, together with Mr. William H. Katz, were elected as trustees in bankruptcy.

4. As previously indicated, all physical assets of Reliance were sold at public auction leaving in the hands of this Agency as collateral security accounts receivable evidenced in some cases by notes and mortgages. One of such notes and mortgages was executed by one Spencer Rulison, a builder-dealer, erecting a project consisting of Reliance homes in Schenectady, N. Y. He abandoned the project leaving 23 Reliance houses in various stages of completion. After considerable negotiation the rights of this Agency under the note and mortgage in question were assigned and sold to Mr. Rudolph H. Dussault, 1306 State Street, Schenectady, N. Y., for $60,000 cash. This price represented in our judgment the maximum recovery value of this collateral after giving consideration to the necessity of foreclosure of the mortgage, completion of the project, and ultimate sale of the dwellings. Petition relating to the proposed sale was presented to the Bankruptcy Court but the court took the position that its approval was unnecessary, the question of the fairness and the reasonableness of the sales price of this collateral being one which the bankruptcy trustees might present when our proof of claim was presented for allowance. On July 13, 1951, the trustees executed an assignment of their interest in the Rulison project and on August 15, 1951, a final settlement of the sale was effected.

We trust that the above furnishes the information you requested. If you should desire any other information available to us, we will be glad to furnish it.

Sincerely yours,

RAYMOND M. FOLEY,
Administrator.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, later my attention was called to a balance sheet dated July 31, 1949, which allegedly had been prepared from the books of the Reliance Homes, Inc. In that balance sheet I noted one item which referred to the accumulated deficit or loss as being $1,035,542.56 as of July 31, 1949.

This balance sheet dated less than 5 weeks after the approval of the loan shows the company to be insolvent to the extent of over $¾ million. The validity of this balance sheet has been verified by the Comptroller General's office.

At this point I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the RECORD the balance sheet of the Reliance Homes, Inc., dated July 31, 1949, to which I have just referred. The complete balance sheet, including all exhibits and notations is available to the Department of Justice or the congressional committee, but it is not being incorporated in the RECORD due to its length.

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

Reliance Homes, Inc., balance sheet, July 31, 1949

ASSETS

Current assets:	
Cash in banks and on hand	$185,552.36
Accounts receivable, trade:	
Assigned to FHA-insured loans	88,990.00
Assigned to RFC loans	5,830.00
Unassigned	1,000.00
	95,820.00
Accounts receivable and advances, employees	503.14
Accounts receivable, others (note 1)	7,563.06
Advances to suppliers for materials	5,979.74
Inventories (note 2):	
Raw materials	267,118.38
Work in process	25,412.19
Finished stock	32,543.91
Total	325,074.48
Prepaid expenses:	
Unexpired insurance premiums	12,586.43
Other prepayments	755.64
Total	13,342.07
Total current assets	633,834.85
Purchasers' security deposits (contra)	22.000.00
Fixed assets (note 3):	
Machinery and equipment	227,282.98
Furniture and fixtures	19,122.25
Total	246,405.23
Less accumulated depreciation	14,782.56
	231,622.67
Leasehold improvements	17,346.61
Less reserve for amortization	3,613.85
	13,732.76
Advances for equipment purchases	2,181.38
Total	247,536.81
Other assets:	
Deposit re United States Navy performance bond	25,000.00
Other deposits	9,417.00
Freight damage claim	7,627.44
Financing charges re FHA-insured loan, unamortized balance (note 4)	13,066.83
Demonstration house at realizable value (note 5)	2,000.00
Total	57,111.27
Grand total	960,482.93

LIABILITIES

Current liabilities:	
FHA-insured bank loan (note 6)	762,530.00
Less cash collateral account	192,500.00
	570,030.00
Accounts payable, trade	188,846.52
Advances to employees	262.44
Subcontract erection costs payable	8,721.73
Accrued deferred maintenance, United States Navy (note 7)	11,007.55

Reliance Homes, Inc., balance sheet, July 31, 1949—Continued

LIABILITIES—continued

Current liabilities—Continued	
Accruel payrolls	$14,651.88
Accrued interest on loans	3,482.49
Accrued workmen's compensation insurance	2,850.13
Accrued corporate taxes	1,930.10
Accrued payroll taxes	9,387.89
Accrued legal fees	26,632.90
Total current liabilities	837,803.63
Purchasers' security advances (contra)	22,000.00
Reconstruction Finance Corporation loans (note 8)	858,468.00
Total liabilities	1,718,271.63

CAPITAL STOCK

Preferred, 5 percent, noncumulative (par value $100 per share):	
Authorized, 30,000 shares	
Issued, 2,500 shares	250,000.00
Less in treasury, 400 shares	40,000.00
	210,000.00
Class A common voting stock (par value 10 cents per share):	
Authorized and issued, 20,000 shares	2,000.00
Less in treasury, 6,150 shares	615.00
	1,385.00
Class B common nonvoting:	
Authorized, 180,000 shares	
Issued 80,000 shares	8,000.00
Less in treasury, 24,600 shares	2,460.00
	5,540.00
	216,925.00
Surplus (deficit):	
Capital surplus	60,828.86
Operating deficit (schedule B ($1,035,542.56)	(974,713.70)
Contingencies (note 9)	----------
Total	960,482.93

Mr. WILLIAMS. I immediately recognized that if this balance sheet represented the true picture of the corporation's status as of July 31, 1949, it meant that based upon their own books the corporation was then insolvent to the extent of over $750,000, and that if this statement were accurate there was a strong indication that the financial statement of March 31, 1949, upon which the loan had originally been approved, was false.

It should be noted that the date July 31, 1949, appearing on the second financial statement is just 5 weeks after the $3,838,786 loan was approved June 27, 1949. As of that date there had been but one disbursement on loan No. 2483, that being a $501,468 loan on July 15, 1949.

This notation on the company's balance sheet indicated an accumulated deficit of $1,035,542.56 on July 31, 1949, against a claimed net worth of $253,947 in their financial statement March 31, 1949, upon which their loan of June 27 had been approved.

Assuming both these statements to be accurate, it would mean not only that the company was insolvent to the extent of approximately $750,000 within 5 weeks after the loan had been approved but also that they had lost $1 million during this short period. In the 5 weeks June 27, 1949, to July 31, 1949, a claimed net worth of $253,947 was replaced by an admitted loss of $1,035,542.56, thereby representing an insolvency to the extent of $781,156.56.

Recognizing the importance of establishing the accuracy of this balance sheet and the notations referred to, I submitted the whole case to the honorable Lindsay C. Warren, Comptroller General, with the request that he investigate the case with particular emphasis upon the possibility that the financial statement as filed under date of March 31, 1949, upon which a loan might have been approved, might have been false.

Under date of March 12, 1954, I received a preliminary report from the Comptroller General in which they stated that while they had not made a complete investigation and could not make specific charges, nevertheless their preliminary investigation did indicate:

First. That the financial statement as submitted to the Reconstruction Finance Corporation under date of March 31, 1949—which statement was used as a basis for the approval of a $3,838,786 loan—was not an accurate picture of the financial condition of the company in that they overstated their assets by about $232,000.

Second. That the company was actually on the verge of insolvency on the date the loan was approved.

Third. That the second disbursement, in the amount of $832,948, was made on August 26, 1949, just 26 days after a second financial statement had been filed with the Reconstruction Finance Corporation showing beyond any question that as of that date the company was insolvent to the extent of over $750,000.

Fourth. That during the succeeding months, extending through August 30, 1950, additional disbursements were made to the company as follows:

Nov. 4, 1949	$100,000.00
Nov. 18, 1949	582,000.00
Feb. 1, 1950	665,000.00
Feb. 28, 1950	520,000.00
Apr. 17, 1950	437,000.00
July 31, 1950	99,917.17
Aug. 24, 1950	28,000.00
Aug. 30, 1950	29,965.59

Fifth. That both loans were declared to be in default 7 days after the final disbursement and that 4 months later the company was in bankruptcy.

At this point I ask unanimous consent to have incorporated in the RECORD the report on this case as submitted by the Comptroller General under date of March 12, 1954, along with a letter received from Mr. Frank H. Weitzel, Acting Comptroller General, under date of April 2, 1954, in which he confirmed that during the entire period the Reliance Homes, Inc., constructed a total of only 350 homes. Based upon the loss which the Government will sustain on these loans, each of these homes cost the American taxpayers approximately $10,000—the purchase price of the homes, of course, still having to be paid by the home buyers.

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

COMPTROLLER GENERAL OF THE UNITED STATES,
Washington, March 12, 1954.

Hon. JOHN J. WILLIAMS,
United States Senate.

MY DEAR SENATOR WILLIAMS: In accordance with your informal request the General Accounting Office has made a limited review of the enclosed financial statements of Reliance Homes, Inc., Lester, Pa., furnished our representatives during the conference held in your office on February 25, 1954.

Two copies of a memorandum concerning the review on reported losses of the Reliance Homes, Inc., for the 4-month period ended July 31, 1949, are attached for your consideration.

If there is any further information you desire, please advise.

Sincerely yours,

LINDSAY C. WARREN,
Comptroller General of the United States.

MEMORANDUM ON REPORTED LOSS, RELIANCE HOMES, INC., MARCH 31, 1949, TO JULY 31, 1949

A limited review has been made of the June 30, 1948, March 31, 1949, and April 30, 1950, balance sheets of Reliance Homes, Inc., Lester, Pa. The first two balance sheets were attached to the RFC letter addressed to Senator WILLIAMS dated July 5, 1950. The balance sheet of March 31, 1949, shows surplus of $38,027, and the balance sheet of April 30, 1950, indicates a deficit of $1,035,542.56 as of August 1, 1949. The review was concerned primarily with seeking an explanation of the reasons for such a substantial change within the short period of 4 months. In this connection we referred to some of the files in the custody of the officer of the Administrator, Housing and Home Finance Agency, relating to the loan made to Reliance Homes, Inc., by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation.

The enclosed balance sheet of March 31, 1949, is in fact a condensation of the balance sheet submitted by Reliance Homes with their loan application dated April 26, 1949. Although the full statement appears to have been prepared by a firm of certified public accountants, it is not certified by them. The accountant's letter transmitting the statement clearly states that (1) the inventory values are "calculaed" (this results in a computed or estimated figure for cost of sales); (2) "a physical count of the inventory" was not attended; (3) confirmation letters were not mailed; and (4) "we do not express an opinion on the statements as a whole." One of the notes to the balance sheet is as follows:

"Inventories based on book records at March 31, 1949, consisted of the following:

2 houses at sales price of $5,500	$11,000.00
Materials purchased (pledged)	84,435.55
Materials purchased (not pledged)	488,498.29
Direct labor and factory overhead:	
Prior to December 1948	1,404.48
December 1948	33,734.04
January 1949	49,004.24
February 1949	60,339.13
March 1949	86,484.03
	230,965.92
Total	814,899.76
Less 18 houses delivered at sales price of $5,500	99,000.00
Calculated value of inventory at Mar. 31, 1949	715,899.76"

The condensed March 31, 1949, balance sheet shows "Other assets" of $305,919. This item appears in greater detail in the balance sheet supporting the loan application, as follows:

Deposits:	
Collateral trust fund	$88,000.00
Purchasers' security deposits	16,500.00
Utilities, etc	4,391.00
Total	108,891.00
Other assets:	
Engineering and development expense	140,772.31
Unamortized preproduction expenses	55,445.92
Organization expense	810.20
Total	197,028.43
	305,919.43

Whereas the condensed March 31, 1949, balance sheet shows surplus as being $38,027, the more complete balance sheet shows:

Surplus:	
Capital	$60,828.86
Appraisal	49,975.00
Operating deficit	(72,776.78)
Total	38,027.08

There are certified financial statements of Reliance Homes, Inc., as of July 31, 1949, in the files of HHFA. These statements show a "Capital surplus" of $60,828.86 and an "Operating deficit" of $1,035,542.56.

A comparison of the financial statements as of March 31 and July 31, 1949, indicates the following:

1. The accumulated costs to March 31, 1949, may have been incorrectly divided between costs of sales and inventory. Whereas on 4 months' sales of $108,000 to March 31, 1949 (including $9,000 for delivery and erection), the cost of sales was calculated as $99,000, or 92 percent; on 12 months' sales to July 31, 1949, of $348,537 the manufacturing costs amounted to $1,069,608, or 307 percent.

2. The March 31, 1949, balance sheet shows $197,028.43 as deferred expenses. It appears that all of these expenses have been added directly or indirectly to the operating deficit at July 31, 1949, except approximately $30,000 transferred to machinery and equipment account.

Thus it seems that the large recorded loss of Reliance Homes, Inc., in the period from March 31, 1949, to July 31, 1949, might be attributable to the following:

(a) The calculated inventory value at March 31, 1949, may have been overstated by about $232,000 (the difference between the cost of sales to March 31, 1949, calculated as $99,000, and the cost of sales to that date we estimate as $331,436). During the 4-month period from March 31, 1949, to July 31, 1949, houses were sold for about $498,000 less than their cost to manufacture. These conclusions are based on the following table, the manufacturing costs for the year ended July 31, 1949, being divided between the 8- and 4-month periods in proportion to sales:

	12 months ended July 31, 1949 (note 1)	8 months Aug. 1, 1948, to Mar. 31, 1949 (note 2)	4 months Apr. 1, 1949, to July 31, 1949 (note 2)
Sales	$348,537	$108,000	$240,537
Manufacturing costs	1,069,607	331,436	738,171
Gross loss before selling and administrative expenses	721,070	223,436	497,634

NOTE 1.—These amounts are from a statement of profit and loss certified by a firm of certified public accountants.

NOTE 2.—Sales amounts are as reported. Manufacturing costs for the 2 periods are estimated based on the relationship between sales and manufacturing costs for the year ended July 31, 1949.

(b) Selling, administrative, and other expenses (net) of about $172,000 between March 31, 1949, and July 31, 1949.

We have not ascertained when the July 31, 1949, financial statements prepared by the certified public accountants came into the hands of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation but the transmittal to Reliance Homes, Inc., was dated October 21, 1949. The records show that the entire amount of the $357,000 loan was disbursed by RFC at that date, but only $501,468 (on July 15, 1949) and $832,948 (on August 26, 1949) had been disbursed on the larger loan of $3,838,786.

COMPTROLLER GENERAL OF THE UNITED STATES,
Washington, April 2, 1954.

Hon. JOHN J. WILLIAMS,
United States Senate.

MY DEAR SENATOR WILLIAMS: Enclosed is the additional information which you informally requested on March 12, 1954, concerning the loan by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation to the Reliance Homes, Inc., Lester, Pa., as reflected in the files now in custody of the Housing and Home Finance Administrator.

The enclosures are:

1. A photostatic copy of the financial statement of March 31, 1949, and July 31, 1949.

2. Excerpts from RFC's report by Office of Loans, Housing Branch, on application for loan of $3,838,786.

3. Notes on loan disbursements.

With respect to your inquiry as to the number of houses sold and delivered by Reliance Homes, Inc., it appears from the files that the total was 350 through September 1950 as reflected in the following schedule:

1949:	
March	18
April	11
May	13
June and July	18
	60
August through December	83
1950 through September	207
Total	350

If there is any further information you desire, please advise.

Sincerely yours,

FRANK H. WEITZEL,
Acting Comptroller General of the United States.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I will say that in addition to these reports, there are many additional notations and files which are not being incorporated in the RECORD because of their length. However, they are all being made available in their entirety both to the congressional committee which is responsible for the activities of the agency, and to the Department of Justice, to see what may be done at this late date.

MANUFACTURE OF TIME FUSES AND TIME DEVICES FOR NATIONAL DEFENSE PURPOSES

Mr. HUNT. Mr. President, some months ago I read in the press a statement that the Nation was dependent upon the United States watch and clock industry for the manufacture of time fuses and time devices necessary in the production of bombs, explosives, and other forms of ammunition. This statement went on to say that only the horological companies could furnish these necessary devices so essential to our national defense.

As a member of the Armed Services Committee this news greatly concerned me. I immediately made inquiries of the Department of Defense of our Government to ascertain whether or not these statements were correct. In due time, I was advised by the Ordnance Departments of the Army and Navy that these time fuses and devices were made by a great many American concerns during World War II and the Korean war, concerns that had no connection at all with the manufacture of watches. Among the suppliers of mechanical time fuses to our Departments of the Army, Navy, and Air Force, I was advised that Eastman Kodak Co., National Cash Register Co., Eclipse Machine Division of Bendix Aviation Corp., Underwood Corp., King-Seeley Corp., Gibb Manufacturing & Research Corp., Thomas A. Edison Co., and George W. Borg Products, were eight concerns that furnished many, many thousands of these mechanical time devices.

I have also received information from the Frankfort Arsenal in Philadelphia and from the International Business Machines Co., Ltd., of Toronto, Canada, which is very illuminating. These reports show that more mechanical time fuses and devices were made by concerns outside the clock and watch industry than were made by United States concerns engaged in the watch and clock industry.

I am happy to learn that there seems to be, therefore, many concerns not engaged in the clock and watch industry that have made and are capable of making the hundreds of thousands of these devices when called upon in time of national need.

The information which has come to me will be, I think, of interest to the whole Congress, and I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD immediately following these remarks.

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

NAMES OF SOME SUPPLIERS OF MECHANICAL TIME FUSES

1. Eastman Kodak Co., Rochester, N. Y.
2. National Cash Register Co., Dayton, Ohio.
3. Eclipse Machine Division of the Bendix Aviation Corp., Elmira, N. Y.
4. Underwood Corp. (Underwood-Elliot-Fisher), Hartford, Conn.
5. King-Seeley Corp., Ann Arbor, Mich.
6. Gibb Manufacturing & Research Corp., Janesville, Wis.
7. Thomas A. Edison Co., West Orange, N. J.
8. George W. Borg Products, Delevan, Wis.

In addition to these American companies, outside of the jeweled lever watch and clock industry, are summaries and reports from the following:

1. Frankford Arsenal, Philadelphia, Pa.
2. International Business Machines Co., Ltd., Toronto, Canada.

The following information was obtained from officials of the Eastman Kodak Co.:

"The Eastman Kodak Co. operates in the Rochester area with complete independence and does not rely on the domestic watch companies for components, machinery, design, or assistance of any kind. Eastman Kodak has been responsible for the complete manufacture and assembly in recent years of the M500 series (new name for M–43) mechanical time fuses and rear fitting timing devices, which are a clock-like mechanism and which are identical with the products being manufactured by the domestic watch companies. Eastman Kodak reports currently that they have six research and development projects underway related to defense and have had at recent times a total of 14 research and development projects.

"Eastman Kodak's production facilities and manpower at the plant where its mechanical time fuses are made total far in excess of that of the combined capacity of the domestic jeweled watch companies—Elgin, Hamilton, and Waltham. This one plant currently employs about 12,000 people, approximately 250 of whom are in tool and die work. The tool and die department has in the past successfully made dies for fuse gear train and escapement gears and other small parts which are exact replicas of the work produced by the domestic watch companies. Eastman is fully equipped with screw machines, pinion cutters, gear hobbers, pivot polishing machines, and other necessary facilities.

"It is interesting to note that the only component purchased on the outside by Eastman Kodak is an escapement spring of the type normally supplied by domestic watch companies. However, Eastman Kodak purchases this part from a company in Clifton, N. J., whose main business, operated under the name Windsor Manufacturing Co., is the manufacture of ping pong balls.

"Independent subcontractors, tool and die shops, and manufacturing plants employing a large number of skilled mechanics, engineers, et cetera, are readily available in the Rochester area and provide a basis for the immediate expansion of Eastman's tooling and production capacity in the event of war. The people at Eastman estimate that there are over 25 such shops in the immediate area on which they can depend.

"Since the domestic companies, in the last analysis, rest their claim to essentiality on the fact that they are the only ones capable of producing a jeweled watch movement, we feel that it is highly relevant to state that the production heads of Eastman Kodak declared flatly and unequivocally that their company could make precision chronometers for the Army and Navy, if required, and in approximately 6 months."

The following information was supplied by officials of the National Cash Register Co.:

"On the basis of the company's extensive experience in producing the M–43 mechanical time fuse during World War II, and on the basis of their company's highly integrated production skills and equipment, they could again enter into production of complete fuses and fuse parts and would not be dependent in any respect on watch companies. During World War II, National Cash Register manufactured within its own plant all parts for its fuses, including the escapement spring. National Cash Register's current work force totals about 12,000 and its affiliated group of subcontractors are represented in about 25 shops for tool and die work and for parts manufacturing.

"The company has facilities for the performance of all the necessary tool and die work as well as for the manufacturing of all parts and only relies on subcontractors to supplement requirements at peak workloads.

"National Cash Register has as facilities for making machines and equipment for the production of mechanical time fuses. They have the engineering facilities and normally make a good deal of their special equipment.

"In addition, they stated they could make chronometers, an item which the watch companies have stated was peculiarly within their own manufacturing and engineering skills."

The following information was obtained from officials of the Eclipse Machine Division of the Bendix Aviation Corp.:

"Eclipse began to make mechanical time fuses, including all components and assemblies, in 1939. Their production rate of 500 a day was gradually expanded until they were producing 25,000 units a day. Not only because of their already acquired experience in making mechanical time fuses, but for the reasons given below, they are completely confident that they could resume fuse production at substantially any rate required by the Government. They felt that they are especially qualified since Eclipse could draw upon a large number of tool and die shops and small-manufacturing shops in their area and in the general area from Rochester, N. Y., to Harrisburg, Pa. They pointed out that these shops not only possess the skills and facilities, but they have a very high-grade working force, including skilled mechanics. These tool and die and production shops currently supply such companies in their general area as Westinghouse, Remington Rand, Bausch & Lomb, Ansco, and Taylor Instrument Corp. In the opinion of the production executives of Eclipse, there are no special or unique qualifications in the watch industry required for mechanical fuse manufacturing which they could not fully match. They stated that they would be able to move faster and expand production to a higher level than any of the domestic watch companies. They emphasized that the skills required for mechanical time fuses are essentially engineering skills such as they now utilize and are more closely related to the problems of production engineering than to that of producing watches. They too stated they could manufacture chronometers.

"They are fully confident that they could produce any timing device required and cited the fact that they are now producing a high-precision mechanical timing device on which they could not supply further information because the product was classified."

The following information was obtained from officials of the Underwood Corp. (Underwood-Elliot-Fisher).

"The Underwood Corp. is currently engaged in the manufacture of a highly secret fuse and in the production of gyroscopes, among other defense items. It is their opinion that the secret fuse contains many components which are similar to those of a mechanical time fuse. However, they stated that they know of no watch company making this special fuse.

"Underwood's officials stated conclusively that watch experience is not necessary for fuse manufacture.

"During World War II, while on production of the T–47 (now the M–129) fuse, they obtained pinions and gears from United States Time Corp., a pin lever watch and clock manufacturing company. They stated that this arrangement was attributable, not to their incapacity to manufacture the special parts, but to the expanded production demands at that time.

"The Underwood Corp. now commands a work force of approximately 5,000 in their Hartford and Bridgeport plants, and a special research group at New Hartford, Conn."

The following information was obtained from an official of the King-Seeley Corp., Ann Arbor, Mich.:

"The King-Seeley Corp. has produced and is producing M–500 series fuses and is fully capable of producing virtually all of the parts without assistance of outside companies. It can produce its own tools and dies and also has the capacity and ability to build some of the special machines, if necessary. As an example, they are presently producing pivot polishing machines such as were produced by Eastman Kodak during the last war.

"Beyond their own capacity and facilities, they have available to them in their immediate area tool and die shops and manufacturing shops capable of making both the tools and dies and the parts, if this should become necessary to meet peak requirements. They have gone to watch manufacturers for a few parts as a matter of convenience rather

than of necessity. They acquire their hair springs from the Borg Corp.

"The opinion was expressed that fuse manufacturers, other than the domestic watch and clock companies, could get into the production of mechanical time fuses or similar items as quickly as anyone else."

Information obtained from officials of Gibb Manufacturing & Research Corp.:

"The Gibb Corp. received a prime contract for 3½ million mechanical time fuses during the early part of the Korean war. At the time, the Gibb Corp. was loaded to capacity and subcontracted to the Gruen Watch Co., in Cincinnati, Ohio, an importer of Swiss watches. The work at Gruen was supervised by Gibb personnel. The Gibb Corp. reports that they could have completed this work in their own plant if it had not been for previous Air Corps contracts.

"Commenting further on the manufacture of fuses, Gibb representatives said that Gibb was chosen because of their background in this kind of work, and because, during the early part of the war, when the Ordnance Department wanted to get started on the manufacture of fuses, the domestic jeweled watch industry was not interested in getting Government work. However, when the United States Government activated controls on materials, the jeweled watch industry very quickly jumped over to Government work.

"It was pointed out that the Gibb plant possesses automatic screw machines, pivot polishing machines, Safags, Mikrons, and Pederman screw machines. Gibb also has tool making facilities but, like other companies, turns to outside sources to supplement its own tool and die work. It was stated that there are plenty of tool and die shops in the southern Wisconsin area, and that the company does not depend in any way on the domestic watch industry for any help in the manufacture of mechanical time fuses. Hairsprings were furnished to them by the Borg Corp., and other springs were furnished by Perryman of Clifton, N. J., both outside of the watch industry.

"Gibb officials stated that, starting from scratch, including making of all dies, fixtures, tools and gages, they could be producing new fuses within 6 months. In connection with the 501 and 500 series fuses, the gages and fixtures are now owned by the United States Government and, therefore, they could get into production within approximately 4 months.

"They stated that the Gibb Corp. could make chronometers, and estimated it would take approximately 6 months.

"An official of the Gibb Corp. also stated that it was his belief that a good number of the fuses could be made by such nonwatch companies as Hoover Vacuum Cleaner, Monroe Calculator, Burroughs Adding Machine, Minneapolis-Honeywell, Sangamo Co., and Badger Meter Co. Most of these companies, he pointed out, are involved in making precision instruments for the Air Corps."

The following information was obtained from past and present officials of the Thomas A. Edison Co.:

"The Thomas A. Edison Co., has had a great deal of experience in the production of M–43 fuses. During World II, on the instructions of naval ordnance, they purchased from watch companies certain components such as escape arbors, pinion blanks, centrifugal gears and other parts, all of which were supplied to them by the Benrus Watch Co., an importer of watch movements from Switzerland. However, the Edison Co. representative stated flatly that if these instructions had not been given by naval ordnance, his company would have made the same parts themselves because they were capable of doing so. They possessed all the machinery and facilities for making these parts.

"It was pointed out that Edison started from scratch and ended up with the best firing record of any manufacturer of mechanical time fuses in the United States. At no time was Edison dependent on the domestic watch manufacturing companies for their skills or assistance.

"Mr. Wehrenberg of Westfield, N. J., was interviewed because he was at one time research director of the Special Products Division of the Thomas A. Edison Co. (1940–45) and was manager of the same division from 1945–47. During this time he was in charge of production of the M–43 mechanical time fuse for Edison.

"His opinion was similar to that given by all others interviewed that watch manufacturing experience is not essential to fuze manufacturing. He pointed out that the Edison Co. had made substantially all the parts necessary and possessed all the equipment such as hobbing machines, automatic screw machines, pivot polishing machines, etc. He stated that in the few instances in which they purchased parts or components from jeweled watch or pin lever watch companies, these purchases were made as a matter of convenience. The Edison Co. possessed, however, the capacity to make everything they purchased in this area.

"Perhaps the most important statements brought to light in our interview with Mr. Wehrenberg are the following:

"Watch engineering and manufacturing experience are not essential to the design and manufacture of mechanical time fuses. Fuses are designed especially to satisfy specific ordnance fuse objectives, and while they may have a clock mechanism, this clock mechanism has to be so engineered as to satisfy these objectives. For instance, the weight and composition of the parts and the centrifugal and other physical forces which are created when the fuse is either dropped from an airplane or used in an artillery shell necessitate a design of parts, such as pinions and gears, having characteristics different from those in a watch. In other words, the arrangement of a train of pinions and gears is a function of different factors. Accordingly, in the opinion of Mr. Wehrenberg, it might even be better for nonwatch experience to be utilized than to utilize watch experience.

"He felt, therefore, that the engineering skills developed by Edison, the Underwood Corp., Eclipse Division of Bendix and others were far better suited to this work than those of the domestic watch companies."

The following information was obtained from officials of the George W. Borg Corp.:

"The George W. Borg Corp. is perhaps one of the most highly qualified corporations in the United States for the production of horological devices. It is so qualified, in fact, that within the last few years the Borg Corp. had actually considered entering the field as manufacturers of jeweled lever watches, but were deterred only by the fact that the problems of merchandising and marketing were so far afield from their normal experience that they decided for the time being not to enter the new field. In fact, however, they presently have the mechanical and production skills requisite for manufacturing jeweled lever watches.

"George W. Borg Corp. produces and ships hair springs of such fine quality that they are purchased by manufacturers in Switzerland.

"Especially significant is the experience of Borg Corp. during World War II in the production of mechanical time fuses. Borg found it necessary during that period, because of a lack of assistance that the domestic watch companies could give them, to make their own equipment, and develop facilities to make mechanical time fuses. They made their own Swiss automatic screw machines and other machines for that purpose. They found, too, as a result of their experience, that many parts normally made on Swiss automatic machines could now be produced on their own Brown & Sharpe machines. They developed many methods of increasing production.

"Their executives state that because of the reluctance and unwillingness of the American watch companies to supply them with parts and assistance during the Korean war that the Borg Corp. made the decision to produce all of their own parts.

"They advised that they have a tool and die shop capable of making any of the tools or dies necessary for mechanical time fuze production. They also advised that in the southern Wisconsin area there is a substantial number of subcontractors that they can call upon for making either parts or tools and dies if necessary to meet peak load requirements.

"In conducting this investigation we had a production executive and a chief engineer visit the Frankford Arsenal. Officials of Frankford Arsenal made the unsolicited statement that they did not consider the domestic jeweled-watch industry essential to the manufacture of mechanical time fuzes and that this statement was recently made to representatives of the Defense Department. Interestingly enough, in inquiring into the fuze components and their manufacture in the United States, they informed us that the following additional companies made contributions through subcontracting:

"Part name	Company	Address	Products
Escapement arbor	Automatic Specialty Co	Baltimore, Md	Automatic screw machine products.
	Everlast Metal Products	New York, N. Y	Aluminum ware.
	King-Seeley	Ann Arbor, Mich	Oil gages, ammeters, speedometers, etc.
Centrifugal gear (blanked)	Farrington Manufacturing Co	Boston, Mass	Covered metal jewel and display boxes, plastic display boxes, metal specialties, charga-plate credit service.
	Thomaston Special Tool Co	Thomaston, Conn	Special tools.
	Heath Co	Benton Harbor, Mich	Radio test equipment kits.
Escape gear (wheel)	King-Seeley	Ann Arbor, Mich	See above.
	Eastman-Kodak Co	Rochester, N. Y	Photo film, paper, apparatus, supplies, and chemicals.
Gears Nos. 1, 2, 3, and 4	M. H. Rhodes Co (Also Ingraham Watch and New Haven Clock.)	Hartford, Conn	Timing devices for delay action, electrical and mechanical; radio relays; automatic interval electrical switches; parking meters.
Gear No. 5	Obex Manufacturing Co., Inc	Lynbrook, Long Island, N. Y.	Cameras, projectors, instrument and precision parts.
	Gruen Watch Co	Cincinnati, Ohio	Watches.
Adj. guide	Eastern Watch Case Co	Waterbury, Conn	Watchcases.

"Part name	Company	Address	Products
Escapement levers			
(All prime contractors—This is a delicate piece and is made in such a way as to be closely controlled to individual manufacturers' requirements.)			
Pinions Nos. 1, 2, 3, and 4	Mailly Manufacturing Co	Waterbury, Conn	Swiss screw machine products.
	Howard Clock Products	Waltham, Mass	Parts manufacturer.
	Bristol Instrument Gears	Bistol, Conn	Gears and pinions, gear assemblies, etc.
Pinion No. 5	Woodside Screw Machine Co., Inc	Woodside, N. Y	Screw machine parts; Swiss automatic.
(This is now made of hollow tubing, but the outside contours remain the same as the old pinion No. 5).	Lormar Instrument Co	Neptune, N. J	
Escape pins	Torrington Co	Torrington, Conn	See below.[1]
Firing pin shaft	General Phonograph Manufacturing Co., Inc	Putnam, Conn	Pointed steel goods.
Setback pin	Everlast Metal Products	New York, N. Y	See above.
	Specialty Screw Machine Products Co	Lancaster, Pa	Screw machine products, Swiss work, instrument parts, special screws.
	Revere Camera Co	Chicago, Ill	Cameras.
Plates Nos. 1 and 7	Forstner Chain Corp	Irvington, N. J	Jewelry.
(Tools for these parts are made by the Moore Tool & Die Co. of Bridgeport, Conn.)	Eastman-Kodak Co	Rochester, N. Y	See above.
	Farrington Manufacturing Co	Boston, Mass	Do.
Escape springs	George Perryman (owner of Windsor Manufacturing Co.).	Clifton, N. J	Ping pong balls.
	Borg, George W., Products	Delavan, Wisc	Electronic and mechanical equipment.
Adjusting screws	Research Development Manufacturing Co	Philadelphia, Pa	Screw machine products, Swiss work, instrument parts, special screws.
	Woodside Screw Machine Products Co	Woodside, N. Y	See above.
	Acme Screw Products	Dayton, Ohio	Screw machine products."

[1] Torrington Co. Products: Needles, needle bearings, bicycle spokes, nipples, pedals, handle bars, swaging machinery, small metal specialties, precision machined and ground; pins; blades; pivots; studs.

Information obtained from officials of the International Business Machines plant in Toronto, Canada, regarding their mechanical time fuse manufacturing:

"The company's normal business is, of course, calculating machines. It presently has contracts for the manufacture of the M–501 fuse and the M–502 fuse for the Canadian Government. All drawings and specifications are being supplied by the Frankford Arsenal at Philadelphia, Pa. For all practical purposes, this contract is being given technical and engineering supervision by Frankford Arsenal, although paid for by the Canadian Government.

"IBM of Canada received its contract for this fuze in the summer of 1952. Approximately 9 months after they received their contract, they began to make delivery. At the start, some parts were supplied by other companies such as Eastman Kodak, George W. Borg, King-Seeley, etc., but in no case was IBM supplied with parts by a United States jeweled watch company. After a year's experience, IBM was producing all the parts as well as the complete fuse in their plant, except for the escapement spring which it buys from George W. Borg. The purchase of this spring from Borg is a matter of convenience rather than necessity. During this period of time, IBM had to acquire most of the necessary equipment, such as pinion cutters and gear hobbers, etc., as well as to create the tools and dies, make the parts, and assemble the fuse. It makes all its own tools and dies for the parts for this fuse, including the gear dies.

"IBM is now producing fuses at the rate of a thousand a day. This plant employs 1,500 people. IBM officials indicated that they could make their own machines and equipment, if necessary, in order to make the parts to build the fuse. However, this was not necessary since they were able to acquire all the machines required for the job in sufficient time to meet their delivery commitments. They have in their immediate vicinity a large number of tool and die companies who could supply them with the type of tools and dies that are necessary, and there are also small manufacturing plants in the area to whom they could farm out, if necessary, many of the small parts that are required for the job. They advise that they did not need the help of the American jeweled watch industry in order to make the fuse, nor did they have occasion to call upon them. In the interest of getting the job done at the earliest possible time, they called upon others for engineering advice and help, and it is interesting to note that the people they called on were Eastman Kodak, George W. Borg, King-Seeley, as well as Frankford Arsenal, who, as is generally known, have the manufacturing facilities and the engineering know-how for this family of fuses.

"It is also interesting to note that, whereas Canada may have called on us during the last war for mechanical time fuses, there is now a Canadian plant set up and self-sufficient for the manufacture of mechanical time fuses."

CONSTRUCTION OF HIGHWAYS

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 3184) to amend and supplement the Federal-Aid Road Act approved July 11, 1916 (39 Stat. 355), as amended, and supplemented, to authorize appropriations for continuing the construction of highways, and for other purposes.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, in urging the passage of Senate bill 3184, I know I am voicing the sentiments of the people of my State.

The people of Texas believe in good roads. They know the value of good roads. They long have considered good roads a sign of progress. This feeling on the part of Texans is reflected in our State's marvelous highway system.

The job of building and maintaining adequate highways is, of course, an especially big one in Texas. After all, the State of Texas makes up about one-twelfth of the total area of this country. The maintained mileage of the Texas Highway System has increased from 23,400 miles in 1940 to the 45,169 miles maintained at the beginning of this year. After we complete the additional mileage already designated and financed, the maintained mileage of the Texas Highway System will be 50,581 miles. That is well over twice the mileage of the system in 1940.

Most of this expansion has come about since the end of World War II. That is particularly true of the Texas farm-to-market road system. We now have in Texas a total of 24,295 miles of farm-to-market roads, built or designated and financed. This system has been developed principally since 1945. During the years 1950 and 1951 alone, the Texas Highway Department placed between 3,000 and 4,000 miles of farm-to-market roads under construction each year.

During the period from 1940 to 1953, travel on Texas highways more than doubled. Texas motor-vehicle registrations rose from 1,920,000 in 1941 to 3,550,000 last year. In other words, we now have almost 1 motor vehicle for every 2 Texas citizens. All the highways, roads, and streets in Texas serve 86 million vehicle-miles of travel daily.

Mr. President, I have recited these facts to show that the State of Texas has not neglected its highway system.

The passage of Senate bill 3184 would enable Texas, as it would enable all other States, to continue the program of highway progress.

Mr. President, the proposed increase in Federal aid for highways simply recognizes the fact that our national highway system is falling behind domestic civil needs. In addition, of course, an adequate highway system is vitally essential to our national defense.

It is especially noteworthy, I think, that Senate bill 3184 would provide six times as much money for the interstate highway system as is provided under the present law—$150 million annually, as compared with the $25 million annually now provided.

The increase in Federal aid would not be confined to the interstate system. Primary roads, secondary roads, urban highways—all would receive more Federal aid than at present.

As compared with the present law, Senate bill 3184 provides $910 million a year for the Federal-aid highway systems, as against $575 million as of today. The increase is, in my opinion, fully justified.

Highway engineers say that the United States now has a $35 billion deficiency in highway improvements. In my own State, the grand total of our highways' needs is estimated by Dewitt Greer, our

outstandingly able State highway engineer, at $1,665,310,000.

Mr. President, the Federal aid of $910 million a year provided by Senate bill 3184—together with the sums spent by State governments and local governments—would be a long step forward in meeting the national deficiency.

We in Texas know that money spent to build and maintain good roads where they are needed is never wasted.

Because I know the situation in my own State, I would like, Mr. President, to give a brief résumé of the backlog of badly needed highway work that has been planned by the Texas Highway Department.

It is estimated that $100 million will be expended for construction and reconstruction of the Texas highway system during the present calendar year. That will exhaust all the funds that will be available to the department for the year.

In addition to projects previously programed by the Texas Highway Commission covering this sum of $100 million, a sizable list of advance planning has been authorized—particularly on the primary and interstate highway systems, both rural and urban in nature. This advance planning work, on which the Texas Highway Department has become obligated, amounts to $287,100,000 in construction work.

We have needed work on the primary and interstate highway systems in Texas amounting to $121 million, on which all the right-of-way has been secured and on which construction plans are well advanced.

We have needed construction work on the same highway systems in the amount of $23,800,000, on which some planning work has been done and some right-of-way secured.

We have construction work which has been committed in the amount of $142,300,000, on which right-of-way deeds have not yet been submitted to the county or city but on which planning work is in progress. That is the status of the Texas highway system.

Passage of S. 3184 would enable Texas, by matching Federal funds with State funds, to continue to make sound progress in building and maintaining its highway system.

Other States would be similarly affected.

Mr. President, I consider this proposed legislation to be in the public interest.

I call attention to the fact that the proposed increase in Federal aid has the backing of the President, the Bureau of the Budget, and the Bureau of Public Roads.

It has, also, the backing of the people generally—and they are the beneficiaries of good roads.

The farmer needing a good road between his farm and his market place; the merchant who draws his customers from the surrounding countryside and who receives much of his merchandise over highways from adjacent cities; the salesman whose livelihood depends upon his ability to travel swiftly and safely; the tremendous trucking industry; the millions of families who exercise the traditional American privilege of taking a 2-week traveling vacation—these, Mr. President, are the people who benefit from good roads.

We will act in their best interests by passing this bill to increase the amount of Federal highway aid made available to the several States.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, during the debate yesterday afternoon, I placed before the Senate a picture showing how the bill S. 3184 will affect the Federal highway program for 1954. I pointed out that whereas at the present time the existing law authorizes a total of $652,500,000, S. 3184 proposes a total of $1,002,000,000, an amount substantially the equivalent of the receipts from the several taxes on motor fuels. It is substantially the equivalent of what the anticipated Federal taxes on gasoline, diesel fuel, and lubricating oils will provide for the fiscal years 1956 and 1957.

In fiscal 1953, these excise taxes on motor fuels yielded $979 million, within $21 million of $1 billion. The receipts from these taxes have been increasing at the rate of 5 percent a year. So it is believed that for the fiscal years 1956 and 1957, for which the bill provides, the receipts will pass the $1 billion mark.

Mr. President, this is the 17th time a Federal-aid highway bill has been brought before Congress for consideration. These bills have provided for Federal cooperation with the States in highway building over a continuous span of 38 years, interrupted only during the war years.

The Federal-aid program has been an outstanding success. It has stimulated cooperation among the States in agreeing upon roads crossing State borders. It has aided in developing more nearly uniform road standards throughout the Nation. It has given impetus to research which leads the way toward better and safer highways. The matching features have encouraged greater progress on the State programs.

It should be remembered that Federal highway bills are not Federal construction programs. Instead, they provide a measure of Federal aid for the State and local highway programs. The States match the Federal funds, dollar for dollar, and they perform all construction work on Federal-aid roads.

Actually, the States spend much greater sums on highway work than Congress provides in Federal aid. The States not only put up their matching money, but quite a bit more. In 1953, for example, State and local governments spent $2.7 billion for road construction, and an additional $2.2 billion for maintenance and financing costs. In that year the Federal Government contributed about half a billion dollars in Federal funds—to be more precise, $515 million—whereas the States were putting up, in their programs, a total of almost $5 billion.

I have before me a table which has been prepared by Mr. S. Howard Brown, president of the contractors' division of the American Road Builders Association, which very graphically portrays the amount of highway construction, in terms of dollars, performed by the several States in the calendar year 1953. This information is based upon the actual construction under contracts awarded by the several State highway departments. Each State is listed with respect to what the total contract lettings of the State were. There then follows a column which shows the amount of State construction. Next is a column showing the amount of Federal-aid funds in connection with each of the contracts. The fourth column shows the percentage of State highway department construction under the Federal-aid program. It is a very remarkable showing.

Let me cite the example of an outstanding State. I shall refer to the State of the distinguished senior Senator from Connecticut, who I observe occupying the chair of the majority leader at the moment.

The State Highway Department of Connecticut, in 1953, let contracts totaling $11,161,000. The amount of Federal-aid funds was $3,279,000. The State's portion was $6,645,000.

This is a graphic illustration of the way in which the aid advanced by the Federal Government has stimulated expenditures by a State, and the State has provided almost twice the amount provided by the Federal Government.

In the State of Pennsylvania, contracts were let in 1953 totaling $105,366,000. The Federal-aid share of that amount was only $19,791,000. The balance of that amount was provided by either the State, counties, or cities.

I am certain the entire table will be of interest to all Members of the Senate, and I ask unanimous consent that it may be printed at this point in my remarks.

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

Influence of Federal aid on highway construction—Highway construction contracts awarded by State highway departments, calendar year 1953 [1]

State	Total State highway department construction [2]	Portion of total State construction under Federal-aid program	Federal-aid funds	Percent of State highway department construction under Federal-aid program
	Thousands	*Thousands*	*Thousands*	
Alabama	$26,892	$18,557	$9,875	69.0
Arizona	14,809	10,579	6,859	71.4
Arkansas	13,065	7,962	3,837	60.9
California	95,319	62,167	34,760	65.2
Colorado	16,403	14,117	9,782	86.0
Connecticut	11,161	6,645	3,279	60.4

[1] Estimated.
[2] Includes contracts awarded for special toll facilities and work by force account.

Influence of Federal aid on highway construction—Highway construction contracts awarded by State highway departments, calendar year 1953—Continued

State	Total State highway department construction	Portion of total State construction under Federal-aid program	Federal-aid funds	Percent of State highway department construction under Federal-aid program
	Thousands	*Thousands*	*Thousands*	
Delaware	$10,454	$6,412	$3,256	61.3
Florida	29,938	15,642	8,059	52.2
Georgia	29,543	23,107	11,835	78.2
Idaho	12,341	11,990	8,720	97.1
Illinois	90,626	53,124	27,264	58.6
Indiana	31,508	24,823	13,782	78.8
Iowa	36,648	19,540	9,860	53.3
Kansas	27,188	21,478	10,739	79.2
Kentucky	33,046	16,305	8,228	49.3
Louisiana	33,129	17,767	9,147	53.6
Maine	18,056	9,486	4,718	52.5
Maryland	26,539	9,465	7,944	36.9
Massachusetts	61,801	17,579	8,783	28.4
Michigan	56,674	33,217	16,372	58.6
Minnesota	40,587	20,833	10,799	51.3
Mississippi	17,779	15,385	8,470	86.5
Missouri	32,960	21,131	10,567	64.1
Montana	10,382	10,382	6,357	100.0
Nebraska	8,532	7,839	4,001	91.9
Nevada	5,458	5,087	4,409	93.7
New Hampshire	6,703	4,249	2,342	63.4
New Jersey	36,420	20,422	10,062	56.0
New Mexico	15,596	12,612	8,344	80.8
New York	214,489	71,151	35,746	33.2
North Carolina	37,616	18,859	9,131	50.1
North Dakota	12,913	11,740	5,855	90.9
Ohio	44,106	33,776	16,108	76.5
Oklahoma	39,987	18,348	9,401	45.9
Oregon	34,042	32,264	21,843	94.7
Pennsylvania	105,366	39,613	19,791	37.6
Rhode Island	6,403	6,159	3,079	96.2
South Carolina	19,978	11,023	6,468	55.2
South Dakota	16,710	13,760	10,111	82.3
Tennessee	45,678	20,429	10,498	44.7
Texas	105,886	59,246	32,401	55.1
Utah	9,449	7,526	5,737	79.6
Vermont	4,237	4,002	2,079	94.5
Virginia	31,436	20,694	10,408	65.8
Washington	33,716	16,768	10,012	49.7
West Virginia	27,012	12,844	6,421	47.5
Wisconsin	45,963	29,260	15,060	64.6
Wyoming	9,917	7,244	5,236	73.0
District of Columbia	2,788	1,848	963	66.3

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, good as the highway program has been in the past, we are confronted by the sad fact that there is a tremendous deficiency in our highways. Wars have interrupted the prosecution of our highway program, and today traffic has far outstripped highway capacity.

The war years took a severe toll in deterioration and obsolescence, from which we have not recovered. Now we find that about 64 percent of the Federal-aid system roads need improvement. That improvement will cost altogether about $35 billion. The best efforts at all levels of government, over a considerable period of time, will be needed to bring our highways up to standard so that they can handle today's traffic of 55 million vehicles.

Members of the committee feel that the Federal Government should now move to meet the great highway deficiency. The increased sums we have proposed in Federal aid will of themselves help to a certain extent. Moreover, we expect that these increases will further spur the States to greater efforts so that the actual effect will go considerably beyond the amounts of the increases.

We feel that if we authorize Federal aid in approximately the total amount of the Federal taxes collected on gasoline, diesel fuel, and lubricating oils we will be giving States an example of good faith and responsibility that will encourage them a great deal.

In that connection, I should like to repeat, for the attention of the Members now on the floor, the increases provided under the several categories. The Federal primary system today gets $247,500,000. We are proposing to increase that to $342 million, representing an increase of almost $100 million for the Federal primary system.

Under our proposal, an increase is provided for the secondary system from $165 million to $228 million.

The urban system presently gets $137,500,000. We are proposing to increase that to $190 million.

In all 3 of these systems, the Federal primary, Federal secondary, and Federal urban, we are proposing to increase the amounts from the present total of $550 million to $760 million.

In addition to that, the committee is reporting a sixfold increase for the interstate system, which is now at the level of $25 million. We propose to increase that to $150 million.

There are several significant differences between S. 3184 and the bill recently passed by the House of Representatives.

In the first place, the Senate bill provides a billion dollars instead of a total of $875 million, as I have previously pointed out.

In the second place, the Senate bill contains no provision, such as the House bill contains, making the entire interstate highway authorization contingent on continuance of the 2-cent Federal excise tax on gasoline. The committee felt this would be a bad legislative precedent, making the authorization contingent on certain revenues, whether they come from sales of gasoline or perfume or household appliances. We felt it would be a bad precedent for our highway system, linking the program with a certain class of revenues, without regard for needs. Highway officials are practically unanimous in their fierce opposition to the principle of "linkage." And we felt it would be reckless, risking the entire interstate system—which needs improvements most desperately, according to the great bulk of testimony given us, and which needs Federal encouragement most particularly—on a single tax item.

In the third place, the Senate bill contains no provision, such as the House bill contains, allowing transfer of up to 25 percent of the amount apportioned to any State from one system—primary, secondary, or urban—to another system. There was no evidence to show that the present percentages of apportionment have brought about excessive development of one system at the expense of the others. Permission to transfer funds might deprive any single system of as much as 50 percent of its funds.

In that connection I invite the attention of the Members of the Senate to page 9 of the committee report.

The 25-percent provision, it will be noted, could be applied two ways. Twenty-five percent could be taken from the urban system and 25 percent from the primary system, and that could be put on the secondary system. If that were done, the secondary system would be increased 50 percent by taking 25 percent from each of the other systems. Or 25 percent could be taken from the primary system and 25 percent from the secondary system, and that 50 percent could be applied to the urban system. I believe the House bill contains a provision that the total amount transferred shall not exceed 25 percent. However, that could be done in any one of three ways, depending on the attitude of the highway commission, the governor, or the legislature of the State involved, whoever would make the determination as to the transfer. So the committee felt that such a provision disturbing the existing relationship between the systems should not be adopted without conclusive evidence to show its necessity.

I should now like to invite the attention of the Senate for a few moments to the proposal with respect to the interstate system and its apportionment. This is doubtless a matter the Senate will want to consider carefully. The interests of all the States are affected by the formulas for apportionment and by the ratios of matching.

The first thing which should be understood is that the bill proposes no change whatsoever in (a) the proportionate relationship between the amounts authorized for the primary, secondary, and urban systems, our regular traditional highway network, or (b) the method of apportionment to the States for these systems, or (c) the Federal-aid matching ratio for these systems.

The primary, secondary, and urban systems will each receive the same percentage as in the past of the total authorization for the three, that is, 45 percent for the primary, 30 percent for the secondary, and 25 percent for the urban. The total authorization will be apportioned to the States exactly as before, and matched on a 50–50 basis as before.

The total authorizations will be apportioned exactly as before, under what we call section 21. That is, one-third on the basis of population, one-third on the basis of road mileage, and one-third on the basis of area. The primary and secondary systems will be apportioned on that basis.

The only change affecting the primary, secondary, and urban systems is the proposal to authorize substantially larger amounts for each than previous Federal-aid highway acts—a total of $760 million compared to $550 million in the 1952 act.

The changes in the formula for apportionment and in matching ratio apply only to the sharply increased authorization for the interstate system, in the amount of $150 million.

There is no thought whatsoever, and I wish to stress this as much as the RECORD can show it is stressed, that this difference in the interstate system should be a precedent for extending a new formula for apportionment or a new matching ratio to the regular systems—primary, secondary, and urban. Quite the contrary. Most likely the present formulas and the present ratio will remain intact for many, many years.

It is also true that every State will receive a greater total for all the systems combined than has been appropriated heretofore. A total for each of the States will be found at pages 5 and 6 of the report accompanying the bill.

In dealing with the interstate system, however, the committee believes we face an emergency, because of which there were several new proposals, all backed with strong and logical arguments.

One proposal was that the amount of authorization for the interstate system be greatly increased from $25 million, as authorized in 1952. The argument based on need could not be denied. The committee considered recommending an authorization of $100 million, and also considered recommending an authorization of $200 million, as proposed in the bill as passed by the House of Representatives. Finally we settled upon an authorization of $150 million, and that is what now is proposed.

The second proposal was that the interstate system funds be apportioned to the States on the basis of population alone. This was strongly urged by the American Association of State Highway Officials, the American Automobile Association, and many other groups interested in highway legislation from a national point of view. We compromised on this issue, and accepted the House provision, proposing that half of the interstate authorization—or $75 million—be apportioned on the basis of population, and that the other half be apportioned according to the traditional formula incorporating area, mileage, and population.

Of the total Federal-aid authorization of $910 million, the new method of apportionment affects, therefore, only $75 million.

Another proposal was that the Federal-aid ratio for matching on the interstate system be changed from the traditional 50–50 basis, in recognition of the greater Federal interest in this "backbone" system of highway and the greater cost, due to the higher standards of construction required.

At one time a 75–25 percent ratio was used when the strategic network was begun; and there was some suggestion to use it again, so as to make it easier, or, one might say, more attractive for the States to match the Federal funds and to use their available funds in building the interstate system. But this would also mean a smaller total amount spent on Federal-aid interstate road construction than if the States had to match on a 50–50 basis. That is to say, assuming an authorized appropriation of $150 million for interstate highways, on the 50–50 basis the States would have to put up another $150 million, making a total of $300 million. On the other hand, on the 75–25 percent basis, the States would have to put up only $50 million, making a total of $200 million available.

Thus, as the Senator from Kansas will see, we would have $100 million less for construction of the interstate highways.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from South Dakota yield to me?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. PAYNE in the chair). Does the Senator from South Dakota yield to the Senator from Kansas?

Mr. CASE. I am happy to yield to the Senator from Kansas.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, I am very much interested in the highway program. I think I understand the distribution of funds among the States in the case of primary, secondary, and urban highways, but I am not so familiar with the distribution of funds in connection with the interstate system.

As I understood the Senator from South Dakota, he said we had been providing $25 million for the interstate highway fund, and now it is proposed that the fund be increased to $150 million, to be allocated under a new formula. Let me ask what the old formula was or how was the fund previously distributed?

Mr. CASE. The present fund of $25 million is distributed on the three-way basis of area, population, and mileage. For example, to state the matter specifically, on pages 5, 6, and 7 of the report there are tables which give the apportionment of the $25 million, under the 1952 act, for each of the States; and on pages 5 and 6 there is another table showing the apportionment of $75 million on a population basis, and $75 million according to section 21 of the Federal Highway Act, making a total of $150 million.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from South Dakota yield further to me?

Mr. CASE. I am happy to yield.

Mr. CARLSON. I wish the Senator from South Dakota would clarify the question of distribution of the funds for the interstate highway system and the amount of funds on a percentage basis which the States will be required to match. It would help me very materially if the Senator from South Dakota would do that.

Mr. CASE. First, let us consider the total. If the amount is matched on a 50–50 basis—the normal basis of matching—obviously, $150 million provided by the Federal Government would call for a total of $150 million to be put up by the several States, so there would be provided a total of $300 million for the interstate system.

If the matching occurs on a 75–25 percent basis, the Federal Government would put up $3 for each dollar the States put up; in other words, the Federal Government would put up a total of $150 million, and the States would put up a total of $50 million, making a grand total of $200 million.

However, the committee compromised on a 60–40 percent matching basis, which means that the Federal Government would put up $6 for every $4 put up by the States. The intent is thereby to have the Federal Government provide a substantial part of the cost of the interstate system.

In the case of the interstate system 3 or 4 elements of cost are greater than in the case of either the primary or the secondary systems. The first is that the rights of way required for the selected roads of the interstate system are, in many instances, higher in cost than are the normal rights-of-way.

The second is that a great part of the interstate system connects the capitals or the large cities of the country. Therefore, that system reflects a heavier flow of traffic, which, in turn, requires a heavier base course, heavier paving, wider highways, and other elements which enter into the situation—as, for instance, signaling and cloverleaf designs for access to the highways. All of them result in higher cost.

Recognizing, therefore, that the tendency of some State commissions might be to use their funds for matching in connection with either the normal primary or secondary systems, it was the opinion of the committee that by offering the funds on a 60–40 percentage basis, the States would be attracted or persuaded to use their available funds for matching for the interstate roads, and thereby help complete the interstate system.

I also invite the attention of the Senate to the chart appearing on the easel at the rear of the Chamber. It shows a map of the United States, on which is displayed the interstate system. By examining the map, Senators can determine the recognized interstate system for their States and all other States.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from South Dakota yield further?

Mr. CASE. I am happy to yield to the Senator from Kansas.

Mr. CARLSON. As I have stated, I have had some experience, as Governor of a State, in dealing with primary, secondary, and urban highways. However,

the interstate system is comparatively new.

I can very well appreciate the need of funds for this type of highway, because of the greatly increased cost of construction in certain areas which are densely populated and highly developed, and for other reasons.

I wonder whether the proposals of the committee in respect to the interstate system and the basis of distribution of funds the Senator from South Dakota has mentioned had the approval of the State highway commissions and others interested in the construction of such highways.

Mr. CASE. The Association of Highway Officials wanted to go further than the committee went; that is, they wanted an appropriation of $200 million by the Federal Government to be authorized, and they wanted all the funds to be distributed on the basis of population. However, the committee felt that it would be a little abrupt to make that much of a change in the apportioning plan; and, as I have stated, the committee voted for the adoption of the 60–40 plan.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, will the Senator from South Dakota yield to me?

Mr. CASE. I yield.

Mr. MARTIN. Is it not true that the bill as passed by the House of Representatives provides for authorization of an appropriation of $200 million, and that provision probably was based on the suggestion of the Association of Highway Officials?

Mr. CASE. I think that is correct; the House accepted that recommendation.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from South Dakota yield further to me?

Mr. CASE. I am happy to yield.

Mr. CARLSON. I appreciate the problems involved in connection with the expansion of our highway program, and I am somewhat familiar with them.

I believe that we in Kansas, because of some previous State highway legislation and because of funds we have available, will be able to match all the money authorized by this bill.

One thing about which I am concerned is the possibility that in the future we shall provide a new formula for the distribution of highway funds. Does the Senator from South Dakota feel that in connection with this bill we might be setting a pattern for the interstate system which eventually would extend to the primary, secondary, and urban highway systems?

Mr. CASE. No; I do not accept that as a likelihood.

The reason for that is that one must consider the purposes of the several systems.

The purpose of the secondary system is to provide farm-to-market roads, and it would be practically impossible to provide an aid program for farm-to-market roads on the basis of population and serve that particular system.

The primary road system serves the particular purpose of creating in every State roads which will connect the principal cities and county seats and will develop a degree of highway standardization which will cause the highways of one State to conform to or be similar to those of other States.

As the Senator from Kansas examines the map in the rear of the Chamber, he will see that in connection with the interstate system, there are some very large open spaces. If we did not have a Federal-aid primary program we would not have any highways of very high standard in the large open spaces. As the Senator knows, the States of Kansas, Nebraska, South Dakota, and North Dakota, which are in the central part of the country, do not have a great network of interstate roads. They must have a primary road program if they are to have good roads between the county seats and the principal cities. So a distribution on the basis of population alone would not serve the primary system, and would not serve the secondary system. The Senator from South Dakota very definitely feels that there will never be any acceptance by the Senate Committee on Public Works of a proposal to apply a population basis for the distribution of either the primary or the secondary road money.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. CASE. I yield.

Mr. CARLSON. I wish to take this opportunity to express my personal appreciation to the Committee on Public Works, which brings this important piece of highway legislation to the floor of the Senate. I think the amount of the proposed increase is well in keeping with the need for highway construction, in view of the rapidly increasing number of automobiles and trucks on our highways. From the standpoint of using the revenue which is obtained from the gasoline tax, or at least a greater proportion of it, the bill is in keeping with modern times. In 1950 I was chairman of the governors' conference. In that year and in previous years we called the attention of the Congress of the United States to the fact that we were collecting $1 billion or more in gasoline taxes and using probably $500 million for highway work, the balance going into the Federal Treasury for General Government expenses. I believe that the proposal to use a greater proportion of the revenue from the gasoline tax for highway purposes is a forward step.

I wish to commend the junior Senator from South Dakota and the committee. I think they have rendered the country a great service in bringing this piece of proposed legislation to the floor of the Senate.

Mr. CASE. The Senator's very generous remarks are deeply appreciated. In response, I should like to emphasize a little further the reason for the apportionment proposed with respect to interstate highways. In that connection, I invite the attention of Senators to the table which appears on page 66 of the hearings. The table shows the designated mileage of the interstate system for each of the States, the cost of the work needed to complete the interstate system, and the percentage of cost which is represented by the work to be accomplished in each State. It also shows the population, percentagewise, and the percentage of apportionment under section 21, together with the apportionment on a population basis.

The reason for including this table in the RECORD is that Members of the Senate may determine the ratio of proposed funds to the amount of work to be done.

There are 2 or 3 States to which attention should be invited, because they make the whole point.

In California, for example, the cost of the work to be accomplished would be $1,169,427,000. That is 10.38 percent of the cost of the total interstate system. Ten percent of the cost of the interstate system would be expended in completing the system in California. Yet if we were to apportion the money on the basis of section 21—the old three-way division—California would receive but 4.74 percent of the money, less than half the amount necessary to complete the system.

The same thing is approximately true in Pennsylvania, where the cost of the interstate system to be completed represents 8.22 percent of the dollars required for the total system. Apportionment under section 21 would mean only 4.05 percent, representing less than half of the dollars required, proportionately, to complete the system.

Almost the same thing is true in Illinois. Perhaps the situation is a little worse in that State, because Illinois has 7.60 percent of the cost, but the apportionment under section 21 would provide only 3.98 percent.

It so happens that in my State apportionment under the old formula would give us slightly more in dollars than the compromise formula proposed by the committee; but it must be remembered that the interstate system is a national system, designed to meet a national need in a time of emergency. We are thinking in terms of building highways which will make it possible to transport huge quantities of material for national defense, and also, if need be, to provide ways for people to get out of cities or into cities, according to the developments of any particular situation. So I feel that the interstate system is amply justified in the amounts and on the basis proposed.

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

Mr. CASE. I yield.

Mr. MARTIN. What would be the total cost of the interstate system according to present estimates?

Mr. CASE. The estimates for the cost of the work needed to complete the system show a total of $11,266,372,000.

Mr. MARTIN. How much is it proposed to appropriate in this bill?

Mr. CASE. One hundred and fifty million dollars.

Mr. MARTIN. Has the Senator made an estimate as to how many years would be required to complete the system at this rate of appropriation?

Mr. CASE. Assuming that the States put up $4 for each $6 the Federal Government puts up, $250 million is one-fourth of a billion, and it would require 4 years to get $1 billion. Eleven billion dollars would require 44 years.

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

Mr. CASE. I yield to the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. POTTER. How much revenue does the Government receive from the Federal gas tax and the automobile and other excise taxes which are included in the formula for highway allotment?

Mr. CASE. For the year 1953 the Federal Government received $979 million in excise taxes on gasoline, diesel fuel oil, and lubricating oil.

Mr. POTTER. How much does the bill contemplate giving back to the States in grants for highway construction?

Mr. CASE. The bill contemplates a total of $1,002,000,000. That is practically the equivalent of what the excise taxes will produce for the years to which the bill is applicable. The bill is really an authorization for the fiscal years 1956 and 1957. Receipts have been increasing at a rate between 5 and 10 percent a year, so we feel that the $979 million received in the fiscal year 1953 will reach $1 billion in 1956 and 1957.

Mr. POTTER. So it is anticipated that nearly 100 percent of the Federal excise taxes on gasoline and lubricating oil will go back to the States for highway purposes.

Mr. CASE. That is the intent of the bill.

Possibly I should clarify that answer in one respect. The total of the Federal-aid programs is $910 million. The bill authorizes $90 million for roads on Federal lands, such as park roads, forest roads and trails, and Indian roads. The total of $910 million plus $90 million makes an even $1 billion. Then there is authorized $2½ million for roads on public lands. The total is the equivalent of the amount received from the special excise taxes.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks the table to which I have referred.

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

National system of interstate highways

State	Mileage	Percent of mileage	Cost of work needed [1]	Percent of cost	Population, percent	Apportionment, sec. 21	Apportionment, population basis
Alabama	890.8	2.40	$87,976	0.78	2.03	2.18	1.92
Arizona	1,136.9	3.06	92,108	.82	.50	1.54	.75
Arkansas	517.8	1.39	78,289	.69	1.27	1.71	1.19
California	1,900.5	5.11	1,169,427	10.38	7.02	4.74	6.62
Colorado	661.7	1.78	72,294	.64	.88	1.86	.83
Connecticut	262.4	.71	219,302	1.95	1.33	.65	1.26
Delaware	25.5	.07	49,428	.44	.21	.50	.75
Florida	1,141.2	3.07	115,263	1.02	1.84	1.64	1.73
Georgia	1,110.6	2.99	175,728	1.56	2.29	2.56	2.15
Idaho	616.9	1.66	50,243	.45	.39	1.28	.75
Illinois	1,540.9	4.15	856,378	7.60	5.78	3.98	5.45
Indiana	1,065.4	2.87	389,437	3.46	2.61	2.45	2.46
Iowa	670.2	1.80	78,349	.70	1.74	2.51	1.64
Kansas	701.5	1.89	89,783	.80	1.26	2.52	1.19
Kentucky	648.4	1.74	181,933	1.61	1.95	1.90	1.84
Louisiana	597.1	1.61	221,010	1.96	1.78	1.59	1.68
Maine	300.4	.81	74,171	.66	.61	.87	.75
Maryland	265.5	.71	242,278	2.15	1.55	.90	1.47
Massachusetts	335.8	.90	451,896	4.01	3.11	1.30	2.93
Michigan	962.5	2.59	416,399	3.70	4.23	3.21	3.98
Minnesota	850.5	2.29	161,511	1.43	1.98	2.72	1.87
Mississippi	691.0	1.86	88,140	.78	1.45	1.84	1.36
Missouri	1,070.8	2.88	235,284	2.09	2.62	2.97	2.47
Montana	1,243.7	3.35	116,604	1.03	.39	2.09	.75
Nebraska	460.6	1.24	48,239	.43	.88	2.00	.83
Nevada	537.3	1.45	19,568	.17	.11	1.34	.75
New Hampshire	201.0	.55	40,329	.36	.35	.50	.75
New Jersey	192.4	.52	404,053	3.59	3.21	1.34	3.02
New Mexico	1,012.5	2.72	58,110	.52	.45	1.69	.75
New York	1,034.3	2.78	862,261	7.65	9.84	4.85	9.27
North Carolina	712.7	1.92	72.857	.65	2.70	2.54	2.54
North Dakota	498.3	1.34	45,151	.40	.41	1.51	.75
Ohio	1,216.4	3.27	758,591	6.73	5.27	3.59	4.97
Oklahoma	780.1	2.10	166,418	1.48	1.48	2.21	1.40
Oregon	703.0	1.89	117,915	1.05	1.01	1.77	.95
Pennsylvania	1,356.9	3.65	926,579	8.22	6.97	4.05	6.56
Rhode Island	48.6	.13	86,008	.76	.53	.50	.75
South Carolina	697.0	1.88	119,569	1.06	1.40	1.39	1.32
South Dakota	514.7	1.39	44,835	.40	.43	1.61	.75
Tennessee	1,044.9	2.81	241,658	2.15	2.18	2.20	2.06
Texas	2,764.8	7.44	435,988	3.87	5.12	6.68	4.82
Utah	704.1	1.89	84,253	.75	.46	1.19	.75
Vermont	339.8	.91	54,419	.48	.25	.50	.75
Virginia	901.7	2.43	207,309	1.84	2.20	1.96	2.08
Washington	579.5	1.56	184,460	1.64	1.58	1.71	1.49
West Virginia	211.9	.57	206,610	1.83	1.33	1.12	1.25
Wisconsin	449.1	1.21	127,204	1.13	2.28	2.45	2.15
Wyoming	972.7	2.62	60,070	.53	.19	1.29	.75
District of Columbia	16.6	.04	180,670	1.60	.53	.50	.75
Total	37,158.9	100.00	11,266,372	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00

[1] Thousands, based on estimates by individual States, not adjusted to current price levels.

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

Mr. CASE. I yield.

Mr. CHAVEZ. The bill contains $1 billion and a few odd million for the total program, but for Federal aid the amount is only $900 million.

Mr. CASE. The amount for Federal-aid programs is $910 million. The remainder is for roads many of which are links in the interstate system or in the primary system.

At this point I think possibly I should modify the answer which I gave to the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MARTIN] a while ago when he was asking how long a time would be required to complete the interstate system. In our rough arithmetic we figured that it might require 44 years. There is one modification which should be suggested, and that is that the interstate system is the primary system, and it is possible for States to build a part of the interstate system by using primary system money. In fact, in some States that is done. Money for interstate roads can be used on the portions of the primary system which are designated as parts of the interstate system. However, it does not work both ways; that is, it is not possible to use interstate road money on all parts of the primary system, but only on the parts that are designated as interstate.

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

Mr. CASE. I yield.

Mr. MARTIN. What I wanted to do was to impress upon the Members of the Senate how far we are behind in the construction of the interstate system. I made the statement yesterday, in my brief opening remarks relative to the bill, that the important means of transportation, from the earliest days of America down to the present, has been our road system. It is not our railroads or our waterways or our airways that unite the States, but it is our interstate system of highways. The distinguished Senator from Tennessee and I were discussing that point only a moment ago.

General Washington, when he became President, saw the need of a road opening up the West from the vicinity of the National Capital. That road is now Route 50. The celebrated men of Kentucky and of Tennessee, when they came to the Capital in those early days, reached that road in the vicinity of Columbus, Ohio, and then proceeded eastward. The road plan of our country has kept the States tied together more than any other one thing.

The reason I asked my question of the distinguished Senator from South Dakota, who has done such a magnificent job relative to the road bill, was that I wanted to impress on the Members of the Senate the long period of time it will take for us to complete the interstate system, which is the basic system of transportation in our country.

Mr. CASE. The Senator from Pennsylvania properly emphasizes the point that we must step up the program if we are to get the interstate system completed in time for any of us to use it. It is true of course that the application of funds from the primary system and also from the urban system can speed it up.

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

Mr. CASE. I yield.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I wish to associate myself with the remarks of the Senator from Pennsylvania with respect to the importance of the transportation system of this country. In my opinion nothing has united the several States more than have the roads. In the Constitution and in documents and papers the term "United States of America" is used. What actually unites the United States is its roads.

I should like to ask the Senator from South Dakota a few questions about the pending bill. First, I wish to compliment him on presenting one of the finest

road bills that has ever been reported to the Senate. That is the opinion of the senior Senator from New Mexico, with reference to the bill itself. I differ, however, with the chairman of the committee and with the chairman of the subcommitee on the use of the interstate funds. Is it not a fact that up to this time, up to the time of the presentation of the pending bill, interstate money was divided under the old system, starting in 1916, on the basis of one-third population, one-third area, and one-third postal road mileage?

Mr. CASE. That is correct.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Yes. Is it not correct also that under the bill, in which the authorization for interstate roads is lifted from $25 million to $150 million, the former formula has been completely ignored, and that the additional $75 million will be divided, according to the new system, on the basis of population. Is that correct?

Mr. CASE. I would not say it was completely ignored, because section 21 applies to one-half of the amount. Whereas the State of New Mexico, under the three-way division, received $407,000, under the current authorization of $75 million divided on the old basis, New Mexico will receive $1,228,000, and out of the other $75 million it will receive an additional $552,000. So that the State of New Mexico, for example, will get $1,780,000 for its interstate highways, as against $407,000 at the present time.

Mr. CHAVEZ. That is under the present $25 million figure. Let us refer to the $150 million authorization contained in the bill, and consider it from the standpoint of New Mexico and Idaho.

Under section 21, of the $150 million authorized by this bill, New Mexico would be allocated $2,457,000. Under the committee bill, by the division it provides, New Mexico would get $1,780,000, or $677,000 less than we would get under the old formula. Let us take South Dakota, if we may, instead of Idaho. Under the old formula, South Dakota would get $2,359,000. Under the new formula it would get $1,732,000, or $627,000 less.

I am not arguing the merits of the bill. However, does not the bill go further, so far as the interstate roads are concerned, in that, besides this division, at least 35 percent of the urban money goes to interstate roads, outside this particular amount. Is that not correct?

Mr. CASE. That would depend upon where the State highway commission applied its highway money.

Mr. CHAVEZ. That is what it would do. The term interstate roads means exactly what it says. I am not arguing about the merits of the proposal. But is it not the purpose of the bill to take care of the heavily populated areas, instead of taking care of the interstate mileage?

Mr. CASE. The Senator from South Dakota cannot go quite that far.

Mr. CHAVEZ. In the State of Delaware, for example, there may be 25 miles of interstate roads, and in Rhode Island there may be 40 miles of interstate roads. In any one of the Western States—Utah, for example—there may be thousands of miles of interstate roads. Should not that fact be considered in coming to a solution as to how the interstate money should be used? I know what the Senator from Pennsylvania and the Senator from South Dakota have in mind with respect to constructing the interstate system as soon as it can be constructed, and I agree with them.

Mr. CASE. The sad truth is that if the interstate money should be apportioned strictly under the old formula of a three-way split, some States would have their interstate systems built long before they were completed in the other States. The adoption of the compromise formula is an attempt to complete the interstate system in all the States at about the same time. It will not be possible to do it, but the bill does move somewhat in that direction.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, while the Senator is on that point, may I invite his attention to page 6 of the Annual Report of the Bureau of Public Roads, which I hope he has before him. I read from the third sentence, beginning on page 6, as follows:

> In a survey of the condition of rural portions of the interstate system it was found that only 24 percent of the mileage was adequate for traffic and 76 percent was in need of improvement or reconstruction. On 16 percent of the mileage the need was considered critical.

I point that out to show that on the rural mileage of the interstate system throughout the Nation, according to the report filed for the fiscal year 1953, there is a tremendous need for construction funds. That need is not entirely congested around cities or in States containing large cities. In a real interstate system highways have to traverse large States.

I shall not further take the Senator's time, but I wanted to bring that point to his attention.

Mr. CASE. It is a very good point. There is certainly need for construction of rural mileage under the interstate system, but we should examine into what it will cost to get the job done in rural areas as well as in cities. The Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ] has already stated in the RECORD that South Dakota will receive $600,000 less if we follow the formula in the report than it would under the old formula. I do not object to that. The subject must be approached from a national standpoint and not from a State standpoint.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, will the Senator from South Dakota yield?

Mr. CASE. I yield.

Mr. GORE. Is it not true that under the bill, the secondary road system and Federal aid to the secondary road system receive maximum consideration with reference to local needs and local developments, whereas under the interstate system the bill reported by the committee maximizes the national character and need of trunk lines, giving to the Nation an integrated national system of first-class highways?

Mr. CASE. The Senator is absolutely correct.

Mr. GORE. Does the Senator see any immediate reason why the same formula which applies admirably to secondary roads should be applied to interstate roads?

Mr. CASE. The formula should reflect the purpose of the legislation.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, will the Senator from South Dakota yield further?

Mr. CASE. I yield.

Mr. STENNIS. The Senator from South Dakota makes clear that the same formula does not apply to secondary roads as to primary roads.

Mr. CASE. The formula for both primary and secondary roads is that one-third is apportioned among the States on the basis of population, one-third on the basis of mileage, and one-third on the basis of area.

Mr. STENNIS. Is it not true that one-third is based on rural population?

Mr. CASE. The formula with respect to secondary roads is based on the mileage of rural delivery and star routes, with the difference which the Senator has well pointed out.

THE FEDERAL HIGHWAY FUND FORMULA

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, will the Senator from South Dakota yield?

Mr. CASE. I yield.

Mr. MALONE. The formula would not apply on an equal basis, considering population. The population factor takes into account the amount of money needed for the primary system. The population is much greater in the large cities than in farming areas. If the intent of Congress is still being carried out in the secondary system, the only thing we do when we change the formula is to give advantage to a more thickly populated State over a thinly populated State.

Mr. CASE. Let it be clearly understood that we are not changing the formula of the primary system or of the secondary system.

Mr. MALONE. But we are changing the formula when we come to building roads with Federal aid. The system was established in the first instance to bring to the more thinly populated areas a proper proportion of the funds considering the Government land ownership with the consequent smaller population.

To change the formula, however small the appropriation to which it is applicable lays the groundwork for an extension of it next year.

Mr. CASE. We are not changing the formula of the secondary system or of the Federal primary system.

Mr. MALONE. But we are as to a part of the appropriation.

Mr. CASE. No.

Mr. MALONE. How much of it?

Mr. CASE. We are changing it with respect to $75 million out of a billion dollars.

Mr. MALONE. In any case, we are changing the formula, and the amount is relatively unimportant, because it may be increased as time goes on. We are setting a formula to be followed in the future.

Mr. CASE. For what?

Mr. MALONE. For a part of the Federal road system.

Mr. CASE. No; we are not. We are changing it only as to one-half of the interstate system.

Mr. MALONE. But it is a part of the Federal road system, and it is so designated in the authorization, is it not?

Mr. CASE. It is a part of the interstate system.

Mr. MALONE. Yes. And the interstate system is a part of the Federal highway system for which this Federal participation was inaugurated in the first place.

Mr. CASE. But that is quite different from the Federal secondary system or the other portions of the Federal primary system.

Mr. MALONE. I did not refer either to the secondary system or to the primary system. What I said was that we are setting a precedent whereby a greater proportion of the money would be allotted to the thickly populated States than they would receive under the system under which we have been operating.

Mr. CASE. I point out to the distinguished Senator from Nevada that in an effort to protect the secondary system, the committee did the very best it could with respect to the allocation of the total funds. Under the bill as passed by the House, the authorization for Federal primary, secondary, and urban roads was increased from $550 million to only $600 million; a total of $200 million was applied to the interstate system to be distributed under the new formula. We rejected that in the Senate committee and decided to increase the amount of money not merely to $600 million, but to $760 million. Where the House bill would have provided only $180 million for the Federal secondary system, we have provided $200 million and have provided for its allocation according to the old formula. Where the House would have authorized only $270 million for Federal primary roads, we authorize $342 million, and that also is to be allotted on the basis of the present formula.

Mr. MALONE. I understand that we are establishing a new formula which can be expanded by a future Congress on the basis of precedent. The one we now have we have operated under for approximately 40 years and it has been found extremely satisfactory.

Mr. CASE. Yes; and we are living in a new age, I may say to the Senator from Nevada. I came from a hearing this morning before the Committee on Armed Services, where Admiral Strauss and Admiral Radford spoke to us in terms of the age in which we are living, an age when a hydrogen bomb can blast cities such as Washington completely to pieces.

So we are trying to present to the Senate and to the American people a highway bill which takes cognizance of the age in which we are living, and which will provide for the construction of highways that will facilitate the movement of large volumes of traffic into and out of cities, a highway system which will make it possible to transport more military goods across the country on the interstate system.

Mr. MALONE. I am very glad to hear the Senator from South Dakota is proposing to do that; but if he would study the situation a little further, he might find that over ranges of mountains like the Sierra Nevadas there are single roads of two lanes which probably would become impassable or congested for many hours after a bomb threat or actual explosion had happened in San Francisco. Therefore, it is just as important to expend more money on the Federal-aid system, the primary interstate system, as on any other part of the program. I think I have some idea of the new age. We are now considering that very problem in the committee of which I am a member—chairman of the subcommittee. The Secretary of State just left the committee, and he is one of the most prominent men in the world when it comes to a discussion of the new age.

It has long been the opinion of the junior Senator from Nevada that the taxpayers of this Nation have been taken for a ride on the various schemes of worldwide expenditure of money.

Mr. CASE. May I invite the attention of the Senator from Nevada to the table appearing on page 66 of the hearings?

Mr. MALONE. The Senator from Nevada is already familiar with it.

Mr. CASE. That is where his problem is answered, because it shows the cost of the work necessary to complete the interstate system.

In the State of Nevada, the percentage of cost to complete the interstate system is 0.17 percent. That is, 2 roads across Nevada, 1 down at the tip, and the other across the wider part of Nevada.

Mr. MALONE. The secondary system is not shown.

Mr. CASE. No. We are discussing only the interstate system, so far as the changed formula is concerned. Seventy-five million dollars will be apportioned on the basis of section 21. The State of Nevada will receive 1.31 percent of the amount provided in the $75 million.

It will receive 0.75 percent under the other $75 million.

The State of Nevada will get, in terms of percentage of interstate money, about 8 or 9 times the percentage of the cost of the interstate system that will be required to complete the interstate system in Nevada.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. CASE. I yield.

Mr. MALONE. The purpose of the Federal highway system is to assist all of the States in an interstate system of highways. We are not talking about Nevada alone, or South Dakota or Rhode Island alone. As the Senator from South Dakota has said, new emergencies may arise in the future. Therefore, I merely called attention to the highway across the Sierra Nevada Mountains, to show that a State such as Nevada, and perhaps even California, could not furnish the amount of money which would be necessary to build a four-lane highway, tunnel, or any other adequate transportation necessary to get the people of coast areas to an inland State or an inland area whenever the emergency happened in Sacramento or San Francisco or any other large population center.

During the first session of the 83d Congress, the 2 Senators from California and the 2 Senators from Nevada introduced a special bill to provide funds with which to construct a 4-lane highway across the Sierra Nevada Mountains. That is only one project. There are, no doubt, hundreds of similar projects in the United States.

The formula for the interstate highways is working very well and in about the right proportion. There are 160,000 people in Nevada, and about 10 million in California. But it is estimated that if a bomb hit San Francisco, or if San Francisco or Los Angeles were threatened, the population of Nevada, provided the roads would carry the people, would be increased not merely by a few thousand, but maybe by several times, in a very short period. So the roads which are needed to evacuate the people from large population centers are not simply roads leading from the cities, but to their destination. I point out to the Senator from South Dakota that when a million people leave an area, they are going somewhere. They are simply not moving into the suburbs.

In the West, where the Senator from South Dakota also lives—and he should know something about these conditions—it is necessary to complete a road to the destination, to where the people are going, to where there are water facilities and sewage facilities. Most of Nevada and eastern California is a dry area. People cannot stop just anywhere. It is necessary for them to move on to places where they can live normally and where food is available.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Would the Senator from Nevada please speak a little louder, so that other Senators may hear his part of the discussion?

Mr. MALONE. The junior Senator from Nevada has about completed what he intended to say.

I still do not understand why it is necessary to change the formula when there is little change in the overall or complete need.

Mr. CASE. The committee wanted to help the people who desired to go into the State of Nevada, so we changed the formula in another direction. We provided matching. It is only necessary to put up, in a State which now matches on a 50–50 basis, about 40 cents out of a dollar, and the Federal Government will put up 60 cents. The State of Nevada would receive a better deal. Whereas other States would put up 50 cents on a dollar, Nevada would put up only a little more than 15 cents, because the Federal Government, because of the public lands in Nevada, would put up 84.14 cents out of each dollar. That applies also to the 60–40 provision. We have provided that on the interstate system the Federal Government will put up 60 cents, and the State of Nevada will put up 40 cents out of the dollar.

Mr. MALONE. Instead of 50 cents?

Mr. CASE. Instead of 50 cents.

Mr. MALONE. That will not help a thinly populated State such as Nevada.

Mr. CASE. Yes, it will help Nevada, because, in the application of the 60–40 ratio, it will take into consideration the public lands. So on the interstate system, the State of Nevada will put up

about 13 cents, and Uncle Sam will put up 87 cents.

Mr. MALONE. That is another pain to the Western States, because of the control which has been asserted over public lands by the Department of the Interior for more than 20 years. Eighty-seven percent of the land in Nevada is under the supervision of the Department of the Interior, and we in Nevada do not like that. For 22 years the policy has been that the public owns these lands and is entitled to the income from them. So the Government rents the lands to the stockmen and charges all the traffic will bear. Then the Federal Government distributes the money to the entire public throughout the 48 States.

But that is another question which may be debated at length on the Senate floor at some future time. However, so long as the Government insists on holding those lands, and no method has been worked out and approved by Congress to put those lands in the hands of the private owners and taxpayers in family-sized units, then why object to the provision that a State, with every acre of it in taxable property, except Government monuments or parks, must put up 50 percent? Even when every acre is taxed, they get 50 percent free in matching funds, and they only match the additional 50 percent.

In Nevada and, of course, in other public land States, where there is a much lesser amount of land privately owned, the same condition prevails. What the bill does then, when we finally add it up, is to encroach on the initial formula and set a precedent for penalizing the States where the Government owns the major part of the land.

The original formula compensated, at least in part, for that condition.

Mr. CASE. This might be a good place to point out, also, that the bill reported by the Senate committee increases the funds for forest highways, roads, and trails, for park roads and parkways, for Indian roads, and public land roads. The House bill would continue such authorizations as they are at present. The Senate bill increases each of those by from 10 to 15 percent, according to the various funds.

Mr. MALONE. I think that is a very laudable thing to do, but it has nothing to do with the initial formula or the way in which it has been changed.

Mr. CASE. There are some other special features of the bill to which I desire to call attention very briefly; then I shall yield the floor. One feature is with respect to secondary roads. It was the feeling of many persons who came before the committee that the States should be afforded greater latitude in the application of their secondary highway money. So the committee adopted language proposed by the House, with some modifications. It appears on page 3 of the bill, as follows:

Provided further, That in the case of those sums apportioned to any State for projects on the Federal-aid secondary highway system, the Secretary of Commerce may discharge his responsibility relative to the plans, design, inspection, and construction of such secondary road projects by his receiving and approving a certified statement by the State highway department setting forth that the plans, design, and construction for such projects are in accord with the standards and procedures of the respective States applicable to projects in this category approved by him in accordance with the objectives set forth in section 1 (b) of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1950, and containing satisfactory assurances that such projects will be maintained in accordance with existing law.

The general movement, which has been endorsed by highway officials in a majority of the States, that the States should have a greater voice in secondary projects, was written into the bill in the House. But in the Senate committee we have added language to make it clear that the objectives of the project shall be substantially those set forth in the Federal Aid Highway Act of 1950; and further there is set forth a specific requirement that those certifications shall include a statement that the projects will be maintained by the States.

The States are given much greater latitude than they had previously in the handling of secondary highway funds. I think it is the feeling of the Bureau of Public Roads that the bill will relieve them of some of their responsibility, and will result in a considerable saving of administrative funds, and will permit the States to vary the designs of roads according to the traffic needs. In some States secondary roads seem to have the same traffic needs as primary roads, but in other States the traffic on secondary roads varies a great deal.

There is another provision in the bill on "Studies." It proposes that the Bureau of Public Roads, or the Secretary of Commerce through the Commissioner of Public Roads, shall study the problem of highway financing, including that of toll roads.

The bill also requires that the Bureau shall engage in a program of research designed to determine which materials will improve the quality of roads and the number of roads the Government will get for its money. The research provision is a broad one. It is one adapted from a suggestion by the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON] in the bill which he introduced. We are hopeful that it will yield real benefit for the consideration of the committee in the next highway act.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, will the Senator from South Dakota yield?

Mr. CASE. I yield to the Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. MARTIN. Will not the research also include a study of soil conditions, and materials which could be used to best advantage in the various States; not only materials which are used in building roads, but consideration of the soil conditions, drainage, and factors of that kind, which have to do with the construction of permanent highways?

Mr. CASE. It is true that the provision with regard to research is very broad, and that it includes what the Senator from Pennsylvania has so well pointed out.

Another provision which appears in the Senate bill and not in the House bill, which has attracted considerable interest, is section 13, which appears on page 12 of the bill and reads as follows:

At any time that the President may determine that the level of national employment is such as to warrant an increase in the volume of highway construction, he is hereby authorized to advance the effective date of any authorizations in this act, except the authorization in sections 7 and 8, to a date not more than 1 year earlier than the dates which would otherwise become effective.

Sections 7 and 8 refer to the Inter-American Highway and the so-called Rama Road.

With respect to authorizations in the bill for the Federal aid systems to the States, or for the building of roads on Federal lands, the President, by this paragraph in the bill, would be authorized to advance the authorization date by a year. In other words, the authorization for 1956 could be made available following July 1, 1954, which would begin the fiscal year 1955.

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

Mr. CASE. I yield to the Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. MARTIN. Does that not bring into effect the principle which a great number of people have advocated over the years, that the time to have public works is when there is unemployment and a lesser amount of what we call private business than in the ordinary years, because the public then would get more to show for its dollars than in the years when there exists large employment and large business enterprises?

Mr. CASE. The Senator from Pennsylvania is correct. It might be noted that the Council of Economic Advisers has stated that in a public-works program, roads should come first. Roads would extend their doorways to every portion of the country and would be a constructive project because we would have something to show for the money spent.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President——

Mr. CASE. I yield to the Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator from South Dakota a question. Is it not a fact that the interstate system is just a part of the primary road system?

Mr. CASE. Yes, I suppose it could be said that all of the interstate system is part of the primary system, but the primary system is larger than the interstate system.

Mr. CHAVEZ. When funds are being discussed for interstate roads, why should particular attention be paid to 3 or 4 States, instead of to the country as a whole?

Mr. CASE. We are not paying attention to only 3 or 4 States; we are paying attention to the problem of getting the interstate system completed.

Mr. CHAVEZ. There is no difference between building a two-lane road in New Mexico and one in Connecticut, so far as costs are concerned. There is no difference between building a four-lane road in Colorado and one in Pennsylvania. Is it not correct to say that by the proposed legislation we would be

asking 29 States of the Union to sacrifice themselves, so far as their revenues are concerned, in order to please 11 or 12 States?

Mr. CASE. The Senator from South Dakota cannot quite accept the statement of the Senator from New Mexico, because I am sure an examination of the source of the revenues would hardly justify the statement that we are asking 29 States to dig up for the other States. As a matter of fact, I think the formula proposed will more nearly return revenues to the States of origin than would be the case under the old formula.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Is it not correct to say that the original bill introduced by the chairman of the Subcommittee on Roads of the Committee on Public Works contains a new formula?

Mr. CASE. That is correct. The Senator from South Dakota voted with the Senator in the committee because he was looking at the situation from the standpoint of South Dakota, I suppose. Having increased the funds for secondary and primary roads to the extent we did, the Senator from South Dakota thought we had done a fair job for the States as a whole, and recognized the proposal of the interstate system as a suggestion of a system of national highways, and so he was constrained to support the bill reported by the subcommittee.

There are a couple of other special provisions in the bill upon which I should like to comment. One is the cost of relocation of utilities. We probably had more testimony on the cost of utility relocation than on any other new subject. The committee received many letters and statements, and many witnesses appeared before the committee on the subject. We also had many telephone calls, because telephone companies were also interested. The cost of utility relocation is particularly burdensome when it falls upon municipalities or small utility companies such as telephone, gas, electric, and water companies. But the problem we had was that we were being asked to have Uncle Sam take over the cost of the utility relocations in States where the State legislatures themselves refused to recognize such costs as fair costs of such projects.

In that connection, the distinguished senior Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON] made a suggestion.

At this point, let me say, parenthetically, that I regretted I was called to the railroad station yesterday afternoon, and could not be in the Chamber to join in the tributes which we paid to his integrity, his very fine service, and his high character, and to have expressed my personal regret at his decision to retire.

Mr. President, the distinguished senior Senator from Colorado suggested to the bill an amendment to which the committee gave consideration. That amendment proposed that the Federal Government pay the utility relocation costs out of the Federal aid funds, up to 5 percent. A study was made by the League of Municipalities—I believe that was the name of the organization—which determined that the average cost of utility relocations amounted to 4.81 percent of the cost of projects—which seems very high.

I suggested to the committee, as a compromise, that we recognize one-half of the cost of such relocations, and permit up to 3 percent of the funds apportioned to any particular project to be used to liquidate that cost. But we encountered the argument that it seemed hardly justifiable for the United States Government to pay utility relocation costs in States where the State legislatures had refused to recognize those costs as part of the fair costs of the projects.

Under present law, if a State recognizes the cost of relocating a gas main, or a telephone line, or any other public utility as a fair part of the cost of such a project, then it is submitted to the Bureau of Public Roads; and the Federal Government pays its proportionate share of the total cost of the project. The committee felt that in view of that fact, we should not go further at this time.

So the bill contains a provision requiring that a study be made of that particular subject by the Bureau of Public Roads, and that the results of the study be submitted to the committee at the earliest possible date, for consideration in connection with the next highway bill.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado rose.

Mr. CASE. I yield to the Senator from Colorado.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I thank the Senator from South Dakota.

First, Mr. President, I wish to thank the Senator from South Dakota for the nice things he has said about me personally and about my retirement. I wish to say to him that my decision not to seek reelection was one of the hardest decisions I have ever made, and the hardest one which I believe I shall ever be called upon to make. Of course, one never knows whether he will be reelected, but I decided not to seek reelection.

Mr. CASE. Most of us had a suspicion that if the Senator from Colorado wished to be reelected, he would be.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I appreciate what the Senator from South Dakota says.

Mr. CASE. That is considerable candor for a Republican.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. The Senator from South Dakota has been very kind to me. I recall, too, with a great deal of satisfaction and pleasure, that in the closing days of the 80th Congress, a great favor was done to me and to the State of Colorado, when the Senator from South Dakota made it possible for the first woman superintendent of the Denver Mint to occupy that office. She rendered very capable and splendid service; and the women of Colorado especially appreciate what the Senator from South Dakota did in regard to that matter.

Mr. President, the Senator from South Dakota has discussed the amendment I submitted and the study which is to be made. I should like to have his attention and also the attention—as I know I shall—of the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MARTIN], who is in charge of the bill.

Section 10 of Senate bill 3184 directs that a study be made of the problem of reimbursing from Federal funds the costs incurred by publicly owned and privately owned utilities in relocating their facilities in order to accommodate Federal-aid highways. However, on page 13 of the committee's report, in paragraph 2, the following statement is made; and it is with reference to that statement that I am anxious to have the attention of the members of the committee:

> It is clear that such inequities as may exist are due to relationships between the utilities and the State or local governments rather than relationships with the Federal Government. It would seem neither feasible nor desirable for the Federal Government to give direction to those local relationships by force of application of Federal funds.

I understand that language reflects the views expressed by the Commissioner of Public Roads, in opposition to the proposal of the utility owners and operators. If the language I have just read or any other portion of the report amounts to a prejudgment of the issues presented, then the making of the study, at considerable expense in time and funds to the governmental agencies and utilities, would appear to be useless.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President——

Mr. CASE. I yield to the Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. MARTIN. Let me suggest to the Senator from South Dakota that if the next paragraph of the report is read, I think it may answer the question of the distinguished Senator from Colorado.

Mr. CASE. And in that connection I hope the Senator from Colorado will read the last sentence, particularly, of the following paragraph.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I have read it, and I am not entirely satisfied with it. I do not know that I completely understand it in the way the members of the committee do.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, in connection with that matter, I should like to read into the RECORD the sentence to which attention has just been directed.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Yes.

Mr. CASE. It is as follows:

> The committee feels, however, that it would be helpful to have a thorough study and analysis of all factors relating to this problem, including estimates of costs and anlyses of existing State laws and regulations. It has therefore approved language calling for such a study, with a report to be made to the President for transmittal to Congress not later than February 1, 1955.

That is an early date.

The report at this point concludes with the following:

> It is expected that this study will be conducted on the basis of impartial facts and objectivity.

Mr. President, I do not recall any personal expression of opinion by the Commissioner of Public Roads in regard to this matter. I think I could probably find it.

In any event, whatever his personal opinion may be, let me say clearly and definitely for the record what the committee report says:

> It is expected that this study will be conducted on the basis of impartial facts and objectivity.

It is not to be a study with any intent to come to an anticipated conclusion; but the study is designed to develop the facts, in order to find out, under the various State laws, what the costs would be if the Federal Government were to take some direct action in this regard, to ascertain what the relationships are, to explore the subject, and to make a report not later than February 1, 1955.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I am pleased to have the Senator from South Dakota say that, because if a fair and impartial study of the problem is to be made, I think it would be most unfortunate for the position of either side to the controversy to be prejudiced or encouraged. I think we must approach the matter with a completely open mind. That is what I was worried about when I read into the RECORD the paragraph to which I referred a moment ago.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from South Dakota yield at this point, so that I may make, for the RECORD, a statement along the same line?

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

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Of course.

Mr. HOLLAND. Speaking as one of the minority members of the subcommittee which studied this matter, I wish to assure the distinguished Senator from Colorado that it was our understanding that the study would be objective and impartial, and would be made for the purpose of informing the committee of what could be done. So far as the senior Senator from Florida is concerned, he was rather surprised when he saw the earlier wording which has been read, and which appears in this particular part of the report, but he assumes that that is simply the expression of what the committee would have had to do at this stage without further information about the situation which developed, which was this: The State laws were so different, and the study we had made was so imperfect that there was no clear road open at that stage, and we were asking for a complete study to be made, and a report to be made available, in the hope that there would be a clear road open by which we could bring some relief in the situation which is disturbing the Senator from Colorado.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. And without any preconceived conclusion or prejudice of any kind.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. CASE. I yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. The Senator from Colorado is correct. We would have had to act adversely, I think, if we had acted on the basis of such imperfect information as we had at the time. I prefer to consider the earlier recitals in this particular section of the report as simply reflecting that fact. I think the later recitals, in which we ask for information, and in which we ask the Senate to add to the bill a provision for a study and report, are the real meat of the finding of the committee. We needed light, and felt that this was the way to get it. If such light should show us the way by which we could properly make relief available, I believe the committee would not hesitate to provide it.

Mr. CASE. The Senator from South Dakota appreciates the additional statement of the Senator from Florida.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. One other matter which disturbed the Senator from Colorado is the fact that in his testimony in response to the questions which were propounded to the Commissioner of Public Roads, he seemed to indicate a particular, definite conclusion with respect to the entire subject. I should like to ask Senators if they would object to an amendment to section 10 of Senate bill 3184 which would direct the Secretary of Commerce, rather than the Commissioner of Public Roads, to conduct the study proposed in section 9 of the companion House bill. Are Senators wedded to the idea that the Commissioner of Public Roads should make the proposed study? I am afraid the Commissioner is prejudiced. I gain that impression from what he said before the committee, as contained in the record of hearings.

Mr. CASE. Frankly, I do not know whether the words "Commissioner of Public Roads" were used selectively or not, but I ask the Senator from Colorado if he thinks he would be in any better position if the study were made by the Secretary of Commerce than if it were made by the Commissioner of Public Roads.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I think it would be better if it were made by the Secretary of Commerce rather than by the Commissioner of Public Roads, because, in my opinion, the Commissioner of Public Roads is in many instances a party to the controversies which are involved. Probably it is to be expectd that he should be prejudiced. He lives within a small empire. The building of roads is a small empire, and he is a party to it. I should like to see the study made by someone who is not so intimately involved in the subject to be studied as is the Commissioner of Public Roads.

Mr. CASE. Speaking only for myself as one member of the committee, personally I should have no objection to the change. However, I should wish to consult with other members of the committee. There may be some reason for having the study made by the Commissioner of Public Roads. Generally speaking, it may be said that there has been considerable freedom in using the Secretary of Commerce and the Commissioner of Public Roads interchangeably. That practice runs through Federal highway legislation over a period of years. The Secretary of Commerce is referred to in this bill because the Bureau of Public Roads is in the Department of Commerce. At one time the Bureau was an independent agency. At another it was in the Department of Agriculture. At one time it was a part of the Federal Works Agency.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CASE. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Do I correctly understand that there would be no objection to an amendment to section 10 so as to provide for the study to be made by the Secretary of Commerce rather than by the Commissioner of Public Roads?

Mr. CASE. So far as the Senator from South Dakota is personally concerned, he has no objection. However, before agreeing to an amendment of that sort I should like to confer with the chairman of the Public Works Committee and the ranking members on the minority side.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I thank the Senator. I hope he will confer with the chairman and the other members of the committee.

Mr. CASE. In any event, whatever the language may be, let it be clearly understood that what we want is an impartial objective study.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. That is a very refreshing statement. I thank the Senator.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, will the Senator from South Dakota yield to me?

Mr. CASE. I yield.

Mr. MARTIN. Before the Senator from Colorado leaves the Chamber, let me say to him that I concur in what the distinguished Senator from South Dakota has said relative to the proposed study. It is the intention of the committee that a thorough, impartial study be made of this subject. The committee was very much confused by some of the testimony which it received. It makes no difference to me whether the study is to be made by the Secretary of Commerce or the Commissioner of Public Roads.

TRIBUTES TO SENATOR JOHNSON OF COLORADO

While I am on my feet, let me say that I did not have the privilege of being present yesterday afternoon when several of my colleagues spoke relative to the services of our distinguished colleague, the senior Senator from Colorado. I wish to say publicly that I am extremely sorry the distinguished Senator from Colorado has seen fit to remove himself from this body. I agree with the Senator from South Dakota. I believe that if the Senator from Colorado were to be a candidate he would be reelected. I have served with him on the Finance Committee since coming to the Senate. I appreciate our association very much. The Senator from Colorado has helped me on numerous occasions. My prayer is that he and his fine wife may enjoy many more years of health and happiness.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, will the Senator from South Dakota yield to me?

Mr. CASE. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I thank the Senator from Pennsylvania for his very generous and warm-hearted statement. It has been a great pleasure for me to serve with him. I have found him to be one of the great patriots of our time.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from South Dakota yield to me?

Mr. CASE. I yield. I wish to yield to the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS], but I understand that the Senator from Kansas wishes further to develop the theme of the Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, the fine work of the Senator from Colorado has been praised by the distinguished Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MARTIN]. I concur in his statement.

The Senator from Colorado was born 13 miles from my hometown. He is truly a Kansan. We have watched with great pride the progress he has made in the field of public service in the adjoining State of Colorado. It was a privilege to work with him during my service in the House, which goes back to 1935, while he was in the Senate, and it has been, perhaps, even a greater privilege to be associated with him in the Senate. We in Kansas will miss his fine service in the Senate, but I feel that he and his good wife are entitled to a very well-deserved rest, after he has served his State and the Nation so faithfully and well.

I say to the distinguished Senator from Colorado that it has been a pleasure to know him as a friend, as a legislator, and as a neighbor. I wish for him and his good wife the very best that life can afford.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Kansas for the very kind things he has said. I used to call the Senator from Kansas "my Congressman," because he represented so ably the district in Kansas of which I am a native. Our homes were not too far apart, although I lived in my home much earlier than the Senator from Kansas lived in his home. However, I referred to him with a great deal of affection and pride as "my Congressman." I thank the Senator for what he has said.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, I yield to the Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. President, I wish to join with my colleagues in expressing to the distinguished senior Senator from Colorado our sorrow at his leaving this great body. I may say to the Senator from Colorado that the Mountain States of the West will regret very much his leaving the Senate. He has been a great force in the development of the West for a long period of time.

I first became acquainted with him when he was Lieutenant Governor of Colorado, and I knew him later also when he was the Governor of the State. Of course, I have known him since he has been a Member of this body. He has cooperated on every occasion in the enactment of legislation that would enhance the development of our great West.

We are truly sorry that he is leaving the service of his country in the capacity of a Senator, but we hope that in the years that lie ahead he will enjoy living out in God's country.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, will the Senator from South Dakota yield?

Mr. CASE. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I thank the Senator from Wyoming for his very generous remarks. I was a resident of the State of Wyoming for a few years a long time ago—I presume before the Senator from Wyoming was born——

Mr. BARRETT. I thank the Senator very much for the compliment.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I enjoyed living in Wyoming. Colorado and Wyoming are very close together. The people of the two States mingle very closely. I have enjoyed serving with the junior Senator from Wyoming in the Senate. I watched his career when he was in the House, and I have attended hearings he has held at Grand Junction and at other places in Colorado on Forest Service bills. I regard him as one of my favorite people, and I thank him for what he has said about me.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President——

Mr. CASE. I yield to the Senator from Washington.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, I regret that I was not in the Chamber yesterday when so many tributes were paid to our distinguished friend and colleague from Colorado. I wish to associate myself with the remarks previously made about the long and distinguished career of Senator JOHNSON.

I had the privilege of serving for 4 years on the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy with the Senator from Colorado. I know of his tremendous contributions to that all-important work.

I also had the privilege of working with Senator JOHNSON, during the time that I served in the House of Representatives, in connection with many of the great power and reclamation projects in the West.

We who come from the West and from the Far West will miss his invaluable counsel. I do not know of anyone who has made a greater contribution to the cause of the West than has Senator JOHNSON of Colorado.

His typical western independence has lent great strength to this all-important legislative body.

I wish to join with my many colleagues in wishing Senator JOHNSON and his good wife all of the best as they return to the great State of Colorado.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, I yield to the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. POTTER. Mr. President, I, too, wish to join with my colleagues in expressing my regrets that the distinguished and honored Senator from Colorado sees fit to seek retirement.

As a new Member of the Senate it has been my good fortune to serve with him on the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, a committee which has great responsibility and great authority in recommending legislation concerning the regulatory agencies of our Government. I know of no man in or out of Congress who has a better knowledge of and a keener interest in this large segment of our Government. I have called upon the distinguished and honored Senator many times for advice. His counsel has been widely sought, and he is a man whom we all hold in high esteem.

I sincerely hope that Mrs. Johnson and the Senator will enjoy many years of happiness and health.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, I yield to the Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I am pleased that we in New Mexico know Senator JOHNSON about as well as any neighbor could know him. Not only do we know him well, but we know him in good faith. We have followed his political career for many years.

I am glad in a way that he is retiring. He and his wonderful wife are entitled to the good things of life, and I know he will appreciate being a free man again.

I have only one regret, Mr. President. I have so many Republican relatives in Colorado who have voted for him as a Democrat that I do not know how they will vote in the future.

I wish the Senator all the best.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I wish to express my very warm appreciation to the Senator from Washington [Mr. JACKSON], and to the Senator from Michigan [Mr. POTTER], and to the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ] for their very generous and kind remarks.

THE HIGHWAY BILL

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

Mr. CASE. I yield.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, the Senator from Mississippi was called to the telephone a short time ago and did not hear the Senator from South Dakota speak with reference to the utility survey. So far as I am concerned, it is my recollection that we did not have sufficient facts before us in the committee—and I believe that view was shared by the whole membership of the committee—on which to base any judgment in which from a factual standpoint we could feel secure. Was that the Senator's position on that point?

Mr. CASE. The point the Senator from Mississippi makes was the view accepted by the committee. We felt we did not have sufficient facts to enable us to take affirmative action, and, therefore, we wanted a study made. The Senator from Colorado was concerned lest some language in one of the paragraphs of the report prejudged the study. It was the intention of the members of the committee that we should have the kind of study made which is referred to in the final sentence of that section of the report dealing with utility relocations:

> It is expected that this study will be conducted on the basis of impartial facts and objectivity.

Mr. STENNIS. I have read that part of the report, and I believe the concluding sentence in that section makes it clear that what we wanted and what we expected was a factual study and a factual report, because that is what we need on which to base action. I appreciate the Senator's statement.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, there is only one additional section, section 17, which appears at page 13 of the bill. I ask unanimous consent that it may appear in my remarks at this point.

There being no objection, section 17 of the bill was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

> SEC. 17. (a) Highway construction work performed in pursuance of agreements between the Secretary of Commerce and any State highway department which requires approval by the Secretary of Commerce and which is financed in whole or in part by funds authorized under this or succeeding acts, shall be performed by contract awarded by competitive bidding under such procedures as may by regulations be pre-

scribed by the Secretary of Commerce, unless the Secretary of Commerce shall affirmatively find that, under the circumstances relating to a given project, some other method is in the public interest. All such findings shall be reported promptly in writing to the Committees on Public Works of the Senate and the House of Representatives.

(b) In any case in which approval by the Secretary of Commerce of any contract for such highway construction work is required, the Secretary shall require as a condition precedent to such approval a sworn statement executed by, or on behalf of, the person, firm, association, or corporation to whom such contract is to be awarded, certifying that such person, firm, association, or corporation has not, either directly or indirectly, entered into any agreement, participated in any collusion, or otherwise taken any action in restraint of free competitive bidding in connection with such contract.

Mr. CASE. I merely wish to point out that this is a new section in Federal highway legislation. Very briefly, it provides that any contracts awarded to accomplish projects authorized by this or any succeeding acts shall be awarded on a competitive bidding basis, under such rules and regulations as the Secretary of Commerce may prescribe.

It specifically provides that when a contract is awarded the Secretary of Commerce shall require, "as a condition precedent to the approval of a contract, a sworn statement, executed by" the appropriate person in behalf of the contractor, "certifying that such person, firm, association, or corporation has not, either directly or indirectly, entered into any agreement, participated in any collusion, or otherwise taken any action in restraint of free competitive bidding in connection with such contract."

Mr. President, in point of dollars, this is the largest of the Federal aid bills which have been presented to the Congress. The committtee felt it was only proper that competitive bidding should be required in order to obtain the maximum number of roads in quality and quantity for the dollars spent. Therefore, Mr. President, that provision was included in section 17, and it is commended to the Senate.

In conclusion, I merely wish to say that the bill was reported by the committee with a wholehearted endorsement, for we believe that the dollars spent under this bill are an investment in America which will yield both private and public income for all time to come.

Mr. POTTER. Mr. President, it should be apparent that the continuing deterioration of the Nation's highways constitutes an acute problem which must be met as early as possible. The breakdown of the highway systems is a threat to the economy of the Nation which is recognized by all authorities on the subject. This measure more nearly approximates the need for funds which were previously used to meet the burdens of defense expenditures. The use of a greater share of the revenues raised from taxes on gasoline, diesel fuel, and motor oil for Federal aid to highways is consistent with the urging of the administration for a return to a constructive program in a peace with prosperity approach. It has been my belief for some time that we should get on with this type of work which is neither wasteful nor synthetic, in solving as it does problems which become most costly as the deterioration progresses further.

I am pleased that the committee recognized the need for a greater share of these tax funds for transfer to the States in bringing the means for meeting the financial burdens of road building to those State highway officials who live closely with the requirements of their local economies. In my State there is a dread of the effect of procrastination on this legislation because delay threatens our industry, its workingmen, the farmers and all others in the State who are in one way or another annoyed by sluggishness in the treatment of this program. I am informed by the president and the executive committee of the American Automobile Association that only 24 percent of the national system of interstate highways meets standards of sufficiency. This note of alarm comes from an association with a membership of 4,250,000 motorists. Motoring in this country is not a matter of luxury today. It is a vital link with the conduct of everyday business. The further breakdown of the system of roads spells jeopardy to our economy.

Mr. President, from reliable witnesses who testified before the Committee on Public Works there has been adduced the interesting fact that 63.8 percent of the mileage on the Federal-aid systems is in need of improvement, and that an ever-increasing gap exists between the maintenance and use of the highways. This figure is shocking, and there is a strong indication that it is climbing to a total that spells disaster. This percentage figure was the result of a survey last year. It is evident that delay has been costly to the point of extravagance.

Two years ago, repairs to this 63.8 percentage of the Federal-aid systems which had become impaired would have cost $32 billion. It is now estimated that the same work will cost $3 billion in excess of that figure. What price delay?

It seems to me that we will not have discharged our duty to the public unless we at least create a status of sufficiency for the users of our highways as soon as practicable.

For many years there was some justification for neglect of this dangerous situation. The economy of a war period did not permit attention to be focused on this enormous lag in work which must be done to maintain our basic needs over a long period. This reason for neglecting this work no longer exists. This bill is a step in the right direction and, in my opinion, is the most important and worthwhile legislation to come before us in years. I implore the aid of all my colleagues to the end that the matter be disposed of and the necessary commitments be made.

Mr. President, at the present time, the Federal tax on gasoline, diesel fuel, and motor oil raises roughly $1 billion. This bill does not envision the earmarking of taxes from this source but authorizes an appropriation of $910 million for Federal aid to highways. The declining level of defense expenditures most certainly justifies emphasis at this time on spending for vital construction which takes the place of spending for purely military needs. The public is aware of its urgency and the penalties that would be suffered by postponement of its objectives.

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. 208. An act for the relief of Sister Constantin (Teresia Kakonyi);

S. 532. An act for the relief of Giulio Squillari, Mrs. Maggiorina Barbero Squillari, Rosanna Squillari, and Eugenio Squillari;

S. 939. An act for the relief of Njdeh Hovhanissian Aslanian;

S. 1208. An act for the relief of Andrew D. Sumner;

S. 1209. An act for the relief of Dr. Uheng Khoo;

S. 1231. An act for the relief of Franz Gerich and Willy Gerich, his minor son;

S. 1691. An act to authorize Potomac Electric Power Co. to construct, maintain, and operate in the District of Columbia, and to cross Kenilworth Avenue NE., in said District, with, certain railroad tracks and related facilities, and for other purposes;

S. 1937. An act for the relief of Rev. Francis T. Dwyer and Rev. Thomas Morrissey;

S. 2499. An act for the relief of Hua Lin and his wife, Lillian Ching-Wen Lin (nee Hu); and

S. 2534. An act for the relief of Dora Vida Lyew Seixas.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 61) favoring the suspension of deportation of certain aliens.

The message further announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 238) granting the status of permanent residence to certain aliens.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the enrolled bill (H. R. 5529) to preserve within Manassas National Battlefield Park, Va., the most important historic properties relating to the battles of Manassas, and for other purposes.

THE WAR IN INDOCHINA

Mr. KENNEDY obtained the floor.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Massachusetts yield?

Mr. KENNEDY. I yield.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, I think the Senator from Massachusetts is about to make a very important address, and I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Massachusetts yield for that purpose?

Mr. KENNEDY. Yes, Mr. President, with the understanding that I shall retain the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

THE WAR IN INDOCHINA

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, the time has come for the American people to be told the blunt truth about Indochina.

I am reluctant to make any statement which may be misinterpreted as unappreciative of the gallant French struggle at Dien Bien Phu and elsewhere; or as partisan criticism of our Secretary of State just prior to his participation in the delicate deliberations in Geneva. Nor, as one who is not a member of those committees of the Congress which have been briefed—if not consulted—on this matter, do I wish to appear impetuous or an alarmist in my evaluation of the situation. But the speeches of President Eisenhower, Secretary Dulles, and others have left too much unsaid, in my opinion—and what has been left unsaid is the heart of the problem that should concern every citizen. For if the American people are, for the fourth time in this century, to travel the long and tortuous road of war—particularly a war which we now realize would threaten the survival of civilization—then I believe we have a right—a right which we should have hitherto exercised—to inquire in detail into the nature of the struggle in which we may become engaged, and the alternative to such struggle. Without such clarification the general support and success of our policy is endangered.

Inasmuch as Secretary Dulles has rejected, with finality, any suggestion of bargaining on Indochina in exchange for recognition of Red China, those discussions in Geneva which concern that war may center around two basic alternatives:

The first is a negotiated peace, based either upon partition of the area between the forces of the Viet Minh and the French Union, possibly along the 16th parallel; or based upon a coalition government in which Ho Chi Minh is represented. Despite any wishful thinking to the contrary, it should be apparent that the popularity and prevalence of Ho Chi Minh and his following throughout Indochina would cause either partition or a coalition government to result in eventual domination by the Communists.

The second alternative is for the United States to persuade the French to continue their valiant and costly struggle; an alternative which, considering the current state of opinion in France, will be adopted only if the United States pledges increasing support. Secretary Dulles' statement that the "imposition in southeast Asia of the political system of Communist Russia and its Chinese Communist ally . . . should be met by united action" indicates that it is our policy to give such support; that we will, as observed by the New York Times last Wednesday, "fight if necessary to keep southeast Asia out of their hands"; and that we hope to win the support of the free countries of Asia for united action against communism in Indochina, in spite of the fact that such nations have pursued since the war's inception a policy of cold neutrality.

I think it is important that the Senate and the American people demonstrate their endorsement of Mr. Dulles' objectives, despite our difficulty in ascertaining the full significance of its key phrases.

Certainly, I, for one, favor a policy of a "united action" by many nations whenever necessary to achieve a military and political victory for the free world in that area, realizing full well that it may eventually require some commitment of our manpower.

But to pour money, materiel, and men into the jungles of Indochina without at least a remote prospect of victory would be dangerously futile and self-destructive. Of course, all discussion of "united action" assumes the inevitability of such victory; but such assumptions are not unlike similar predictions of confidence which have lulled the American people for many years and which, if continued, would present an improper basis for determining the extent of American participation.

Permit me to review briefly some of the statements concerning the progress of the war in that area, and it will be understood why I say that either we have not frankly and fully faced the seriousness of the military situation, or our intelligence estimates and those of the French have been woefully defective.

In February of 1951, for example, the late Brig. Gen. Francis G. Brink, then head of the United States Military Advisory Group, in Indochina, told us of the favorable turn of events in that area as a result of new tactics designed by Gen. Jean de Lattre de Tassigny. In the fall of that same year, General De Lattre himself voiced optimism in his speech before the National Press Club here in Washington; and predicted victory, under certain conditions, in 18 months to 2 years, during his visit to France.

In June of 1952, American and French officials issued a joint communique in Washington expressing the two countries' joint determination to bring the battle to a successful end; and Secretary of State Acheson stated at his press conference that—

> The military situation appears to be developing favorably. * * * Aggression has been checked and recent indications warrant the view that the tide is now moving in our favor. * * * We can anticipate continued favorable developments.

In March 1953, the French officials again came to Washington, again issued statements predicting victory in Indochina, and again joined with the United States in a communique planning military action and United States support which would achieve their new goal of decisive military victory in 2 years.

In May of 1953, President Eisenhower and Secretary of State Dulles told the Congress that our mutual-security program for France and Indochina would help "reduce this Communist pressure to manageable proportions." In June an American military mission headed by General O'Daniel was sent to discuss with General Navarre in Indochina the manner in which United States aid "may best contribute to the advancement of the objective of defeating the Communist forces there"; and in the fall of last year General O'Daniel stated that he was "confident that the French-trained Vietnam Army when fully organized would prevail over the rebels."

In September of 1953, French and American officials again conferred, and, in announcing a new program of extensive American aid, again issued a joint communique restating the objective of "an early and victorious conclusion."

On December 2, 1953, Assistant Secretary of State for Far Eastern Affairs Walter S. Robertson told the Women's National Republican Club in New York—in words almost identical with those of Secretary of State Acheson 18 months earlier—that "In Indochina . . . we believe the tide now is turning." Later the same month Secretary of State Dulles stated that military setbacks in the area had been exaggerated; and that he did not "believe that anything that has happened upsets appreciably the timetable of General Navarre's plan," which anticipated decisive military results by about March 1955.

In February of this year, Defense Secretary Wilson said that a French victory was "both possible and probable" and that the war was going "fully as well as we expected it to at this stage. I see no reason to think Indochina would be another Korea." Also in February of this year, Under Secretary of State Smith stated that:

> The military situation in Indochina is favorable. * * * Contrary to some reports, the recent advances made by the Viet Minh are largely "real estate" operations. * * * Tactically, the French position is solid and the officers in the field seem confident of their ability to deal with the situation.

Less than 2 weeks ago, Admiral Radford, Chairman of the Joints Chief of Staff, stated that "the French are going to win." And finally, in a press conference some days prior to his speech to the Overseas Press Club in New York, Secretary of State Dulles stated that he did not "expect that there is going to be a Communist victory in Indochina"; that "in terms of Communist domination of Indochina, I do not accept that as a probability"; that "we have seen no reason to abandon the so-called Navarre plan," which meant decisive results only 1 year hence; and that the United States would provide whatever additional equipment was needed for victory over the Viet Minh; with the upper hand probably to be gained "by the end of the next fighting season."

Despite this series of optimistic reports about eventual victory, every Member of the Senate knows that such victory today appears to be desperately remote, to say the least, despite tremendous amounts of economic and material aid from the United States, and despite a deplorable loss of French Union manpower. The call for either negotiations or additional participation by other nations underscores the remoteness of such a final victory today, regardless of the outcome at Dien Bien Phu. It is, of course, for these reasons that many French are reluctant to continue the

struggle without greater assistance; for to record the sapping effect which time and the enemy have had on their will and strength in that area is not to disparage their valor. If "united action" can achieve the necessary victory over the forces of communism, and thus preserve the security and freedom of all southeast Asia, then such united action is clearly called for. But if, on the other hand, the increase in our aid and the utilization of our troops would only result in further statements of confidence without ultimate victory over aggression, then now is the time when we must evaluate the conditions under which that pledge is made.

I am frankly of the belief that no amount of American military assistance in Indochina can conquer an enemy which is everywhere and at the same time nowhere, "an enemy of the people" which has the sympathy and covert support of the people. As succinctly stated by the report of the Judd Subcommittee of the House Foreign Affairs Committee in January of this year:

> Until political independence has been achieved, an effective fighting force from the associated states cannot be expected. * * * The apathy of the local population to the menace of Viet Minh communism disguised as nationalism is the most discouraging aspect of the situation. That can only be overcome through the grant of complete independence to each of the associated states. Only for such a cause as their own freedom will people make the heroic effort necessary to win this kind of struggle.

This is an analysis which is shared, if in some instances grudgingly, by most American observers. Moreover, without political independence for the associated states, the other Asiatic nations have made it clear that they regard this as a war of colonialism; and the "united action" which is said to be so desperately needed for victory in that area is likely to end up as unilateral action by our own country. Such intervention, without participation by the armed forces of the other nations of Asia, without the support of the great masses of the peoples of the associated states, with increasing reluctance and discouragement on the part of the French—and, I might add, with hordes of Chinese Communist troops poised just across the border in anticipation of our unilateral entry into their kind of battleground—such intervention, Mr. President, would be virtually impossible in the type of military situation which prevails in Indochina.

This is not a new point, of course. In November of 1951, I reported upon my return from the Far East as follows:

> In Indochina we have allied ourselves to the desperate effort of a French regime to hang on to the remnants of empire. There is no broad, general support of the native Vietnam Government among the people of that area. To check the southern drive of communism makes sense but not only through reliance on the force of arms. The task is rather to build strong native non-Communist sentiment within these areas and rely on that as a spearhead of defense rather than upon the legions of General de Lattre. To do this apart from and in defiance of innately nationalistic aims spells foredoomed failure.

In June of last year, I sought an amendment to the Mutual Security Act which would have provided for the distribution of American aid, to the extent feasible, in such a way as to encourage the freedom and independence desired by the people of the Associated States. My amendment was soundly defeated on the grounds that we should not pressure France into taking action on this delicate situation; and that the new French Government could be expected to make "a decision which would obviate the necessity of this kind of amendment or resolution." The distinguished majority leader [Mr. KNOWLAND] assured us that "We will all work, in conjunction with our great ally, France, toward the freedom of the people of those states."

It is true that only 2 days later on July 3 the French Government issued a statement agreeing that—

> There is every reason to complete the independence of sovereignty of the Associated States of Indochina by insuring * * * the transfer of the powers * * * retained in the interests of the States themselves, because of the perilous circumstances resulting from the state of war.

In order to implement this agreement, Bao Dai arrived in Paris on August 27 calling for "complete independence for Vietnam."

I do not wish to weary the Senate with a long recital of the proceedings of the negotiations, except to say that as of today they have brought no important change in the treaty relationships between Vietnam and the French Republic. Today the talks appear to be at an impasse; and the return from Paris to Saigon of the Premier of Vietnam, Prince Buu Loc, is not a happy augury for their success. Thus the degree of control which the French retain in the area is approximately the same as I outlined last year:

Politically, French control was and is extensive and paramount. There is no popular assembly in Vietnam which represents the will of the people that can ratify the treaty relationship between Vietnam and the French. Although the Associated States are said to be "independent within the French Union," the French always have a permanent control in the high council and in the Assembly of the Union and the Government of France guides its actions. Under article 62 of the French Constitution, the French Government "coordinates" all of the resources of the members of the Union placed in common to guarantee its defense, under policies directed and prepared by the French Government. French Union subjects are given special legal exemptions, including the privilege of extraterritoriality. The French High Commissioner continues to exercise powers with respect to the internal security of the Associated States, and will have a similar mission even after the restoration of peace. When Vietnamese taxes affect French Union subjects, there must be consultation with the representatives of the countries concerned before they are imposed. The foreign policy of Vietnam must be coordinated with that of France, and the French must give consent to the sending of diplomatic missions to foreign countries. Inasmuch as the French did not develop experienced governmental administrators before World War II, they have guided to some degree actions within the local governments by requiring the Vietnamese Government to turn to them for foreign counselors and technicians.

Militarily, French control is nearly complete. The United States has in the past dealt primarily with the French military authority, and these in turn deal with the Associated States. Our equipment and aid is turned over to the French who will then arrange for its distribution according to their decision. The French are granted for a period of time without limit facilities for bases and garrisons.

Culturally, the French are directly in contact with the training of intellectual youths of Vietnam, inasmuch as France joined in the establishment of the university, installed a French rector, and provided that all instructions should be in French.

Economically, French control of the country's basic resources, transportation, trade, and economic life in general is extensive. In Vietnam, estimated French control is nearly 100 percent in the field of foreign commerce, international and coastal shipping, and rubber and other export products. The French control 66 percent of the rice export trade. Moreover, possession of property belonging to the French cannot be changed without permission of the French; and France shares the veto right under the PAU agreement on matters affecting France's export and import trade.

All of this flies in the face of repeated assurances to the American people by our own officials that complete independence has been or will be granted.

In February of 1951, for example, the American Minister to the Associated States, Donald Heath, told us that the French colonial regime had ended and that "all Indochinese Government services were turned over to the Indochinese States." This is untrue. In November of 1951, Assistant Secretary of State Dean Rusk again assured us that—

> The peoples of the Associated States are free to assume the extensive responsibility for their own affairs that has been accorded them by treaties with France.

Last year, the Department of State assured me that—

> France had granted such a full measure of control to the 3 states over their own affairs that * * * these 3 countries became sovereign states.

In February of this year, Under Secretary of State Smith stated that the representatives of the Governments of Vietnam and of France would "meet in Paris to draw up the treaty which will complete Vietnamese independence." As I have said, those conversations began in July, and broke off 10 days ago. And again Secretary Dulles stated last week that—

> Their independence is not yet complete, but the French Government last July declared its intention to complete that independence, and negotiations to consummate that pledge are underway.

They are underway 9 months after the pledge was originally given.

I do not believe that the importance of the current breakdown of these negotiations has been made clear to the Senate or the people of the United States. Every year we are given three sets of assurances: First, that the independence of the Associated States is now complete; second, that the independence of the Associated States will soon be completed under steps "now" being undertaken; and, third, that military victory for the French Union forces in Indochina is assured, or is just around the corner, or lies 2 years off. But the stringent limitations upon the status of the Associated States as sovereign states remain; and the fact that military victory has not yet been achieved is largely the result of these limitations. Repeated failure of these prophecies has, however, in no way diminished the frequency of their reiteration, and they have caused this Nation to delay definitive action until now the opportunity for any desirable solution may well be past.

It is time, therefore, for us to face the stark reality of the difficult situation before us without the false hopes which predictions of military victory and assurances of complete independence have given us in the past. The hard truth of the matter is, first, that without the wholehearted support of the peoples of the Associated States, without a reliable and crusading native army with a dependable officer corps, a military victory, even with American support, in that area is difficult if not impossible, of achievement; and, second, that the support of the people of that area cannot be obtained without a change in the contractual relationships which presently exist between the Associated States and the French Union.

Instead of approaching a solution to this problem, as Secretary Dulles indicated, French and Vietnamese officials appear to be receding from it. The Vietnamese, whose own representatives lack full popular support, because of a lack of popular assembly in that country, recognizing that French opinion favoring a military withdrawal would become overwhelming if all ties were entirely broken, have sought 2 treaties: one giving the Vietnamese complete and genuine independence, and the other maintaining a tie with the French Union on the basis of equality, as in the British Commonwealth. But 9 months of negotiations have failed thus far to provide a formula for both independence and union which is acceptable to the parties currently in the government of each nation. The French Assembly on March 9—and I believe this action did not receive the attention it deserved—substantially lessened the chances of such a solution, through the adoption of a tremendously far-reaching rider which declared that France would consider her obligations toward Indochinese states ended if they should revoke the clauses in the French Constitution that bind them to the French Union. In other words, Mr. President, the French Parliament indicated that France would no longer have any obligations toward the Associated States if the present ties which bind them to the French Union—ties which assure, because of the constitutional arrangement of the French Union, that the French Republic and its Government are always the dominant power in the union—were broken.

I realize that Secretary Dulles cannot force the French to adopt any course of action to which they are opposed; nor am I unaware of the likelihood of a French military withdrawal from Indochina, once its political and economic stake in that area is gone. But we must realize that the difficulties in the military situation which would result from a French withdrawal would not be greatly different from the difficulties which would prevail after the intervention of American troops without the support of the Indochinese or the other nations of Asia. The situation might be compared to what the situation would have been in Korea, if the Japanese had maintained possession of Korea, if a Communist group of Koreans were carrying on a war there with Japan—which had dominated that area for more than a century—and if we then went to the assistance of the Japanese, and put down the revolution of the native Koreans, even though they were Communists, and even though in taking that action we could not have the support of the non-Communist elements of the country.

That is the type of situation, whether we like it or not, which is presented today in connection with our support of the French in Indochina, without the support of the native peoples of Indochina.

In Indochina, as in Korea, the battle against communism should be a battle, not for economic or political gain, but for the security of the free world, and for the values and institutions which are held dear in France and throughout the non-Communist world, as well as in the United States. It seems to me, therefore, that the dilemma which confronts us is not a hopeless one; that a victorious fight can be maintained by the French, with the support of this Nation and many other nations—and most important of all, the support of the Vietnamese and other peoples of the Associated States—once it is recognized that the defense of southeast Asia and the repelling of Communist aggression are the objectives of such a struggle, and not the maintenance of political relationships founded upon ancient colonialism. In such a struggle, the United States and other nations may properly be called upon to play their fullest part.

If, however, this is not to be the nature of the war; if the French persist in their refusal to grant the legitimate independence and freedom desired by the peoples of the Associated States; and if those peoples and the other peoples of Asia remain aloof from the conflict, as they have in the past, then it is my hope that Secretary Dulles, before pledging our assistance at Geneva, will recognize the futility of channeling American men and machines into that hopeless internecine struggle.

The facts and alternatives before us are unpleasant, Mr. President. But in a nation such as ours, it is only through the fullest and frankest appreciation of such facts and alternatives that any foreign policy can be effectively maintained. In an era of supersonic attack and atomic retaliation, extended public debate and education are of no avail, once such a policy must be implemented. The time to study, to doubt, to review, and revise is now, for upon our decisions now may well rest the peace and security of the world, and, indeed, the very continued existence of mankind. And if we cannot entrust this decision to the people, then, as Thomas Jefferson once said:

> If we think them not enlightened enough to exercise their control with a wholesome discretion, the remedy is not to take it from them but to inform their discretion by education.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I have no desire to take the Senator from Massachusetts off the floor, but I wish to make a comment on the speech he has just made.

First of all, I must say there is much, and probably the predominance, of what the Senator from Massachusetts has said with which I would fully agree.

I think it important that the Congress and the Nation understand fully the problems that exist in Asia, particularly in the immediate area of southeast Asia with which the speech today of the Senator from Massachussetts was concerned.

Of course no one is wise enough at the present moment to know what the ultimate aim and objective of the Chinese Communists may be—whether they will enter the war in Indochina in force, as they did in Korea, or whether they will continue to supply arms and equipment, as they are doing now. It seems to me that if they enter the war in force there will be a challenge to the free nations of the world and free men everywhere which they cannot ignore or sidestep. I believe the time is rapidly approaching—if, indeed, it is not already here—when the free nations of the world, if they really believe in a system of collective security, must stand up and be counted. Certainly, this Nation of ours, large though it is in population, with 160 million people, and rich though it is in resources, is not in a position time and time again to assume the overwhelming share of the burden, as we did in Korea.

As the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts knows, only 17 of the 60 members of the United Nations contributed a single soldier, sailor, or airman to the resistance against aggression in Korea. All of them together contributed about 10 percent of what the United States alone contributed. This Nation supplied some 450,000 men at one time, although perhaps a million and a quarter of our men passed through Korea in the process of rotation. The little Republic of Korea supplied 600,000, but all the remaining members of the United Nations together supplied only about 45,000.

I have said on the floor of the Senate and elsewhere that I do not believe the Korean experience should be allowed to stand as a precedent. I happen to believe, as I think the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts believes, in a real system of collective security. I emphasize the word "collective." To me

that means that each nation should contribute in general conformity with its population, in general conformity with its resources, and in general conformity with its responsibilities, so that each would share the burden on a fair basis.

I think the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts has put his finger on the most vulnerable spot, so far as obtaining the complete support of the native populations of Vietnam, Laos, and Cambodia is concerned. Even though on July 3 the Government of the Republic of France went a long way toward granting what may be called a great degree of local autonomy, it did not go the whole way and give those people the right to determine whether they wished to remain in or out of the French Union. Personally I am of the opinion that there may be great advantages to Vietnam, Laos, and Cambodia, after gaining their own freedom, in associating themselves, of their own volition, with the French Union. However, I think the choice should be theirs. I believe if they had such a choice they would rally to the support of the non-Communist forces in that area of the world, and the native forces, who are desperately anxious to remain outside the Iron Curtain, could be built up to such a point that, as in Korea, they would be able to carry a large share of the burden.

I do not wish to delay the Senate much longer, but from this side of the aisle I wish to commend the Senator from Massachusetts for a very well-thought-out and provocative speech, which I think both the Senate and the country should read with interest.

When I returned from the Far East on my fourth trip there last October, an interview was published in the U. S. News & World Report of October 30. I shall not read the entire article, but I should like to take the time of the Senate to read the portion dealing with Indochina, because I think the Senator will see that we have much in common in the observations which we made.

The interview appears on page 42 of the U. S. News & World Report for October 30, 1953. The first question which was asked me by the editor of the magazine was:

Question. What impression did our truce in Korea make on the Indochina situation? Did they think this was an appeasement, or did they think of it as a possible solution?

Answer. I think they recognize that, with the limitations that were placed upon our force in Korea, that at least, while it was no victory for the free world, they do not look upon it as a defeat. They recognize it, I think, for what it was—a stalemated condition. But they would, I think, be very much concerned if there was any retreating in the face of further Communist threats or aggression, and they are watching very carefully every move that is made, not only in Washington but in the United Nations and in Europe, to see whether or not there is any major move toward appeasement in the defense of the free peoples of Asia.

Question. Is there any indication that Indochina is going to be a hotter spot than it's been before?

Answer. Yes, I think that it definitely will be within the next 6 months. The French have a new commander there, General Navarre, who has a very fine reputation, and I think that the French have decided that they have to get away from the old Maginot Line type of defense where they would put their French military units in a fortified post on a hilltop in the "Beau Geste" type of warfare, and then the Communists would pretty well control the countryside, at least by night, and appear to be peaceful farmers in the daytime. Now they are taking a position that will permit them to bring in some of those outposts and to get a striking mobile force—the type that has been going out and raiding the Communist supply depots.

Question. Are there any signs that with the armistice in Korea the Red Chinese are able to supply more men and munitions to the Indochina war?

Answer. There are indications that the Ho Chi Minh forces are having their people trained in Communist China and are undoubtedly getting some equipment there. But so far, at least, they do not appear to have sent any substantial number of so-called "volunteers" into the fighting as they have done in Korea. Whether they will do that or not is one of the great unanswered questions at the present time.

I think, however, that since the French declaration in July the French have done a great deal to win the support of the non-Communist civil population in Vietnam, and they are now raising a substantial force in the Vietnam Army itself that will be of material help in cleaning up the Communist situation there.

Question. What indication is there as to the attitude of those countries toward us? Is Indochina thinking in terms solely of France, or do they look to us?

Answer. No, I think that the people want, and I think they are going to insist upon, their complete political freedom from France. My own view is that the age of colonialism in Asia is dead and that countries which expect to win the support of the non-Communist peoples of Asia are going to have to face up to that problem. I certainly don't think that we can have an effective foreign policy in the Far East if the impression is given, either rightfully or wrongfully, that we have tied our policy to that of any colonial power.

Question. What is the attitude toward us in countries like Burma and Thailand?

Answer. I think the United States stands very high in Thailand and in a good many of these countries. I believe that they look to America as a great free country. They recognize that we won our own freedom from colonialism. I think they have been impressed with the fact that we have been helpful to many of these nations having their growing pains, going through some of the same problems that we went through in the early days of the Republic. I think we stand very well. Of course, in a country like Burma they are following the same type of policy as Nehru in hoping that, regardless of how far communism advances up to their borders it will leave them alone.

But very few other people in Asia believe that, if the Communists should overcome Vietnam, Laos, Cambodia, and Thailand, it is realistic to think that they would stop short of invading Burma.

I conclude by saying again that I think the world may be approaching more rapidly than some of us think a decision on the question whether we are to have a real collective security system and are to maintain a system of international law and order which can preserve the peace of the world for ourselves and our children.

The United States has expended billions of dollars in resources in order to rehabilitate the war-torn nations of Europe. It has expended billions of dollars in order to build up situations of strength so that more of the free world will not fall into the hands of the godless men in the Kremlin and the international conspiracy of communism.

But there cannot be an effective system of collective security if some of the nations that have received our help and billions of dollars of our resources, now when the chips may be down, stand on the sidelines and let the United States assume the preponderance of the burden, as we did in Korea.

I believe that the Congress of the United States, the Government of the United States, and the people of the United States are entitled to have a clear-cut and frank expression from all the so-called law-abiding, free nations of the world as to what they are prepared to do in the event of any future type of massive Soviet aggression.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I believe that before we attempt to call on the people of Asia to say whether they would support any action to prevent the Communists from seizing control of Indochina, there must first be given to the people of Indochina a sufficient degree of independence, so that they will be attracted to the struggle, and so that the other peoples of Asia will feel that the war is being waged in their cause and for their benefit.

The Senator from California made reference to the French declaration of last July 3, and suggested that it gave some degree of independence to those people. The point is that the declaration of July 3 gave no further degree of independence to the people of that area than they had previously enjoyed, and those people are still being regulated by the PAU agreement of 1950. The declaration of July 3 was to the effect that it was time that conversations began. Bao Dai arrived in Paris in August, and the conversations continued from that date. They were broken off when the prime minister returned to Saigon 2 weeks ago. No progress has been made since then. Under all the circumstances, to expect that the people of Asia will support any action to prevent that area being taken over by the Communists, is, I fear, hopeless.

When the United States was paying 40 percent of the cost of the struggle and was not considering sending armed men into the area, it was perhaps captious of the United States to insist that the French take a step which they did not desire to take. But now, when the United States is perhaps getting ready to take affirmative action, which may even be unilateral action, it seems to me that we have every right to insist that the causes of the struggle be clarified and that its nature be made certain to our people and the people of the Associated States. Otherwise, we will go in on the "short end of the stick;" the Communists will continue to pour across the border, the people of the Associated States will be hostile to our efforts, and we will find ourselves in a far worse military situation than we ever experienced in Korea.

Therefore, before the United States goes any further, we should ask the French to make clear exactly what the political status will be of the Associated States, and, if necessary, change the

arrangement of the French Union. So long as the French Union's present constitutional status is maintained the people of Indochina will not have genuine independence within the Union. Therefore, if we are considering stepping in—and it must be remembered that we are now paying 80 percent of the cost of the struggle—and if we are to get the support of the American people for such a policy—and I believe the policy should be supported—we should insist that the French Union arrangement be changed, if necessary, even if it requires the repeal of the rider of March 8.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I had a conversation with an official of the Vietnam Government. I shall not identify him by name. He said to me, "Senator, we recognize that if the French were to pull out we would not have the military power or the training or the force to prevent our country from being overrun by the Communist forces, backed up, as they are, by Communist China." He said further: "It would not even be necessary for the Republic of France to say that we would have our complete independence tomorrow. If they would only say, as you did in the case of the Philippines, that by a given date, which date may be 3 years or 5 years from today, 'We give you our absolute pledge that at that time you will have a free choice of either remaining in the French Union or getting out of it,' the whole atmosphere would change."

As I pointed out, there might be some advantage to the people of that area in voluntarily associating themselves for defense purposes with the French Union. However, they would have to have some specific guaranty of that kind. Perhaps it would have to be underwritten by the United Nations or by the United States. In that way, when the day came that France had pledged that the people of the Associated States would have complete independence, they would be able to make the choice.

Finally I wish to say—and I do not believe the free world should lose sight of it, and I do not think people who are determined to maintain their freedom should lose sight of it—that in all the history of Russia, under the Czars and under the commissars, there has been nothing equivalent to the action of the United States of America in setting up a free and independent Philippine Republic, and there has been nothing equivalent to Great Britain setting up a free and independent India, Pakistan, and Burma, or of the Netherlands setting up a free and independent Indonesian Republic.

To the contrary, during the period when the nations of the west were giving freedom to the people of Asia, international communism, as represented by the men in the Kremlin, were destroying the freedom of the people of Latvia, Lithuania, and Estonia. and were fastening satellite governments upon the people of Poland, Rumania, Bulgaria, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, of North Korea, and were fastening Communist tyranny upon the people of China.

I believe that perhaps our story has not been sufficiently told in that area of the world. I believe we have made a mistake. I say it in no partisan sense, because the same thing could perhaps be said of one administration as of another. We have many fine friends in Asia—in the Republic of Korea, in the Republic of China, now on Formosa, in the Republic of the Philippines, in Thailand, in Pakistan, and in other areas of that part of the world—and I believe those people could be encouraged to tell the story of what the free world has done to bring freedom to them, in contrast with the Communist tyranny which has been established by the Soviet Union, and in that way we might still win the battle for men's minds.

We will not win the struggle by arms alone, Mr. President, as the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts has pointed out, although arms are important when we are facing a ruthless enemy. However, if we could acquaint them with that story and rekindle some of the spirit of freedom from colonial domination which animated our own country when we were a colony, if we could make known to them the truth about the difference between the free world and the godless Communist tyranny, we could still win the battle and help to maintain, both in Asia and in Europe, a free world of free men.

Mr. KENNEDY. I am sure we can do so, once we clarify the cause of the free world. Up to this date it has not been done because of the control which the French have exercised over the Associated States.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, I wish to commend the distinguished junior Senator from Massachusetts for his brilliant analysis of the problem we face in Indochina. As I understand his remarks, the genius of our policy in Indochina must be to give full expression to the basic desires and wishes of the people of that area. I believe that their deep-rooted desire is for freedom. We must give full expression to that desire.

Mr. President, as we look at conditions in Indochina, the administration, it seems to me that conscientious as it is in trying to take some constructive action, is hesitant about giving to the people of the United States an explanation of the real problem which we face. I do not believe for one moment it follows that because the Chinese may not enter the conflict we can save Indochina. I think the people should be told in no uncertain terms that we cannot allow Indochina to fall into Communist hands. To do so would mean that we will lose southeast Asia.

I believe the administration hopes and prays that it will not have to come to Congress with this explosive situation. I think it has been a hope and a prayer up to this time. In my opinion, the Congress of the United States, Democrats and Republicans, have a responsibility to support the administration in trying to save southeast Asia. I think the administration should come to Congress with a resolution stating in no uncertain terms our wishes and aspirations for the people of Indochina and for all Asia and to outline the policy to be pursued. We should give to the President and his administration the support they need to carry out a policy of effective collective security. What is needed more at this point than anything else is firm support from the Congress of the United States on a full bipartisan basis, so that the hands of the administration can be strengthened in dealing with other nations. The other nations must of necessity participate wholeheartedly and we must receive assurances that they will do their part. I do not believe we can wait much longer lest we lose southeast Asia to the Communist forces which are about to take over.

Mr. KENNEDY. I will say to the Senator from Washington that I do not think Indochina can be saved unless the other Asiatic nations which are now maintaining a policy of cold neutrality are willing to take their fair part in the struggle. After all, they are the ones who should do so. For the United States to intervene unilaterally and to send troops into the most difficult terrain in the world, with the Chinese able to pour in unlimited manpower, would mean that we would face a situation which would be far more difficult than even that we encountered in Korea. It seems to me it would be a hopeless situation. Therefore, I do not think we should adopt a policy which requires United States intervention unless minimum guaranties for real independence have been made. By such guaranties it may be possible to rally Asiatic support.

Mr. JACKSON. I wish to state that obviously the very foundation of any move on our part in asking for support from the people of our country and from other nations must be predicated upon the policies which the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts has so effectively outlined today.

I wish to commend the distinguished majority leader for all he has said in reference to the problem. We must make it clear to the people of Indochina and Asia that in whatever moves we make we have but one objective, and that is to support their basic desire for freedom.

Mr. KENNEDY. As the Senator knows, the French have replied that they will not continue the struggle if the present political arrangements are changed. Frankly, I see no real difference between French withdrawal today from Indochina, and having the United States intervene unilaterally in support of the French on the current political basis. Both policies would end in disaster.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator from Massachusetts yield?

Mr. KENNEDY. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I wish to commend most highly the scholarly and statesmanlike address of the junior Senator from Massachusetts. I am glad to he is facing realities as they are and is inviting the attention of the administration to the need for greater knowledge with reference to conditions in that particular area of the world, not only on the part of the Senate and the House, but on the part of the American people as well. I was very much impressed by what the Senator said, and I paraphrase his statement, that the time to talk about a review is not after the fact has been accomplished.

I wonder if the Senator can tell the Senate what he thinks Secretary Dulles had in mind when he was making his speech before the Overseas Press Club in New York recently.

Mr. KENNEDY. There is every indication that what he meant was that the United States will take the ultimate step.

Mr. MANSFIELD. And that is what?

Mr. KENNEDY. It is war.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Does the Senator from Massachusetts know that at the present time the French Union and the Associated States have approximately 591,000 troops in Indochina, and in contrast to that number the Communists have 290,00 troops? Does the Senator know that France today does not send any of her conscripts into Indochina to fight? Does the Senator realize the risks implicit and implied in the speech made by the Secretary of State before the Overseas Press Club?

Mr. KENNEDY. If the United States intervenes in order to save the present situation, prior to a massive intervention by the Chinese from the north—and it appears that such intervention may be necessary on the present basis because the Vietminh seem to be winning—the Chinese will send in additional manpower, and our intervention would be useless. The best hope is to win the support of a majority of the population. I would hesitate to guess how many members of the nationalist army are now engaged at Dien Bien Phu. There is no doubt that there are many officers paid at the same rate at which the French Army is paid who have enlisted because of economic advantages, but I do not know how many members of the native army are actually fighting in that stronghold. The production of battalions and the number of officers have been a disappointment it seems to me.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I have heard figures stated within the past 24 hours to the effect that there are approximately 3,000 fighting there.

Mr. KENNEDY. Are they members of the independent army or of the French Union forces?

Mr. MANSFIELD. They are members of the Army of the Associated States.

Mr. KENNEDY. What is the percentage?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Of approximately 15,000 at Dien Bien Phu they represent approximately one-fifth of the total command.

The Senator will recall reading in the newspapers within the past few days that the Chief of State had a meeting with the graduating class of the Vietnamese Military Academy, and that at that ceremony 600 Vietnamese were graduated as captains, majors, and lieutenants, indicating that for the first time the French and the Vietnamese are trying to reach the proper battalion level, because they had up to that time very few officers in those particular grades, with nothing in between.

It is my hope that what the Senator has said will be read quite seriously in the executive department, and that very soon Congress will be taken into the confidence of the administration, so that we will know what is going on in that area of the world.

Mr. KENNEDY. I think Congress should know whether the call by the United States for united action is due to the fact that the Vietminh forces are perhaps now stronger than the Vietnam forces, or whether it is due to the extent of the Chinese assistance to the Vietminh. I believe it is the former. I believe it is because the forces of the Vietminh have become so powerful that they are pressing hard on the French, and therefore it is to assist in a civil war that the call for united action has been made.

Mr. MANSFIELD. But when we refer to "united action," we do not know what the Secretary of State is speaking about, except as we read by the press reports this morning to the effect that the Government has asked for conferences with Great Britain, Australia, and New Zealand. Is that to be the extent of the united action? Where do the native people come in? Whose independence is being fought for?

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

Mr. KENNEDY. I yield.

Mr. SYMINGTON. I also wish to associate myself with this most excellent analysis made by the Senator from Massachusetts of the situation in Indochina. I am impressed with the care and accuracy with which he has defined the chronological statements made with respect to continued optimism about the Indochinese situation.

Some weeks ago the distinguished senior Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] and I went abroad. In Paris, we discussed with officials, at some length, the question of Indochina. I believe the Senator from Massachusetts has clearly illustrated that Indochina is primarily a problem in Paris.

Although I cannot speak for my colleague, the Senator from New Hampshire, I have his permission, after I read the speech of the Senator from Massachusetts, to make a few comments of my own, to speak only for myself, with respect to our trip abroad.

After many hours of discussion in Paris, we found confirmation of most of the points raised today by the Senator from Massachusetts. We asked if they saw any military solution. The answer was, "No."

We then asked if there was any political solution which could be seen. The answer was, "No."

Later we asked about a program based on the statement of President Eisenhower in October 1952. I believe this was to the effect that, so far as the Far East was concerned, it should be Asians against Asians if there was trouble, with America on the side of the right. With that premise, we later asked if the French would be willing to have used in Indochina those troops offered by South Korea, troops which I believe constitute a part of the fourth largest standing army in the world today. The answer was, "No."

We then asked if the French would be willing to utilize troops from Formosa, from an army which I understand constitutes the fifth largest standing army in the world today.

It should be noted that most of both these armies have been financed with American money. The answer was, "No." We then asked a completely hypothetical question: If the French were willing to leave Indochina, and we in turn were willing to take over the war for the freedom of the three states, would the French agree that the three states should have their freedom? The answer was "No."

So after extensive discussions, held over many hours, our feeling was one of frustration as to any definite, affirmative policy. At least at times, we became suspicious of the possibility there was no regret the matter was being held in such a state of flux, because it was a method to secure continued support.

As has been previously stated on the floor of the Senate, the amount of money given, directly and indirectly, to Indochina within the past 12 months, exceeds the total cost of the farm parity program in the United States since its inception.

I wish to again commend the distinguished junior Senator from Massachusetts upon his brilliant analysis of the problem.

Apparently we are getting closer to entering into the war in Indochina. That may or may not be for the best—I take no position on that question at this time. What is coming out, however, reminds me a great deal of the days just prior to, and just after, Korea, when I was on the National Security Council.

It does seem to me that we should be told more of the truth as to exactly what is going on about Indochina.

We found no positive policy in Paris, which makes it more important, it would seem, to have a policy in this country.

Under all those circumstances, and considering the fact that someone said today the United States is now paying 80 percent of the cost of the Indochina war—78 percent was a figure I heard before today—I ask the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts whether he does not believe it rather extraordinary that we should be moving into this picture, and at the same time be further reducing heavily our own military strength?

Mr. KENNEDY. I certainly do, because obviously, if the United States is to be required to take such action, then it will require extensive military preparations.

Mr. SYMINGTON. May I ask one more question, along the same line?

Mr. KENNEDY. Certainly.

Mr. SYMINGTON. If at this time it is felt on the part of the administration that it may be necessary for the United States to enter the Indochinese war, with all its possible ramifications, and at the same time the administration believes in further heavy reduction of our military strength, then would it not be a logical deduction that the possibility of the entrance of the United States into the Indochinese war has already been considered and a decision reached on it?

Mr. KENNEDY. Yes. Obviously, since the Secretary of State has made a statement in which he called for united action, if the statement means

anything, and if the action is to be implemented, it means that the United State will be expected to bear the burden of the fighting and to strengthen its military establishment.

The problem is of grave importance, because the meeting at Geneva is coming nearer. The French Assembly has authorized the French Government to conduct negotiations at Geneva. If the French conduct negotiations with Ho Chi Minh, he will agree only if it means that, step by step, he will control the whole area.

If Secretary Dulles is to persuade the French not to enter into that kind of negotiation, obviously the French will expect, instead, that the United States will play an increasingly larger part in the war.

If we are to enter into the situation militarily, it is a question whether we shall have united action or not. In the current political situation, we shall definitely not have the support of a great percentage of the people of the Asiatic nations, who desire to maintain neutrality in the struggle. Therefore, should we try alone to maintain the struggle in Indochina under those conditions, I think our program would be doomed to failure. I think that is the problem we have to meet.

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

Mr. KENNEDY. I yield.

Mr. JACKSON. Does not the distinguished junior Senator from Massachusetts feel that we have reached the point where the President ought to come before Congress and outline the policy and the program of the United States in relation to Indochina?

I recall very distinctly that during the 80th Congress a very serious situation arose in Greece, when Greece was about to fall. The President of the United States came before Congress and recommended a policy, which later became known as the Truman doctrine. He outlined what he expected of Congress and Congress promptly responded. Greece was saved. I think that certainly the situation in Indochina has reached the point where the President of the United States should come before Congress and give to Congress and the American people a statement of what the policy of the Government is and what is expected of Congress and the American people.

I conscientiously feel that if the President will tell us what is expected of us, we in Congress, regardless of party, will do everything we possibly can to back up the President, so that he will have a strong hand in trying to avert a war which might envelop all of southeast Asia.

Mr. KENNEDY. I certainly agree with the Senator from Washington. He mentioned the struggle in Greece. Of course, we went to the assistance of a regime or a Government which had the wholehearted support of the people against the Communist guerrillas. But in this instance we are going to the direct assistance of the French, who have dominated that area since 1860, and who still maintain excessive powers over it. So it is no wonder that many of us hesitate to enlist our men and our treasure in a struggle which may go on indefinitely, and in which the justice of the cause is not completely and clearly on our side, in the eyes of the people of that area.

Mr. JACKSON. I heartily agree with the distinguished junior Senator from Massachusetts. I certainly believe that our policy, must be to aid freedom and the liberties of the people of that area.

Mr. KENNEDY. Perhaps a comparable situation would have existed if the United States had entered the Cuban war on the side of Spain, against the natives who desired independence. But never in the history of the United States, at least since the Mexican war, have we intervened against a native population, and in support of a power which has maintained colonial control.

I am certain that the long period of French colonialism has ended. But unless the French are willing to change, at least for the Associated States, the French Union concept, it seems to me that our hopes in that area, regardless of how extensive our intervention may be, are doomed to failure.

Mr. JACKSON. I would not for a moment want anything that I said on the floor of the Senate to be construed as asking that our people intervene on behalf of French colonialism. I think the Senate made a mistake in not supporting the amendment offered by the distinguished junior Senator from Massachusetts last June. I supported it. That amendment would have made unmistakably clear that our desire to assist in Asia was primarily due to our inclination to aid the people of that area to obtain their own freedom.

Mr. KENNEDY. I think the reasons for defeating it would have been sound, as the majority leader said, if results had flowed from the French statement of July 3; but the July 3 statement has not been implemented by any kind of action.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Massachusetts yield?

Mr. KENNEDY. I yield to the Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. ANDERSON. I desired to add my word of commendation to the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts for his statement, and say to him that he was extremely fortunate in that the able majority leader was on the floor of the Senate while the statement was made and that he supplemented it by a very strong statement of his own. I hope the debate is indicative of the interest of Congress and its desire to speak frankly on the facts, as indicated by the remarks of not only the Senator from Massachusetts, but the distinguished majority leader.

So far as I am concerned, the whole question is summed up in a few words which the Senator from Massachusetts used when he said a victorious fight can be maintained once it is recognized that the independence of southeast Asia and the repelling of Communist aggression are the objectives of such a struggle—not the maintenance of colonialism by the French Government. I hope the French people and the French Government will take those words very seriously.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Massachusetts yield?

Mr. KENNEDY. I yield to the Senator from Washington.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I, too, like the other Senators, was vitally interested in what the Senator from Massachusetts said. I think his address was a very good analysis of the whole situation. I believe we ought to be a little careful in accepting some concrete policy, because there is a certain situation in existence. I, too, was in Indochina not many months ago, and I probably shall go there again in a very few days. I am also a member of the committee which will act on the appropriations in connection with the matter.

I agree wholly with the Senator from Massachusetts and with my colleague, the junior Senator from Washington, that we are thinking about the independence of free people, and that is what is engaging their attention. But I am sure that we have to be careful about one thing. The French today could say, "All right. We grant complete independence to the three States." I know what would then happen in France, and the Senator from Massachusetts knows. The French Government would say, "All right; we wash our hands of it. They are independent." I know what would then happen in Indochina. We would find that what was the Vietnamese Government would soon become the Viet Minh Government, and communism would then be established there. That may be what will happen. If so, we have to face that unpleasant situation, as the Senator from Massachusetts pointed out. The question involves basic issues.

Mr. KENNEDY. I do not say that we would have to accept one of the two alternatives, either that we support the French and their present contractual relationship with the three Associated States, or that the French withdraw completely, with the result that the Viet Minh would gain control.

The third alternative, and the one I would support, is that the French recognize the independence of the people of the three states, so that the French will secure the support of the Associated States, and in that way secure the loyalty of the common people as well as the intelligentsia of that area so they will support the army. But if the two alternatives are either to support the French in the present contractual relationships of the three Associated States in the French Union, or the French withdraw, I think either would lead to disaster. I do not believe we could get united action behind the first alternative, because I do not think the Asiatics and the people of the Associated States would be in favor of it. Then the burden will fall on us and on the French.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I agree with the Senator. I think we have got to abandon the first two alternatives. Nevertheless, the situation is unpleasant. The distinguished Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] and I spent many hours talking to those people last June and we have spent time talking to others about it. I wonder whether we have to face the unpleasant alternatives. One is that

France would say, if it granted the Associated States independence, "All right. We are done." Then we will have to face the very situation we had in Korea. I agree with the Senator from Massachusetts that we must set down the policy we are to follow. Once we have done that, we may be relieved of the unpleasant alternatives. Until we do, many more questions will face us for many years to come. I think the Senator from Massachusetts has made a great contribution toward shaping a policy.

Several Senators addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Massachusetts yield; and if so, to whom?

Mr. KENNEDY. I yield first to the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Will the Senator from Massachusetts indulge me to make a few observations while he retains the floor?

Mr. KENNEDY. I yield.

Mr. DIRKSEN. In the first place, I disagree with the Senator from Massachusetts that the President of the United States should take cognizance of the matter and elevate it to a national issue. It is wholly unlike the situation which existed in Greece, because there we were dealing with a sovereign power. In Indochina we are dealing with a colonial power which has exercised tutelage in Indochina ever since 1865, which relationship has existed continuously ever since that time.

The situation was wholly different when the Truman doctrine was articulated. I see no reason why the President should elevate the matter on a standard at this time, and take cognizance of it in that fashion, notwithstanding the fact that he realizes, as does everyone else, that the situation is truly precarious.

If the Senator from Massachusetts will indulge me another moment, I do not share the anxiety and concern some feel about the danger of sending American troops to Indochina, other than technicians. I believe many forget the logistics and topographical situation involved.

Indochina is about twice the size of the State of Illinois. If one added two States the size of Illinois together, he would have an idea of the size of Indochina. However, four-fifths of the people live in one-fifth of the area, and we are talking here of fighting which is taking place in a localized area in the vicinity of the Red River Delta, at Hanoi, Hai-phong, and along the Tonkin. So that actually there is a localized war, and there are 750,000 or 800,000 active combatant troops, or potentially combatant troops, in that area.

So I could see no good reason for sending other than some technicians there. Obviously, if the French mechanics cannot repair the planes we sent there, we have to send someone who has the capacity to repair them.

So, first, we should never lose sight of the physical situation involved. Second, we should never lose sight of the fact that we are dealing with a very peculiar jurisdictional situation.

My third point is that, as a matter of fact, when the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] and I returned, we made a report to the President of the United States, last June; and at that time we indicated that out of all the discussions with our men in uniform, with our civilians who were carrying on the point 4 program, with the Vietnamese, including the Prime Minister, and with everyone else there, including, also, the French, we had the conviction—and I think it is the one that my friend, the Senator from Massachusetts, now maintains—that in order to develop effective fighting men among the natives, they must be given something for which to fight. At the present time they have no constitution, no bill of rights, no guaranties. That was the essence of the first report we made—namely, that it is necessary to set up a target of independence.

In the case of the Philippines, long ago we projected the target of independence by setting it for the Fourth of July, 1946; and, after years of incubation and preparation, independence for the Philippines became an actuality.

I do not understand how we could possibly ask the French summarily to leave there and say, "Independence is complete." First, there must be a capacity for the exercise of freedom. Indochina would fall tonight if the French were to state over the radio and elsewhere that on next Tuesday morning they would leave Indochina. In that event, that would be the end.

Politically, in this situation we are at the short end of a very difficult administrative problem; namely, during all the years the French have failed to develop among the native people—and no one can condone this—a trained administrative talent to run their own affairs. The French set up at Saigon a miniature Paris, and the French administered the banking business and all the other businesses and arrangements, with the result that today, in the year of our Lord 1954, we pay the bill because there are no native administrators to handle their own affairs.

As a result, it seems to me that the reasonable and logical thing to do now, and I believe it was also the reasonable and logical thing to do before, is to recommend the setting of a target date for freedom—complete freedom, if we like—for Laos, Cambodia, Vietnam—all parts of the so-called Associated States.

If a target date is set for some time in the future; and if by word, deed, or otherwise, we can say to the 21-million natives in Vietnam, "Look: Five years hence there will be a constitution and guarantees of liberty and independence, and independence for you will become a reality on that date; there is the target against which we shall operate, and we give you firm assurance of it, and we do so by sealing it now on parchment to which we sign our names," then it seems to me that is the logical approach by means of which to take care of this situation; for otherwise that area will fall.

Of course there will then be some who will urge that we should go in, whole hog. However, let us not forget that unless we carry on in some fashion there, the French may move out, and suddenly may say, "We will dump it into the lap of the United Nations." Then what will the situation be, Mr. President? In Korea the United Nations' forces were 90 percent United States troops, and the United Nations' expenditures in Korea were 90 percent United States funds. Would there be a similar result in Indochina? I hope not, because I would be the last to go along with a program of that sort.

It was for that reason that, when the foreign aid authorization bill was on this floor last year, and after an effort had been made to eliminate from the bill a large portion of the appropriations authorized—the House had voted to make a reduction of more than a billion dollars—although I did not like the assignment I had under those circumstances, nevertheless I carried on in the effort to have some of the authorization of funds restored, because it appeared to me that this area was of importance to the United States and to the entire world—and for a reason which we do not fully comprehend. That reason is that this area is the surplus rice bowl of southeast Asia.

Every year Japan secures 500,000 tons of rice from the Red River delta, which is the rice bowl which takes care, also, of Burma, Thailand, Cambodia, Laos, Formosa, Indonesia, and other countries. So we are not dealing with what is solely a military question. On the contrary, this pressing matter goes to the self-preservation of the people of that section of the Orient. That is why this subject is so important, because if we were to give the Reds control of the surplus rice bowl, the rest would be easy for them, and no country would have either sufficient ingenuity or talent or resources to be able to develop the instrumentalities of warfare to keep the area going and to save southeast Asia.

So that is the situation, and it is very simple, I think, as we look at it from the economic standpoint, and then when we comprehend the military picture or the political picture from the standpoint of the capacity of the people. After 85 years of French tutelage and domination and administration of the area, the natives are unable to administer their own affairs. Their capacity to administer them cannot be developed overnight. In solving that problem, we must summon some real restraint and patience.

Mr. KENNEDY. If the French are unwilling to give up their interest there, except for purposes of defense for a period of 2 or 3 years, and only because of a desire to permit the native armies to develop, then what is our interest there? In that event, we shall have no political or economic stake in preserving Indochina free from the Communists. Instead, we want to help maintain the independence of that area, free from Communist domination. If that cause is not good enough for the French, then it seems to me that any action we take is foredoomed to disaster, because if the French are unwilling to give up their economic and political domination of the area, the support of the native

peoples cannot be won, even by means of a promise of independence in 5 years. Therefore, a promise of independence 5 years from now, when this matter now is coming to a head at Geneva, or in the next few months if we take the word of the Secretary of State, does not seem to be enough. If the French are not willing to make sufficient concessions to win the support of the native people, then the cause is hopeless.

We have heard the French say, "Support us or we will pull out." However, how do we expect to obtain the support of the native people of that area and of other areas in Asia? Certainly the Asiatics must be given a definite reason for participating in the struggle, or else they will not participate in it.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Permit me to say at this point that, as I recall, when the foreign aid bill was under consideration by the Senate, there was submitted an amendment to the effect that aid would be conditioned on freedom.

Mr. KENNEDY. That is correct; the Senator from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER] submitted the amendment, and I supported a modified, less mandatory version of it.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Indeed, so; and that amendment was fully discussed on the floor of the Senate. It was on July 4, 1953, when Laniel was Prime Minister, that a statement went out from Paris that the French intended to begin, and would begin in a few days, negotiations looking to the independence of the Associated States.

Now, when my friend, the Senator from Massachusetts, says the native people cannot wait that long——

Mr. KENNEDY. No; my point is that the negotiations have collapsed, because the Prime Minister has returned to Saigon, and the French Parliament has adopted a resolution to the effect that if the present arrangement between the Associated States and France is broken, France will consider the negotiations ended. So I say that the negotiations referred to on July 3 have broken down. It has been 9 months since then.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I realize that; but let us consider the negotiations which we had in the case of Korea. Negotiations can be reinstituted at any time.

We recall that Ho Chi Minh was taken to Paris in 1946. He was the leader of the Viet Minh forces.

Mr. KENNEDY. That is correct.

Mr. DIRKSEN. At that time they were not called the Viet Minh. They simply were called a nationalist group. Evidently the French thought they had with them an arrangement calling for freedom; but when Ho Chi Minh returned, he scarcely had landed in Indochina before he caused the slaughter not only of natives, but of French men, women, and children, as well.

The question was, To what extent could there be dependence upon his word, and to what extent could he enforce his word after he gave it? Consequently, it seems to me that these things must be nursed along for a time, because we simply cannot bring about independence overnight.

Mr. KENNEDY. The concessions made to Ho Chi Minh in 1946, which did not set any date for the use of French facilities in that area, did not include Cochin-China in the area over which he was given control. The French concessions were extremely limited. Since then, every time a military setback has occurred, the French have made more concessions. Cochin-China was included in the area of Vietnam. In 1950, the PAU agreements were made. Then, on July 3, 1953, further promises were made, after the military campaign of that season stalled. So political concessions have followed military defeat. Soon we may undoubtedly have another concession, because of the present military difficulty.

The point I make is that we are not going to get united action and the support of the people of that area until genuine political independence has been granted. The French have an obligation to the free world. This has been their colony. They refused to grant independence to Indochina at the end of World War II, as the British, the Dutch, and the United States did in comparable situations. Therefore, if they are not willing to continue the fight for a year or two—along with the free countries of the world, including the United States if that is what is required—in order to permit the area to be free, it seems to me the situation is hopeless.

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

Mr. KENNEDY. I yield.

Mr. DIRKSEN. In the interest of clarification, the Senator suggests giving them immediately their complete political independence. Does my friend from Massachusetts mean that the French administrators should walk out tomorrow, after the parchment has been signed making independence a reality, without any administrative talent to operate in the situation? Under such conditions there would be deterioration over night.

Mr. KENNEDY. What I would suggest would be two treaties, which the people of Vietnam want. One, granting them complete independence. After all, they have had an opportunity to develop a good many of their own technicians. There are not a great many French civil administrators left in the Associated States.

The second treaty would be a tie binding them to the French Union on the basis of equality. That has not been granted. I think it should be granted before any United States action is taken, because I feel that any action taken by us under present conditions would be doomed to failure.

Mr. DIRKSEN. So far as negotiation is concerned, it offers no real difficulty. It can be set afoot on the basis of all the representations which have been made heretofore.

Mr. KENNEDY. Negotiations have been carried on since last July, in an attempt to arrive at a formula which would combine union and independence. Ten days ago the negotiations were broken off, and the action of the French Parliament indicates that the French Assembly will not support such action. The point I make is that unless they do, anything we may do will be to no avail.

Mr. DIRKSEN. That may be true. I certainly would not face the situation with a sense of defeatism, because, from my own observations and from the discussions here at high levels, it seems to me that the situation can be retrieved and that the difficulties are not insurmountable. It certainly is not necessary to send American troops to Indochina.

Let me add that when all is said and done we have a President of the United States who can sit down in front of a battle map and, without any aid from anyone else, interpret what is on it and tell what the physical situation is.

Secondly, we have a President who has reaffirmed his confidence and faith in those provisions of the Constitution which have lodged the war-making power in the Congress, because it is exclusively there under the Constitution, notwithstanding the fact that a former Secretary of State has said that it is a power which has fallen into abeyance because wars are no longer declared in advance.

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

Mr. KENNEDY. I yield.

Mr. JACKSON. I merely wish to make 1 or 2 comments in connection with the remarks of my distinguished friend from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN].

First, let me say that I believe that the problem which we face is a national issue. I do not see for a moment how anyone can say that we should do anything to prevent the elevation of this problem to the point where it becomes a national issue. It is already a national issue. It is an international issue. I think there is great similarity to the situation which we faced 7 years ago in Greece. The reason why we intervened in Greece was to aid the Government of Greece in order to prevent the Mediterranean area from falling into the hands of the Communists.

The reason why we are concerned in Indochina, above everything else, is to prevent Indochina, and with it all of Southeast Asia, from falling into the hands of the Communists.

The reason why I have raised certain points this afternoon is that I wish to uphold the hand of the President of the United States, and to give to the President any reassurance that he may need from some of us in the Senate. I do not think we should get ourselves into such a situation in that, perhaps a few weeks hence, Senators might rise in this Chamber to criticize the President of the United States for taking precipitate action. It is to prevent that possibility that I have raised certain questions here today.

The situation in Indochina might reach the point where the President of the United States, in his capacity as commander-in-chief, might have to take precipitate action, which might eventually result in all-out war. It is because I wish to prevent that possibility, and in order that the Congress may discharge its responsibility, that I have made certain suggestions about the necessity of the President's stating the policy to the Congress of the United States.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Massachusetts yield, so that I may reply to my distinguished friend from Washington?

Mr KENNEDY. I yield.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I realize that when we discuss matters of such delicacy, terms ought to be very carefully used. Not for a moment did the junior Senator from Illinois tend to demean the seriousness of the situation in Indochina. Possibly conditions there change from day to day. They may change from hour to hour. Certainly the President of the United States, the Secretary of State, and those associated with them have daily reports, and, perchance, hourly reports. They are in a far better position than we are to determine what the situation is at a given moment. When the point is reached where certain information or statement of policy should be imparted to the Congress, there will certainly be no reluctance on the part of President Eisenhower to do so.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Massachusetts further yield?

Mr KENNEDY. I yield.

Mr. JACKSON. I conclude by saying that I heartily agree with my colleague, the junior Senator from Illinois. I think we are probably in general agreement.

I merely wish to make it clear that we should not reach a point from which we cannot withdraw, the only alternative being the possibility of all-out war. I sincerely believe that we ought to know what is our program and what is our policy in Indochina. Then let us get behind that policy and let the world know that the Congress supports the President of the United States in his efforts to prevent southeast Asia from falling into the hands of the Communists.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Massachusetts yield?

Mr. KENNEDY. I yield to the Senator from Mississippi.

Mr. STENNIS. First let me say to the Senator from Massachusetts that I think he has delivered the finest statement I have heard on this subject. It is a statement which certainly needed to be made, not only to the membership of this body, but to the people of the entire country. I think he has made an outstanding contribution in connection with this much misunderstood, cloudy, and uncertain subject.

I thought the response of the Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND], which was characteristic of him, was also on a very high, nonpartisan, constructive plane.

I wish to commend and thank both Senators.

The Senator from Massachusetts emphasizes the fact that he does not believe we should support any war in Indochina unless its basic objective is freedom. I heartily agree with him.

I have it on the very highest military authority—as high as it can be with the exception of the President of the United States himself—that a great deal of the trouble in Indochina is not a lack of men or a lack of material or a lack of weapons, but a lack of a proper will to fight and win. I was greatly impressed by that statement at the time we sent mechanics to Indochina, because we were going into an area that was not lacking firepower or men or anything else, except the will to fight.

The second point I wish to mention is the one that relates to unilateral action. While there are conditions on which Congress would vote to support united action, and I believe the people would back it up, I do not believe that Congress would ever vote, or should vote, to have the United States go in on a unilateral basis. It would have to be a united effort; not a token effort, but a real united effort.

In other words, if there is not sufficient power and strength in Asia, or in some Asiatic country which is willing to take the chance, to stop communism, as we say, or give freedom, and work on the basis of freedom, with some support from the other free nations of the world, then it is a lost cause, as I see it. Unless those conditions are brought about we should not go in. To go in on a unilateral basis would be to go into a trap. It would be to send our men into a trap from which there could be no reasonable recovery and no chance for victory.

So to the extent of united effort, as proclaimed by the Secretary of State, I certainly would back him. However, it must be more than a token of united effort, as I see it.

I believe the Senator from Massachusetts has done a great deal to clarify the situation as to what the actual conditions are in Indochina.

Mr. KENNEDY. I believe conditions should be established in Indochina which would permit the achievement of the united effort to which the Senator from Mississippi has referred.

Mr. STENNIS. I appreciate the statement of the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] in which he referred to the President's statement to the effect that Congress would be called upon to declare war if there is to be any deliberate entrance into war. I accept that statement at full value. However, things can happen from day to day and we could find ourselves in such a position that Congress would have no real choice.

Mr. KENNEDY. As was the case with Korea.

Mr. STENNIS. Yes; except to ratify the condition that then existed.

I believe it is particularly incumbent upon the President of the United States. I accept his assurances in full good faith, and I know he means every word. However, the burden is on him and on his administration to develop the facts, and to not be too late in presenting them to us for consideration according to our responsibility and for the Nation's consideration.

Mr. KENNEDY. I thank the Senator.

CONSTRUCTION OF HIGHWAYS

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 3184) to amend and supplement the Federal-Aid Road Act approved July 11, 1916 (39 Stat. 355), as amended, and supplemented, to authorize appropriations for continuing the construction of highways, and for other purposes.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, I offer an amendment, which is in the nature of a perfecting amendment to the pending bill, S. 3184.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BARRETT in the chair). The Secretary will state the amendment.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 3, line 2, after the word "sums", it is proposed to insert the words "heretofore, herein, or hereafter."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE].

Mr. CASE. The amendment refers to the provision relating to secondary roads. It is for the purpose of clarifying and carrying out the intent of the revision which I explained earlier in the afternoon.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, a few days ago I gave notice that there was intended to be proposed by myself, the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], and the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS] an amendment to Senate bill 3184——

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Mexico yield?

Mr. CHAVEZ. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I understand there is an amendment pending which the Senator from South Dakota has offered. It is technical in nature, and if we can dispose of it——

Mr. CHAVEZ. I have no objection to that.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE].

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, may we have the amendment stated?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will again state the amendment for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 3, line 2, after the word "sums", it is proposed to insert "heretofore, herein, or hereafter."

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, if there is any question in the mind of any Senator, the amendment is to make clear that the secondary road funds will be effective for the fiscal year 1956.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from South Dakota.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, as I previously stated, I have an amendment proposed by myself, the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], and the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS] to Senate bill 3184. The amendment proposes, on page 3, line 24, beginning with the word "The", to strike out down through

the colon in line 7, page 4, and to insert the following in lieu thereof:

The sum herein authorized for each fiscal year shall be apportioned among the several States in the manner now provided for by law for the apportionment of Federal-aid primary funds.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Mexico yield?

Mr. CHAVEZ. I yield.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, I have consulted with other members of the committee, and I think the intention is to take the amendment to conference to see what can be worked out.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, if the Senator takes the amendment to conference, I feel that if it is the intent of the Senate to carry out the terms of the amendment, it should not be a token proposition, but it should represent the action of the Senate.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Mexico yield?

Mr. CHAVEZ. I yield.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I should like to ascertain what the amendment proposes to accomplish. It has not been thoroughly explained while I have been present in the Chamber.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I shall be delighted to tell the Senator from Minnesota.

From the time the first road bill was passed in 1916 until this moment there has been with reference to the distribution of funds for interstate roads a formula which operated on the basis of one-third of the total population, one-third of the area of a State, and one-third of the mileage of postal roads. According to the bill, $75 million of the money for interstate roads will be allocated on the basis of population and the other $75 million will be allocated under the old formula. We feel that in the case of interstate roads the old formula should not be changed. In other words, the amendment would retain the old formula.

Mr. THYE. In other words, as to interstate roads the bill proposes to establish a new formula. Will the Senator explain, because he has concerned himself with this question, why distribution should be considered on the basis of population by States rather than of geographic areas, or total mileage.

Mr. CHAVEZ. The supposed justification was that in certain States, 11 out of the 48 States, the population was so large that it was necessary to base the funds on population, forgetting in the meantime that, nothwithstanding the fact that certain States have large populations, they do not have the interstate mileage which obtains in a State such as Colorado, for instance.

On pabe 4315 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of April 1, 1954, there will be found a list of States, 9 of which will receive benefits. The others will not receive their proper share. It is not a question of dollars and cents. It is a question of principle, that interstate roads should be real interstate roads.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield further, I should like to say that, according to the proposed formula, 19 States would gain and 29 States would lose. At least, that is what I understand. Nineteen States would stand to gain under the new formula, while 29 States would lose under the new formula.

Mr. CHAVEZ. That is true.

Mr. THYE. I have not had the opportunity of studying the bill as have those who serve on the committee, and that is the reason why I ask these questions, so that I may fully understand the situation.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Let us consider the State of Minnesota. Under section 21, which established the old formula that would be retained by this amendment, Minnesota would receive $3,926,000. Under the new formula it would receive $3,333,000, or a loss of more than $500,000. But the question is not whether Minnesota loses $500,000 or whether Colorado loses a large amount, but we wish to carry out the principle of interstate roads.

Mr. THYE. I thank the Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Mexico yield?

Mr. CHAVEZ. I yield.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, I think the Senator's amendment is an excellent one, and I hope it will be taken to conference.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Mexico yield?

Mr. CHAVEZ. I yield.

Mr. STENNIS. As I understand the situation, the chairman of the subcommittee has indicated that it would be acceptable to him to take the amendment to conference. I wish to say that from my viewpoint it is a vital and very important amendment, not only at this time but for years hereafter. It will reinstate the historic formula. The basic historic formula will be changed unless this amendment be adopted. The House has already changed it in the bill it passed. I seriously object to undermining the basic historic formula. Unless the amendment is taken to conference as expressing the will of the majority of the Senate, I shall have to insist that we take a vote to ascertain just what is the will of the Senate.

Mr. THYE. If the Senator from Mississippi has completed his statement, I wish to reemphasize the importance of the amendment which has been offered by the Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. STENNIS. I think the amendment ought to be thoroughly discussed and explained. I feel that a vote should be taken.

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

Mr. CHAVEZ. I yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. I agree with the Senator from Mississippi. I think the question is of great importance. Personally, I hold exactly the opposite view from that which is held by the proponents of the amendment. The majority of the committee held the opposite view. We think that a very fair compromise has been made in reporting the committee bill. We want Senators to have open minds and to know the very vital nature of the question which is dealt with in the interstate highway system, for which it is proposed to adopt a different system of distribution as to only 7½ percent of the total authorization. The amount of upset is, of course, very much less than 7½ percent, because the new formula will be applied to only 7½ percent of the total.

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

Mr. HOLLAND. I do not have the floor.

I simply wish to state complete approval of the position taken by the Senator from Mississippi. The matter is of vital concern to the Nation, and I think it deserves full expression in the RECORD. Even if the distinguished chairman of the committee and the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee are willing to take the amendment to conference—and I shall certainly not object to that course—I still wish to have the RECORD clearly show the position of the majority of the committee, a position which I think addresses itself to the sound judgment of the Nation as a whole, in connection with national defense, and in connection with the promotion of better and safer travel on the highways as well.

I thank the Senator from New Mexico.

Several Senators addressed the Chair.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I have the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Mexico has the floor.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I want not only a majority of the committee to know what this amendment means, but also a majority of the Senate. I want every State of the United States of America—Kentucky, Pennsylvania, Alabama, Texas, Virginia, South Carolina, Mississippi, Georgia, and all the others—to understand the implications of the committee proposal. All it means, purely and simply, is that, for the first time in the history of Federal road legislation, we shall be bailing out a few States at the sacrifice of a majority of States, simply because a few States have large populations.

It is true that some States have large populations. It is also true that some States do not have large populations, but have a great mileage of roads, and this bill provides an entering wedge.

The proponents of this provision tell us, it is true, that they are dividing only $75 million in that way. This is the first time it has been done. They do not forget to tell us the way in which they propose to do it. The primary roads are just as much a part of the interstate system as are the interstate roads themselves.

How must the people of the heavily populated States of the East and the Middle West travel to southern California? They must go through Kansas and New Mexico; they might even go through Oregon.

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

Mr. CHAVEZ. I yield.

Mr. CORDON. Is it not a fact that every mile of so-called interstate road is equivalent to a mile of primary road?

Mr. CHAVEZ. The Senator is correct and by the division sought to be made under the bill, some States will get more than a proper proportionate share. It is desired to divide $75 million to take care of what? Not the interstate roads.

To build a two-lane road in Oregon costs just as much as to build a two-lane road elsewhere. The cost of a sack of cement and the costs of the labor contracts of the contractor are identical.

The only thing which is sought to be done is to assist the heavily populated States to secure rights-of-way. Hence, it is desired to make 29 States in the interstate system suffer, in order to provide for the acquisition of rights-of-way in heavily populated States.

Mr. President, that is unfair; it is contrary to the roadbuilding policy which has been in effect since 1916. I believe in our roadbuilding policy. We have here a good road bill, the finest we ever have had, even including those which were reported when I was chairman of the committee. This is an even better bill. It is a fine bill, and provides more than was ever provided before.

Mr. President, roads are what have united the United States. The Constitution declares the States to be the United States of America, in so many words; but only the building of roads has actually united the States of the Nation. So I am for the bill. I am not against it at all. But I say the idea of legislating for only a few States, and not for the Nation as a whole, is unsound.

Mr. President, I call up my amendment 4–1–54B, and ask that it be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 3, line 24, beginning with the word "The," it is proposed to strike out down through the colon in line 7, page 4, and to insert the following in lieu thereof:

> The sum herein authorized for each fiscal year shall be apportioned among the several States in the manner now provided for by law for the apportionment of Federal-aid primary funds.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I ask for the yeas and nays.

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

Mr. CHAVEZ. I yield.

Mr. RUSSELL. That was what I was about to ask for. If the matter is so important as the remarks of the Senator from New Mexico would indicate, it seems to me we should fortify the action of the Senate by a record vote on the amendment.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I ask for the yeas and nays on the amendment, in order that the views of all Senators may be recorded.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, since it is obvious that the amendment will take more time than I had anticipated, and since it will have to be discussed tomorrow, in any event, because of the number of Senators who have asked whether there was likely to be a yea-and-nay vote tonight, I am prepared to move that the Senate recess until tomorrow, unless Senators desire to submit matters for insertion in the RECORD.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield.

Mr JOHNSON of Texas. We had expected to vote on the amendment. I am sorry the discussion has taken longer than was expected. We have asked Senators on this side of the aisle to return to the Chamber. The Senator from New Mexico, because of an engagement, finds it necessary to leave town tonight.

I understand the yeas and nays have been ordered. I hope there will not be a lengthy discussion, but it is not yet 5 o'clock, and we should like to have a vote on the amendment, in view of the fact that the Senator from New Mexico will not be here tomorrow.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I may say to the distinguished Senator from Texas that, as he knows, earlier in the afternoon, when the question was discussed, I was informed that there might be proposed several amendments which could be taken to conference, the clear implication being that there would not be a necessity for a yea and nay vote on the amendments.

Under those circumstances, a number of Senators, on both sides of the aisle, asked me whether there would be a yea-and-nay vote. I told them I had hoped the bill would pass, but that I felt that any votes on amendments would be voice votes.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I was unaware of that. It was my understanding that the majority leader had indicated to the minority leader that he desired to send for Members to come to the floor, and that he had done so.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I hope that we did not have a misunderstanding. I suggested that Members be sent for, to be sure that a quorum would be present, because, as the Senator will remember, the absence of a quorum had been suggested. My entire conversation with the distinguished Senator from South Dakota and other Senators had been to the effect that there were amendments which the Senator from South Dakota was prepared to take to conference, which presumably would be amendments which would be agreed to by voice vote. So I had given assurances that, at this late hour of the day, there would not be a yea-and-nay vote in the Senate.

Certainly I have no objection to a yea-and-nay vote if the Senator desires to have one but, under the circumstances, I feel that further consideration of the bill should go over until tomorrow, because the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON] has several amendments to offer, and action on them obviously could not be finished tonight.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I am deeply interested in the road bill, but it happens that I have a speaking engagement in Albuquerque tomorrow. I am leaving tonight at 12 o'clock. I wish the Senator from California would let us have a vote on the amendment. Every now and then we all try to help our fellow Senators. I have gone to Sacramento, Calif., to help the Senator from California on a little hearing, and no questions were asked.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Mexico yield?

Mr. CHAVEZ. I yield to the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. FERGUSON. I think the committee did an excellent job in changing the formula. I am opposed to what the Senator is proposing, and I shall vote against his amendment.

Mr. CHAVEZ. It is a case of Michigan getting something as against New Mexico and some other States.

Mr. President, let us have a vote by a division.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair has been informed by the Parliamentarian that the Senator from New Mexico, when he was on his feet, requested the yeas and nays. A sufficient number of hands were shown, and therefore the yeas and nays will be ordered on the amendment of the Senator.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I understand, from the Senator who has the bill in charge, that there will be considerable debate on the pending question. The parliamentary situation has changed from what it previously had been. The hour is 5 o'clock. If a vote were about to be taken I would have to suggest the absence of a quorum. A number of Senators left the Chamber with the assurance from the majority leader that no yea-and-nay votes were expected this evening. I gave such assurances based on what I thought was a general discussion in the Senate that a number of amendments were to be presented, and were to be taken to conference by the chairman of the committee, which would require only a voice vote.

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

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield to the Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. KERR. Is the Senator from California saying that he was willing that Senators who sponsored the amendment, and who favored it, should be led into a boobytrap by an agreement that the amendment would be taken to conference and there be discarded?

Mr. KNOWLAND. No. The Senator from Oklahoma knows better than that. I am not suggesting any such thing. So far as I am concerned, when the Senate adopts an amendment, whether it be by voice vote or a yea-and-nay vote, it expresses the sentiment of the Senate, which should be binding on the conferees. However, when Senators handling the bill have participated in discussions in which they agreed, in order to expedite legislation, that they would accept a number of amendments on a voice vote, and I have given assurances to Senators on this side of the aisle and on the other side of the aisle that, under the circumstances as I understood them, there would be no further rollcalls this evening, I feel I have an obligation, as majority leader, to suggest that the amendment go over and be voted on tomorrow, when there will be ample time to debate it, because I understand some Senators wish to discuss it at some length.

That is the picture, and the Senator from Oklahoma is not correct when he states I understood, or that I ever understood, that Senators were to give only lipservice to this or to any other amendment. That is not the way I operate in the Senate, and I am sure that that is not the way the committee operates.

Mr. KERR. Will the Senator yield for a further question?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield.

Mr. KERR. The Senator from California is aware that the Senator from Oklahoma asked a question, and did not make a statement, is he not?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I got the full implications of the Senator's question.

Mr. KERR. Will the Senator yield for another question?

Mr. KNOWLAND. Yes.

Mr. KERR. If the Senator from California is willing to have the Senate accept the amendment on a voice vote, but is not willing to have it accepted on a yea-and-nay vote, I wish he would tell the Senate why he takes that position, unless he opposes the amendment and feels that it would be in a weaker position in conference, by reason of its adoption by a voice vote, than it would be if it were approved by a record vote.

Mr. KNOWLAND. So far as the Senator from California is concerned, as the majority leader, it does not make one bit of difference to me whether the amendment is acted on by a yea-and-nay vote or voice vote. My only point is that I have some responsibility to Senators when I tell them that there will not be a yea-and-nay vote. Senators who have dinner and other engagements are at least entitled to know if there is to be a yea-and-nay vote in order that they may be able to be present in the Senate to vote.

I am perfectly willing that there be a yea-and-nay vote, if that is what the Senator wants. I am only suggesting that, if there is to be a yea-and-nay vote, consideration of the amendment should go over until tomorrow.

Mr. KERR. Will the Senator yield further?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield.

Mr. KERR. Was the judgment of the majority leader, either as expressed or unexpressed, in any way binding on the Senate?

Mr. KNOWLAND. It was not in any way binding on the Senate; but I submit to the Members of the Senate that both Democrats and Republicans from time to time have the habit of asking me whether, in my judgment, there are going to be any further rollcalls. The Senator knows why that is. It is because a pending bill may be of tremendous importance to Senators, and if there is to be a record vote, and they are not present, some embarrassment may be occasioned to them, whether they are Republicans or Democrats. That is the only position the Senator from California is taking on the matter, in his responsibility as majority leader.

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

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield to the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. THYE. I fully appreciate what the majority leader is faced with, and I also appreciate what the Senator from New Mexico has stated. The Senator from New Mexico is committed to returning to his State, and he must leave at midnight. The Senator from New Mexico is the sponsor of the amendment, in which I fully concur. I shall do all I possibly can to obtain votes in favor of the amendment offered by the Senator from New Mexico. From the best information I have been able to obtain, 19 States will stand to gain by the proposed committee formula, and 29 States will lose by it. If only 19 States gain, I would say it would be unjust and unfair to permit the particular provision in the bill affected by the amendment to stand, and for that reason I wish to support the amendment offered by the Senator from New Mexico. I fully appreciate the fact that the majority leader has committed himself by stating that no record vote will be taken today, and that certain Senators are not present because of dinner and other engagements. I personally believe they should be here at the time the yeas and nays are called. However, the Senator from New Mexico is one of the sponsors of the amendment, and he is now committed to leaving the city at midnight, and he would like to be present when the amendment is voted on.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator from California yield?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield to the Senator from Vermont.

Mr. AIKEN. In regard to the present situation, it is obvious that if 29 States stand to lose by the amendment, and 19 States to gain, there could possibly be a vote of 58 to 38 in the event all Members of the Senate were present. However, they are not all present.

I had understood that the yeas and nays were ordered. I understood the Senator from New Mexico indicated a willingness to accept a standing vote. Would it not be possible to void a yea-and-nay vote and have a standing vote?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Vermont make a request for unanimous consent?

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I ask that notwithstanding the order for the yeas and nays, there be a vote on the amendment by a standing vote.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I object.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, will the Senator from California yield?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield.

Mr. MARTIN. I thought we could complete action on the bill this afternoon, and I asked quite a number of Senators not to debate the bill in order that we might dispose of it today. There are several Senators who wish to discuss the bill. If the amendment is to be decided by a record vote, I myself wish to have the opportunity to speak on it, and that will take a little time. The amendment is a very serious proposal. What we have tried to do in the bill is to make known to the people of the United States the importance of a national highway system. We have been building highways piecemeal previously. We have been appropriating only $25 million a year for the interstate system. The bill authorizes an appropriation of $150 million for that system. The House bill authorizes an appropriation of $200 million. So since we have gone as far as we can, I think the subject ought to be very carefully discussed on the floor of the Senate.

I think a great many of the States, which will receive less money under this formula than under the old one, will vote for the national system. The people of the sparsely populated States want an opportunity to drive through the large cities, where enormous expenditures are required to complete these roads. Those are facts which I am afraid the great number do not understand. Therefore, Mr. President, I think the amendment should be thoroughly discussed on the floor of the Senate.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I submit an amendment intended to be proposed by me to the bill (S. 3184) to amend and supplement the Federal-Aid Road Act approved July 11, 1916 (39 Stat. 355), as amended and supplemented, to authorize appropriations for continuing the construction of highways, and for other purposes. I ask unanimous consent that the amendment lie on the table, be printed, and be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the amendment was received, ordered to lie on the table, to be printed, and to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

On page 15, after line 15, insert the following new section:

"SEC. 19. For the purpose of carrying out the provisions of section 10 of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1952 (66 Stat. 162) there is hereby authorized to be appropriated the additional sum of $10 million, to remain available until expended: *Provided,* That $50 million of the sums heretofore and herein authorized for the purposes of section 6 of the Defense Highway Act of 1941 (55 Stat. 765) as amended and supplemented, shall be available for contract immediately upon the passage of this act."

Renumber succeeding section numbers.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE—ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Bartlett, one of its clerks, announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills and joint resolution:

S. 1456. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to authorize a permanent annual appropriation for the maintenance and operation of the Gorgas Memorial Laboratory," approved May 7, 1928, as amended;

S. 2405. An act to authorize the exchange, upon terms fully protecting the public interest, of the United States Public Health quarantine station at Marcus Hook, Pa., for a new quarantine station;

H. R. 962. An act for the relief of Gabrielle Marie Smith (nee Staub);

H. R. 1148. An act for the relief of Antonino Cangialosi (or Anthony Consola);

H. R. 1529. An act to facilitate the development of building materials in Alaska through the removal of volcanic ash from portions of Katmai National Monument, Alaska, and for other purposes;

H. R. 1568. An act to amend section 6 of chapter 786 of the act of June 6, 1900, entitled "An act making further provision for a civil government for Alaska, and for other purposes" (31 Stat. 323; title 48, sec. 108, U. S. C.);

H. R. 2351. An act for the relief of Sam Rosenblat;

H. R. 2441. An act for the relief of Husnu Ataullah Berker;

H. R. 2747. An act to amend title 17 of the United States Code entitled "Copyrights" with respect to the day for taking action when the last day for taking such action falls on Saturday, Sunday, or a holiday;

H. R. 3045. An act for the relief of Nickolas K. Ioannides;

H. R. 3306. An act to provide for the relief of certain reclamation homestead entrymen;

H. R. 3961. An act for the relief of Margherita Di Meo;

H. R. 4024. An act to change the name of the Appomattox Court House National Historical Monument to the "Appomattox Court House National Historical Park";

H. R. 4056. An act for the relief of Manfred Singer;

H. R. 4707. An act for the relief of Lee Yim Quon;

H. R. 4738. An act for the relief of Gabriel Hittrich;

H. R. 4886. An act for the relief of Ingrid Birgitta Maria Colwell (nee Friberg);

H. R. 4984. An act to remove certain limitations upon the sale or conveyance of land heretofore conveyed to the city of Miles City, Mont., by the United States;

H. R. 5085. An act for the relief of Mrs. Maria Tcherepnin;

H. R. 6434. An act to amend sections 401 and 701 of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act so as to simplify the procedures governing the establishment of food standards; and

H. J. Res. 238. Joint resolution granting the status of permanent residence to certain aliens.

TRIBUTE TO SENATOR JOHNSON OF COLORADO

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the body of the RECORD a statement by me in regard to my good friend, the senior Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON].

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

STATEMENT BY SENATOR MAGNUSON

Last week one of our colleagues announced he will not seek reelection to the Senate in 1954. I refer, of course, to our friend ED JOHNSON of Colorado—"Big ED JOHNSON"—as he is affectionately known by many people in and out of the Senate.

Senator JOHNSON is "big" in the minds and hearts of all of us who have had the opportunity of knowing him and working with him.

It has been my privilege to serve with Senator ED JOHNSON on the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee for the past 10 years. During that time I have never known him to commit an unkind or discourteous act. He has demonstrated his bigness of mind and purpose in innumerable ways. ED JOHNSON is considerate in his dealings with everyone—whether it be a witness, a member of the staff, or a fellow Senator.

ED JOHNSON brought to the Senate a wealth of experience in public service. When he came here in January of 1937, he had already served 4 terms in the Colorado House of Representatives, 1 term as lieutenant governor, and 2 terms as the distinguished Governor of the great western State.

He knew the problems of the West. He has fought shoulder to shoulder with those of us who come from that great section of these United States—always motivated by a deep conviction of what was right for the State he represents as well as for this great Nation which he serves.

Every Member of the Senate will miss ED JOHNSON. It will take a big man to fill his place. We are reluctant to see him leave, but our affection, respect, and best wishes will be with him wherever he is—in whatever new field of service he may enter.

The Senate of the United States has been dignified and honored by his presence here.

I am going to miss a good friend.

BONNEVILLE POWER RATES

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the body of the RECORD a statement by me on the threatened increase in Bonneville power rates, as they affect the Pacific Northwest. Attached to the statement is an editorial on the same subject from the Longview Daily News.

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

THREAT OF INCREASE IN BONNEVILLE RATES AROUSES NORTHWEST—STATEMENT BY SENATOR MAGNUSON

Secretary of Interior McKay and Under Secretary Ralph Tudor have been talking recently of raising Bonneville Power Administration's wholesale rates. This talk has aroused people in the Northwest. The people doubt an increase is necessary at this time. Many interpret such talk as a further evidence of the present administration's policy of "fewer kilowatts at higher cost."

The laws under which Bonneville Power Administration operates require that kilowatts be sold at a price high enough to return the Federal investment in power facilities.

By June 30, 1953, Bonneville Power Administration had produced net revenues of $93,410,000—they are $62 million ahead of their pay-out schedule.

By statute Bonneville rates must be reviewed every 5 years. The best figures available to me demonstrate that in the coming 5-year period Bonneville Power Administration will have a net surplus. Here are the estimates:

1954	[1] $10,000,000
1955	[1] 7,000,000
1956	[1] 4,000,000
1957	[1] 600,000
1958	[2] 2,000,000
1959	[2] 4,000,000

[1] Surplus.
[2] Deficit.

In view of the fact that Bonneville is $62 million ahead of its pay-out schedule and in view further of the fact there will be a net surplus of $3 million to $4 million in the coming 5-year period, it is difficult for the people of the Northwest to understand that an increase in rates should be necessary.

On Thursday, March 4, the Longview Daily News published the following lead editorial entitled "Bonneville Wholesale Rate Is Matter of Vital Public Concern":

"BONNEVILLE WHOLESALE RATE IS MATTER OF VITAL PUBLIC CONCERN

"The Interior Department has gotten around to talking openly about the long rumored possible increase in Bonneville power rates. This is a matter of pocketbook concern to every individual in the Northwest, since an increase in the wholesale rate that Bonneville charges would certainly be reflected in higher household electricity bills.

"Perhaps more important is the effect such an increase would have on the industrial potential of the Northwest. Cheap electric power is about the only industrial advantage the Northwest enjoys. Our transportation, raw materials, and labor costs are generally higher than in other parts of the country.

"Under Secretary of the Interior Ralph Tudor said this week that a study of Bonneville rates is being made and a $5 increase, from $17.50 to $22.50 per kilowatt year, may be forthcoming.

"The Bonneville Act provides that rates are to be reexamined every 5 years and this is a year for reexamination.

"It is generally agreed that sometime in the future the wholesale rate will have to be increased when new hydroelectric dams are completed. This is because the new dams—McNary, Chief Joseph, and The Dalles—were much more expensive to build than the original Bonneville and Grand Coulee Dams. The higher the cost of a dam, the more must be charged for electricity it generates in order to pay off the cost. This high-cost item is one of the main objections to a high Hells Canyon Dam.

"But until these new dams are in production, what reason is there for increasing the wholesale rate? Bonneville in fiscal 1953 showed a profit of $9,567,000.

"The Washington Public Utility Districts' Association, analyzing this situation, believes that eastern interests are trying deliberately to take away the power advantage of the Northwest by 'artificial and arbitrary increases in wholesale rates now simply by changing the ground rules.' There are eight ways in which this could be done:

"(1) Charge a larger share of construction costs to power. This is already being done in the case of McNary Dam unless the Federal Power Commission changes its recent ruling. The FPC wants to charge nearly the whole cost of McNary, including the expensive locks for navigation and fishways, to power users and very little to navigation and fishing.

"(2) Shorten the payout period: A cut from 50 to 40 years in the time a major project is to be paid out has been suggested.

"(3) Charge higher interest rates for power projects: An increase of only one-half of 1 percent could increase the cost of electric power 7 percent. No increase in the rate on the money loaned for construction of the dams is believed justified for the reason that the Government can borrow money at 2 percent and it is charging interest on Bonneville at the rate of 2½ percent and Grand Coulee at 3½ percent.

"(4) Abolish the interest component: Power from Coulee Dam must pay that part of irrigation investment in the Columbia Basin project that is beyond the ability of water users to pay. It amounts to an estimated $400 million over the next 63 years. However, some $80 million of relief was to have been provided by crediting back the interest on the Grand Coulee power investment. The Under Secretary of the Interior recommended that this be abolished, and if it is that result would be a 4-percent increase in the cost of Coulee power.

"(5) Eliminate credit for downstream benefits: Large multiple-purpose projects aid downstream projects. It has been the historic Federal policy to credit new projects with the benefits they provide for dams further downstream even though those dams have not yet been built. If this were done, power costs could be increased an estimated 3 percent.

"(6) Absorb private utility steam costs during low-water years through Federal power charges to all consumers. If this were done power users in Washington State would have to pay the high steam costs of Oregon's private utilities during periods when Bonneville could not supply Oregon utilities' full needs. It is pointed out that private companies already enjoy lower Federal power rates than most PUD's because they can use their steam plants to carry peak loads. Last year private companies paid an average of 2.23 mills for Bonneville power, while the PUD's paid about 3 mills.

"(7) Charge ad valorem property taxes to Federal projects: This would certainly be unreasonable unless States were allowed also to tax other Federal property, including post offices, national forests, etc.

"(8) Charge Federal power a gross revenue tax: This has actually been proposed by a special tax policy committee of the Edison Electric Institute, spokesmen for private electric companies.

"The PUD Association estimates that if all eight of these methods of raising Bonneville's rates were adopted, the cost of

industrial power might be increased as much as 35 or 40 percent next year and be doubled by 1960. This not only would keep new industries from coming into the area, but it certainly would force existing industries, including the Reynolds Metals Co., to close down.

"Bonneville power rates are very much an item of public concern, and the forces of aroused public opinion need to be mustered to prevent these rates from being tampered with to the detriment of the Northwest."

RECESS

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate at this time, I move that the Senate stand in recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 13 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Wednesday, April 7, 1954, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate April 6 (legislative day of April 5), 1954:

Department of Defense

Thomas Potter Pike, of California, to be Assistant Secretary of Defense, vice Charles S. Thomas, who has been nominated to be Secretary of the Navy.

Wilbur Marion Brucker, of Michigan, to be General Counsel of the Department of Defense, vice H. Struve Hensel, who has been appointed an Assistant Secretary of Defense.

United States Circuit Judges

Potter Stewart, of Ohio, to be United States circuit judge, sixth circuit, vice Xenophon Hicks, retired.

Richard Harvey Chambers, of Arizona, to be United States circuit judge, ninth circuit, to fill a new position.

Dal M. Lemmon, of California, to be United States circuit judge, ninth circuit, to fill a new position.

James Alger Fee, of Oregon, to be United States circuit judge, ninth circuit, vice Clifton Mathews, retired.

United States District Judges

Alexander Bicks, of New York, to be United States district judge for the southern district of New York, vice Vincent L. Leibell, retired.

Archie Owen Dawson, of New York, to be United States district judge for the southern district of New York, vice Henry W. Goddard, retired.

Edmund L. Palmieri, of New York, to be United States district judge for the southern district of New York, to fill a new position.

Lawrence Edward Walsh, of New York, to be United States district judge for the southern district of New York, to fill a new position.

Jean Sala Breitenstein, of Colorado, to be United States district judge for the district of Colorado, to fill a new position.

Robert Palmer Anderson, of Connecticut, to be United States district judge for the district of Connecticut, vice Carroll C. Hincks, elevated.

United States Marshal

William Ernest Smith, of Tennessee, to be United States marshal for the western district of Tennessee, vice Ben Ivy King, resigned.

In the Navy

The following-named midshipmen (Naval Academy) to be ensigns in the Navy:

Snowden C. Ager
Dwight M. Agnew, Jr.
Robert J. Akens
Thomas L. Albee, Jr.
Peter C. Alecxih
Ramon C. Alvarado
Arthur J. Ammerman
Clell N. Ammerman
Alfred P. Amoruso
Eugene G. Anderson
Falvie B. Anderson, Jr.
Jack R. Anderson
Joe K. Anderson
Joseph F. Anderson
Walter S. Anderson
William P. Anderson
Matthew E. Anglin, Jr.
Theodore F. Ascherfeld, Jr.
Augustus T. Ashton II
James F. Austin
James W. Austin
Robert C. Austin
William M. Bacon
Thomas L. Baird
Gaylord B. Ballard
Lawrence D. Ballow
Thomas V. Banfield II
Thomas A. Banta
Michael G. Basford
Bradley A. Bassett
John P. Bayne
Derald R. Beal
John L. Beck
Walter R. Beck
Archibald B. Beckmann, Jr.
James F. Bell
Maurice R. Berdan
Robert L. Berg
Frank R. Berkhimer
Robert D. Biederman
William Biggar
Henry G. Billerbeck
Roland C. Bilyeu
Norman H. Bissel
Richard W. Blaes
George T. Bole
Richard P. Bordone
John W. Boyd, Jr.
Frank A. Brame III
Horace W. Brandon
John S. Brennan
Robert L. Brewin
Gordon A. Brill, Jr.
Robert R. Briner
Christopher H. Brown
Robert C. Brown, Jr.
Robert H. Brown
Eugene P. Brummett
James I. Brunell
Robert C. Bunger
Lawrence Burkhardt III
Richard F. Burns
Evenson M. Burtis
Melville R. Byington, Jr.
Mark W. Byrd
Jose C. Cabanillas II
Hamlin A. Caldwell, Jr.
Roderick A. Cameron
Donald S. Campbell, Jr.
John D. Campbell
John L. Campbell
Guy Cane
William A. Cann
Howard R. Canter
James H. Carson, Jr.
Gerald M. Carter, Jr.
Theodore C. Casimes
Ralph E. Childley
George E. Chisholm II
Athol W. Cliff, Jr.
Walter J. Coakley, Jr.
Leonard I. Cole, Jr.
Irvin L. Coleman, Jr.
Byron H. Collier
Ferdinand I. Collins, Jr.
William P. Colvin
Lawrence S. Colwell
Robert G. Conaughton
Thomas W. Conboy
Robert B. Conklin
Samuel R. Connor
Edward C. Copeland
Robert L. Cornell
James P. Couillard
Herbert C. Crane
George H. Crawford
John W. Crawford
Roderick P. Crawford
William T. Crawford
William V. Cronin
Philip W. Cronk
William H. Croom, Jr.
Joseph D. Cummings
Marshall E. Cunningham
Richard A. Currier
Thomas L. Curry
Robert L. Cutts
Bernard F. Czaja
Bart M. Dalla Mura, Jr.
Richard J. Damico
Jerry D. Dancer
William D. Daniels
Ralph G. Davis
Edward H. Dawson, Jr.
Norman A. Deam
Herbert J. Dean
Donald D. Deem
John R. Delaney
Maurice H. Desseyn
Jamieson K. Deuel
Leonard "M" Dickey
Ricky W. Diehl
Lewis E. Diley
Jon C. Dilweg
Philip C. Donovan
John E. Dougherty, Jr.
George W. Dozier, Jr.
Carl C. Drenkard
Julian A. Ducat
Sylvester M. Dulke
Gordon V. Dunn
James A. Dunning
Alan J. Dworsky
Peter B. Easton
Theodore M. Edson
Ralph C. Elder
Donal W. Elliott
Frank B. Elsbree
Frederic G. Fagan
David E. Ferguson
Kenneth A. Ferrer
Peter B. Fiedler, Jr.
William B. Fields
Raymond McD. Fillerup
David A. Fitzwilliam
Robert M. Flaherty
William B. Fletcher III
Paul R. Foley
Donald L. Forbes
Clifton G. Foster, Jr.
Scott R. Foster
Walter B. Frick
Elbert L. Fryberger, Jr.
Truman H. Fugate
George M. Gans, Jr.
Gerald I. Gard, Jr.
Bennett Gardner
Jerry E. Garlitz
Richard T. Gaskill
Fred H. Gates II
Donald H. Gehring
Eugene L. Geronime
William C. Gideon, Jr.
Albert K. Glover, Jr.
Harold A. Glovier, Jr.
David L. Glunt, Jr.
Paul T. Gorman
Basil F. Gray, Jr.
William C. Gray, Jr.
Terry S. Green III
William C. Greenlaw
William E. Greer III
Bernard R. Greisen
Rodney D. Griffiths
Paul M. Grover, Jr.
James G. Grunwell
Allan R. Gunion
Robert S. Haines
Howard LeR. Hall
John D. Halpine
Louis H. Hamel III
Elton E. Hankins
Mark Z. Hanlon, Jr.
Jerry "L" Hamilton
Andrew L. Hamlin
Paul F. Happersett
William W. Hargrave, Jr.
John Q. Hargrove III
George T. Harper, Jr.
Richard R. Hartley
Robert L. Hatfield
Darwin L. Hatheway
John W. Havicon
James C. Hay
James V. Healy
George F. Heinrich
Robert M. Hemings, Jr.
Edward E. Henifin
George M. Henson
Oscar A. Herzer
Irvin K. Heyward IV
William C. Hicklin III
John F. Higgins
Leonard O. Hilder, Jr.
William W. Hill
David R. Hinkle
Allen Hobbs, Jr.
Walter B. Hocker
Edward J. Hogan, Jr.
Thomas W. Hogan, Jr.
William G. Holland
Richard G. Hollenbach
William D. Holloman
William C. Holman
Henry C. Holt IV
William F. Holtz
Thomas J. Hooley
Herbert A. Hope, Jr.
John Honer, Jr.
Charles L. Horowitz
Thomas B. Hudgins
Maurice W. Huffer
William L. Huffman, Jr.
Fred A. Hull
Kenneth E. Hume
Charles B. Hunter
William J. Hunter
Jonathan S. Hurt
Theodore Huttinger
Blair Ireland
Charles E. Jaco
David C. Jenkins
Joseph T. Jennings
Robert J. Jermstad, Jr.
Arthur D. Jesser
Eugene T. Johnston
Fox H. Johnston
James V. Jolliff
Carroll S. Jones
John P. Jones, Jr.
Robert F. Jones, Jr.
Stephen W. Jordan
John G. Juergens
John D. Keating
Edward S. Kellogg III
Richmond K. Kelly, Jr.
Lawrence R. Kilty
Richard B. King
Frederic H. M. Kinley
Leo D. Kinney
Frederick J. Kirby
George F. Knotts
James G. Kohoutek
Frederick J. Kollmorgen
Zygmont J. Kowalskey, Jr.
Chris Krahn
William J. Kratt
Edwin G. Krikorian
David S. Kruger
Jerold L. Krumwiede
Ronald J. Kurth
Walker W. Lambert
James F. Lamore
Elwood W. Land, Jr.
William J. Lane
Roy G. Langrind
Thomas J. Lawson
Charles W. Learned, Jr.
Richard Leslie
David E. Lewis
Ernest W. Lietzan, Jr.
John G. Link
Philip N. Livingstone
Charles L. Long
Waldon E. Lord
Donald E. Loring
William R. Lutz
John F. Lyding
Donald M. Lynne
Philip Lyons
Burnham C. McCaffree, Jr.
Robert T. McCaffrey
Francis J. McCarthy, Jr.
Gerald D. McCarthy
Parker W. McClellan
Benjamin D. McCubbins, Jr.
Ronald F. McDevitt
Guy A. McElroy
James F. McGill
Robert J. McGurk
George R. McKee, Jr.
James A. McKenzie II
Kent A. McKnight
Stephen P. McNally
Patrick "J" S. McNenny
Robert E. Mack
Raymond R. Maestri
James G. Mahorner
John T. Marshall, Jr.
John T. Marshall, Jr.
Edward H. Martin
Robert T. Martin
Carl L. Master, Jr.
Kleber S. Masterson, Jr.
Robert L. Merritt
Marshall R. Messinger
Donald J. Meyer
John R. Michaels
Ralph A. Millar, Jr.
Thomas H. Millen
Charles H. Miller III
Raleigh B. Miller, Jr.
Russell C. Miller
William C. Miller
Donald F. Mitchell
Arthur S. Mobley
Louis F. Moebus
Kenneth Montgomery
William J. Montgomery
Robert W. Montross
Joe Mook
Robert E. Moore III
Thomas W. Moore
Charles H. Morris
Edward H. Mortimer III
Donald A. Morton
Francis S. Mudgett
Richard G. Murphy
Thomas F. Murray
Richard C. Myers
Harold A. Nagel, Jr.
Owen W. Nash
William C. Neel
Floyd G. Nelson
John E. Newton
William H. Nicholls, Jr
Louis C. Niederlander, Jr.
Walter C. Nix
William E. Oberholtzer III
John T. O'Brien
William J. Oldmixon
Charles F. Olsen
Jerome J. Olsen
Robert M. Olsen
Richard L. Olson

Robert J. O'Malia
Walter A. Orsik
Leo A. Orsino
Edward R. Oscarson
Richard G. Padberg
Eugene H. Parker
Richard E. Parks
Matthew F. Pasztalaniec
Julian C. Patrick
Lee R. Patterson
Raymond F. Pavia
William K. Peery
David J. Perault
Jack C. Perkins
Mell A. Peterson, Jr.
Paul A. Petzrick
Charles P. Pfarrer, Jr.
Marvin LeR. Philpot
Dallas Pickard, Jr.
Robert K. Pierce
James B. Pitman, Jr.
Eugene T. Polini, Jr.
Harold I. Pollack
Charles E. Pollard, Jr.
Robert W. Polsin
Charles P. Poreda
George W. Post
George E. Prochaska
Rudolph J. Prosser
Thomas J. Pruitt
Walter J. Quinn
Thomas A. Quirk, Jr.
John D. Raiford
Steve LaC. Ramos
James R. Ramzy
Albert D. Raper
David R. Raunig
Richard R. Read
John R. Reardon
Roger L. Reasonover, Jr.
John A. Reid
Wilson G. Reid
John E. Reisinger
Charles E. Reiss
Robert J. Rennell
James V. Reynolds
William J. Richter, Jr.
Arthur O. Riendeau, Jr.
John E. Riester
Robert F. Rigling
Robert R. Robertson, Jr.
George R. Robey, Jr.
William N. Robinson
William P. Rodriguez
Thomas D. Rogers
Robert B. Rogers
Howard G. Romaine
Charles C. Rose, Jr.
Rufus E. Rose, Jr.
Charles K. Rourke
Kenneth W. Ruggles
Charles F. Rutherford, Jr.
Ernest J. Sabol, Jr.
Wiley M. Sanders
Doral R. Sandlin
Norman M. Sassi
Robert E. Schlenzig
Robert D. Schoeckert
Peter van R. Schoeffel
Charles D. Schoonover
Richard P. Schroats
Lawrence A. Scott
Robert W. Scott
James A. Seabloom
John M. Seacord
Thomas U. Seigenthaler
John W. Sellers
Ralph M. Sesler
John J. Shanaghan
Edward R. Shannon
Walter B. Shaw, Jr.
Oliver V. Shearer, Jr.
Robert K. Sheehan
Robert G. Shields
Paul Shimek, Jr.
Clark W. Shorey
Lawrence A. Shumaker
Edwin A. Shuman III
Thomas U. Sisson, Jr.
Paul Skarlatos
Francis A. Slattery
Paul S. Slawson
Robert L. Smidt
William W. Smila
Allen Smith III
David G. Smith
Irvin LeR. Smith
Leighton D. Smith
Lloyd H. Snider
Edward C. Snyder, Jr.
Richard C. Soderholm
Mitchel S. Soltys
Curtis A. Sorenson
John Van D. Southworth, Jr.
Ernest A. Stamm
Charles E. Steel
Francis X. Steele
James C. Steele
Frederick C. Stelter III
Morris H. Stephenson, Jr.
Edward G. Stevens, Jr
Donald W. Stevenson
William R. Stickling
Michael J. Stoffel
Bernard F. Storck
John Strachan
Paul D. Stroop, Jr.
Terence B. Sutherland
Harry J. Sweet
Anton R. Switzer
Edward H. Tandy, Jr.
Arthur C. Taylor
Timothy C. Taylor
Robert H. Thalman
John F. Tate
Edgar R. Terry
Richard L. Thompson
Nils R. Thunman
Herbert E. Tibbetts
Albin A. Tisdale
Robert G. Tolg, Jr.
Paul E. Treagy, Jr.
Herbert D. Trenham
George A. Trevors
Dennis R. Trone
Ralph A. Turner, Jr.
Donald M. Ulmer
Charles H. Ulrich
Alton L. Van Ausdal
Alexander A. Varbedian, Jr.
Evan J. Vaughan, Jr.
John L. Vaughan, Jr.
Van L. Vierbicky
Victor P. Viglino
Peter J. Vogelberger, Jr.
Bill R. Walker
Dallas L. Wallace
Don Walsh
Harvey T. Walsh, Jr.
Joseph A. Walsh, Jr.
David P. Watkins
Howard B. Watkins, Jr.
Thomas C. Watson, Jr.
Thomas P. Watson
Robert "M" Watson
Haven N. Webb
John E. Wells
Peter M. Wells
Maurice H. Werness
Denton W. West
Charles G. Wheeler
Donald J. White
William A. White
James B. Whitehead
Roy R. Wight
John B. Wildman
James F. Wiley
Eugene N. Wilfert
Donald McK. Wilford
Joseph B. Williams
James S. Willis, Jr.
Robert R. Wilmer
Robert D. Wilson
Hal D. Wood
Fred L. Wood
Leon G. Wood, Jr.
Noel T. Wood
Bruce J. Wooden
John L. Woodward
James R. Wright
Peter B. Wyckoff
Luther D. Yarger
Harold L. Young
Paul F. Young
Joseph J. Zable
Richard M. Zook.

The following-named midshipmen (Naval Academy) to be ensigns in the Supply Corps in the Navy:

Richard A. Anderson
Steven J. Barczewski
Charles W. Bartholomew
William E. Burr
Austin L. Byers
Charles B. Chapman III
Kelsey D. Chase, Jr.
Shelby VanN. T. Clark
Joseph A. Derrico
Paul A. Dollard
Dean W. Ervin
Theodore V. Fekula
Niel P. Ferraro
Otto J. Fuka, Jr.
Philip G. Graessle
Robert A. Hall
John A. Harvilla
Alvin E. Hochmuth, Jr.
W. Pinkney Jones
Leonard D. McCarthy
Bruce D. McCurdy
Stanley P. Michna
James W. Moore
Frank R. Nolan
Chester R. Oberg
Lester E. Ostrom
Elias A. Parent, Jr.
Kenneth A. Peterson
Walter T. Richards
William H. Schulden
Maynard K. Shipley
Jay R. Smith, Jr.
George E. Swenson
James F. Topping
John E. Wagner
Edward K. Walker, Jr.
Chester E. Weymouth, Jr.
Jack A. White
Kenneth B. Wilson
William J. Yeager
George V. Zeberlein, Jr.

The following-named midshipmen (Naval Academy) to be second lieutenants in the Marine Corps:

Richard J. Alger
Joseph N. Allen III
Louis W. Alter, Jr.
Kenneth J. Ball
Barry N. Bittner
Donald P. Bowen
Raymond G. Burke
John J. Cale, Jr.
Richard H. Childress
Anthony R. Correnti
Clyde D. Dean
Richard L. Dennis
Frank J. Dorsey
George F. Ebbitt, Jr.
Stephen S. Eisenhauer
George J. Ertlmeier
Ernest E. Evans, Jr.
John W. Everett
James R. Forte
Frederick J. Franco, Jr.
Phillip B. Friedrichs
Donald M. Fullam
Robert E. Gibson
Edward C. Goodman, Jr.
Vincent P. Hart, Jr.
David L. Hess
Charles M. Isbell
John P. Koonce
John J. Law, Jr.
Kenneth M. McJunkin, Jr.
William E. McKinstry
Robert R. Marshall
Frederick A. Mathews
Stanley J. Michael, Jr.
Robert L. Moon
William E. Morgan
Bryce A. Mutch, Jr.
Robert C. Oakes
James L. Owens
Ronald A. Pavey
David L. Pease
James Pepperdine
Karl E. Peterson, Jr.
Charles L. Phillips
James A. Prestridge, Jr.
Frederick E. Pyeatt III
Richard Raymond III
Andrew J. Reynolds
John H. Rodgers, Jr.
Richard D. Runyan
Glen Sanford
Davis Sayes
William Scullion, Jr.
Jay G. Sellers
Harold E. Shore, Jr.
Alois A. Slepicka
William G. Soden
Edward C. Tipshus
Thomas C. Wells
Earl F. Whipple, Jr.
Russell O. Williams
Fitz W. McM. Woodrow, Jr.
Peter Yadlowsky

The following-named (AROTC) to be second lieutenants in the Marine Corps, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

Grafton D. Addison, Jr.
William W. Berry
James W. Bramlet
Richard H. Casey
Walter J. Decota
John A. Dickerson
Hugh L. Dougherty, Jr.
Louis C. Drake
John L. Fischer
Edmund G. Garbee, Jr.
Harold G. Golla, Jr.
Harold H. Hill
Paul R. Kneuer
Myron S. Kops
John K. B. LeDeaux
Arthur D. Levin
Peter H. Lyons
Bruce M. MacLaren
Francis N. Millett, Jr.
Robert L. Modjeski
James S. Morris, Jr.
John F. Mowbray
Robert E. Price
George W. Ralph
George A. Ramer
John J. Salesses
William P. Schubmehl
Robert R. Shuman
Joseph A. Siler
Jerry L. Sizelove
Robert W. Wentz, Jr.

The following-named to be ensigns (Aviation) in the Navy, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

William DeHart
John R. Emerson
John W. Greenlee
William O. Jones
Eugene P. Kinney
Frank LeR. Moody
Thomas E. Quillin

The following-named to be ensigns in the Navy, subject to qualifications therefor as provided by law:

Aubrey E. Ables
William A. Aumick
Paul P. Bascom
James R. Bauman
Donald C. Bennett
Michael E. Boylson
John F. Campbell
Dudley S. Chambers
Donald A. Cheney
Stephen Cleaver
Raymond P. Coe
John P. Cryer
Willie E. Cumbie, Jr.
John D. Cundieff
Ramsey L. Davis, Jr.
John W. DeLoach
Robert G. Doney
Maxley W. Drumheller
George W. DuCharme
Alvan N. Dunn
William E. Evrard
James W. Faddis
James G. Farrell
Michael J. Fitzgerald
James P. Forsyth
Frank R. Friddle, Jr.
Edwin F. Gatlin
Elvin G. Gluba
Arva F. Gordon
James C. Hayes, Jr.
James D. Hendry
Roy M. Hollingworth
Morris L. Humphrey
Robert C. Ike
David E. Johnson
Francis A. Joiner
Ernest F. Jones, Jr.
Joseph A. Jurkowski
Joseph R. Kabelka
Robert G. Kavanagh
Wayne, Keele, Jr.
Clyde R. Keith
Arlington N. Kline
Robert K. Lehto
Jesse W. Lewis, Jr.
Iven J. Maddox
Earl P. McBride
William L. McNamara
Arthur W. Melton
Byron O. Moore
William B. Moye, Jr.
"R" "F" Musgrave
Charles LaR. Noblit
Richard C. Perfetti
Alfred A. Peterson
Joseph H. Pettigrew
David "A" Phoenix
Carroll R. Price
Joseph R. Priestley
Lawrence F. Ribble
Alan H. Rice
Daniel W. Roderick
Silvano F. Sandoval
Gilbert E. Schmidt
Thomas D. Shearer
Robert L. Shuey
George W. Tracy III
Luther W. Peek
Charles Walker
William P. Welborn
Gustav R. Weston
James E. Whitaker
Charles E. White
Ronel J. D. Williams

The following-named to be ensigns in the Supply Corps of the Navy, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

Jack M. Cornelius
Jimmie S. Delleney
John C. Klaren
Richard N. Knop
Luther W. Peck
Howard "T" Ross, Jr.
Bill M. Velotas
Walter L. Williams
Paul Wohl
Robert H. Young

The following-named women to be ensigns in the Navy, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

Marjorie N. Clarke
Joan G. Mackie

Albert D. Nelson, Jr. (Naval Reserve officer) to be a lieutenant in the Medical Corps in the Navy, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law.

The following-named officers to be second lieutenants in the Marine Corps, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

Doyle R. Ballard
Forest C. Beaty, Jr.
Roy L. Belli
Charles H. Black
William E. Block
Edward R. Brog
Judson C. Bump
William G. Carson, Jr.
Robert P. Charles
James G. Collier
Goodwin Cooke
George J. Coughlin
Talmage R. Cowan
Claude M. Daniels
John P. Delaney
Chester P. Dereng
William C. Dobson
Joseph G. Doser
Edward R. Duda
John A. Durham
James R. Eddy
George M. Edmondson, Jr.
Raymond W. Edwards
John J. Flynn
Karl J. Fontenot, Jr.
John A. Forderhase
Edward P. Freeman
Gordon W. Hardy
Charles F. Harris
Robert A. Hodgins
Richard H. Holt
John E. Hutton, Jr.
Clayton Joyce
Billy J. Keller
Bobby T. Ladd
Lester D. Lane, Jr.
Richard H. Lang
Rodney H. Ledet
Emanuel J. Macchia
Paul M. MacDonald
Jack A. Manhke

Joseph R. Marosek
Arthur H. Miller
Clarence B. Miller, Jr.
James F. Milligan
Michael P. Murray, Jr.
John D. Muzdakis
Joseph G. O'Brien
John T. O'Connell
Robert G. Prebihalo
Richard M. Raia
Edwin J. Richardson, Jr.
Joseph W. Rodgers, Jr.
John F. Rubia
John Q. Ryan
Donald A. Schaefer
Donald F. Selby
Joe W. Shirley
Robert T. Simpson
Thomas H. Simpson
Bobby N. Smith
Theodore O. Snyder
Stanley L. Stanford
John R. Stanley
Alexander W. Stevens
Daniel C. Stewart
William K. Stuckey
Donald P. Tafjen
Hinton L. Tayloe
Robert B. Treat, Jr.
William J. Waguespack III
Donald Wojcik

The following-named (civilian college graduates) to be second lieutenants in the Marine Corps, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

James F. Moriarty, Jr.
Arthur B. Thompson, Jr.

John W. P. Robertson to be a second lieutenant in the Marine Corps in accordance with the provisions of Public Law 347, 79th Congress, as amended (34 U. S. C. 15).

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate April 6 (legislative day of April 5), 1954:

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

Robert Bernerd Anderson, of Texas, to be Deputy Secretary of Defense.

DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY

Charles Sparks Thomas, of California, to be Secretary of the Navy.

UNITED STATES ATTORNEY

Edwin M. Stanley, of North Carolina, to be United States attorney for the middle district of North Carolina.

UNITED STATES MARSHALS

B. Ray Cohoon, of North Carolina, to be United States marshal for the eastern district of North Carolina.

Ray H. Schoonover, of Wisconsin, to be United States marshal for the western district of Wisconsin.

SUBVERSIVE ACTIVITIES CONTROL BOARD

Thomas J. Herbert, of Ohio, to be a member of the Subversives Activities Control Board for the term of 3 years expiring April 9, 1957.

IN THE ARMY

Maj. Gen. Lemuel Mathewson, O14980, United States Army, to be Director, Joint Staff, Office Joint Chiefs of Staff, with rank of lieutenant general, and as lieutenant general in the Army of the United States.

Maj. Gen. Carter Bowie Magruder, O15155, United States Army, to be commanding general, IX Corps, with rank of lieutenant general, and as lieutenant general in the Army of the United States.

Brig. Gen. Oscar Peter Snyder, O4008, Dental Corps, United States Army, to be Assistant Surgeon General, United States Army, as major general, Dental Corps, in the Regular Army of the United States, and as major general in the Army of the United States.

Chaplain (Col.) Patrick James Ryan, O17363, United States Army (brigadier general, Army of the United States), to be Chief of Chaplains, United States Army, as major general, Chaplains, in the Regular Army of the United States, and as major general (temporary), Army of the United States.

The following-named officers for appointment in the Regular Army of the United States to the grades indicated under the provisions of title V of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947:

To be major generals

Maj. Gen. Harry Reichelderfer, O7547.
Maj. Gen. Jonathan Lane Holman, O11226.
Maj. Gen. George Bittmann Barth, O11241.
Maj. Gen. William Shepard Biddle, O15180.

To be brigadier generals

Maj. Gen. Arthur William Pence, O12042.
Brig. Gen. Orville Ernest Walsh, O12094.
Brig. Gen. Herbert Maury Jones, O12251.
Brig. Gen. Bertram Francis Hayford, O12272.
Brig. Gen. Hobart Hewett, O12328.
Brig. Gen. James Holden Phillips, O12331.
Brig. Gen. Nathaniel Alanson Burnell 2d, O12337.
Brig. Gen. Emmett James Bean, O12381.
Brig. Gen. John Bartlett Hess, O12599.
Brig. Gen. Charles George Holle O12612.
Maj. Gen. Bernard Linn Robinson, O12652.

PROMOTIONS IN THE REGULAR ARMY

The nominations of Leland Francis Adair and 698 other officers for promotion in the Regular Army of the United States under the provisions of sections 502 and 510 of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947, which were confirmed today, were received by the Senate on February 25, 1954, and appear in full in the proceedings of the Senate for that date, under the caption "Nominations," beginning with the name of Leland Francis Adair, which is shown on page 2269, and ending with the name of Margaret Elnora Waple, which appears on page 2272.

UNITED STATES AIR FORCE

Gen. John Kenneth Cannon 3A (major general, Regular Air Force), United States Air Force, to be placed on the retired list in the grade of general.

TEMPORARY APPOINTMENTS

The following-named officers for temporary appointment in the United States Air Force under the provisions of section 515, Officer Personnel Act of 1947:

To be major generals

Brig. Gen. Fay Roscoe Upthegrove, 76A.
Brig. Gen. Reuben Columbus Hood, Jr., 498A.
Brig. Gen. Gordon Aylesworth Blake, 582A.
Brig. Gen. Frederic Ernst Glantzberg, 405A.
Brig. Gen. Jacob Edward Smart, 592A.
Brig. Gen. Robert Haynes Terrill, 628A.
Brig. Gen. Phillips Waller Smith, 897A.
Brig. Gen. Alfred Henry Johnson, 270A.
Brig. Gen. Charles Franklin Born, 365A.
Brig. Gen. Edward Holmes Underhill, 421A.
Brig. Gen. Dudley Durward Hale, 431A.
Brig. Gen. Robert Oswald Cork, 523A.
Brig. Gen. Wiley Duncan Ganey, 553A.
Brig. Gen. Kenneth Burton Hobson, 616A.
Brig. Gen. Hunter Harris, Jr., 624A.
Brig. Gen. Kern Delos Metzger, AO914698.

To be brigadier generals

Col. Oliver Kunze Niess, 19022A.
Col. William Lecel Lee, 430A.
Col. William Lafayette Fagg, 465A.
Col. Charles Bowman Dougher, 600A.
Col. Lewis Leo Mundell, 1286A.
Col. Charles Bainbridge Westover, 1351A.
Col. William Grover Hipps, 1358A.
Col. John Spencer Hardy, 1502A.
Col. Thayer Stevens Olds, 372A.
Col. William Albert Matheny, 428A.
Col. John Reynolds Sutherland, 617A.
Col. Dale Orville Smith, 1074A.
Col. Harvey Thompson Alness, 1085A.
Col. Terence Patrick Finnegan, 18703A.
Col. Don Orville Darrow, 1270A.
Col. Nils Olof Ohman, 1321A.
Col. Bruce Keener Halloway, 1336A.
Col. Harold Cooper Donnelly, 647A.
Col. James Clifford Jensen, 1042A.
Col. Arno Herman Luehman, 1080A.
Col. Frederic Henry Miller, Jr., 1273A.
Col. Maurice Arthur Preston, 1337A.
Col. Robert Taylor 3d, 1347A.
Col. Ben Ivan Funk, 1500A.
Col. Marvin Christian Demler, 1550A.
Col. Clarence Theodore Edwinson, 1597A.
Col. Hewitt Terrell Wheless, 1609A.
Col. Henry Viccellio, 1728A.
Col. James Edwin Roberts, 1846A.
Col. James Valentine Edmundson, 1863A.

The following officers for appointment to the positions indicated under the provisions of sections 504 and 515, Officer Personnel Act of 1947:

Lt. Gen. Laurence Carbee Craigie, 61A (major general, Regular Air Force), United States Air Force, to be commander, Allied Air Forces, Southern Europe, with rank of lieutenant general, and to be lieutenant general in the United States Air Force.

Lt. Gen. David Myron Schlatter, 62A (major general, Regular Air Force), United States Air Force, to be commandant, Armed Forces Staff College, with rank of lieutenant general, and to be lieutenant general in the United States Air Force.

Maj. Gen. Thomas Sarsfield Power, 481A, Regular Air Force, to be commander, Air Research and Development Command, with rank of lieutenant general, and to be lieutenant general in the United States Air Force.

Maj. Gen. Roger Maxwell Ramey, 91A, Regular Air Force, to be commander, Fifth Air Force, with rank of lieutenant general, and to be lieutenant general in the United States Air Force.

Lt. Gen. Hubert Reilly Harmon, 18A, United States Air Force, retired, to be special assistant to the Chief of Staff for Air Force Academy Matters, with rank of lieutenant general, and as lieutenant general in the United States Air Force.

RESERVE COMMISSIONED OFFICERS

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, AO343889.
Maj. Gen. Thomas Cates Hardin, AO170727.
Maj. Gen. Chester Earl McCarty, AO235959.
Maj. Gen. Thomas Randall Rampy, AO922780.

To be brigadier generals

*Col. Frederick Griswold Atkinson, AO910458.
*George Abbott Brownell, AO142136 (formerly brigadier general, Air Force Reserve).
Brig. Gen. William Porter Farnsworth, AO922626.
*Col. John Henderson Foster, AO284572.
*Col. William Judson Fry, AO266683.
*Col. John Spence Gulledge, AO265793.
*Charles Augustus Lindbergh, AO215724 (formerly colonel, Air Corps Reserve).
*Col. Joseph Stacey Marriott, AO104544.
*Col. Frank Thomas McCoy, Jr., AO310412.
Maj. Gen. Kern Delos Metzger, AO914698.
Brig. Gen. Walter Irwin Miller, AO913582.
*Col. Clayton Stiles, AO269341.
*Col. Felix Louis Vidal, AO943500.
Maj. Gen. Leigh Wade, AO403535.
*Col. Will Walter White, AO272508.

(NOTE.—Officers whose names are preceded by the symbol (*) are subject to physical examination.)

IN THE REGULAR AIR FORCE

The following-named officers for appointment in the Regular Air Force to the grades indicated under the provisions of title V of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947:

To be major generals

Maj. Gen. Elmer Joseph Rogers, 294A.
Maj. Gen. Roscoe Charles Wilson, 360A.
Maj. Gen. Richard Clark Lindsay, 476A.
Maj. Gen. Frank Alton Armstrong, Jr., 427A.
Maj. Gen. James Elbert Briggs, 356A.
Maj. Gen. Carl Amandus Brandt, 563A.
Maj. Gen. Delmar Taft Spivey, 385A.
Maj. Gen. Kingston Eric Tibbetts, 436A.

Maj. Gen. John Koehler Gerhart, 525A.
Maj. Gen. Dean Coldwell Strother, 591A.

To be brigadier generals

Maj. Gen. Elmer Blair Garland, 322A.
Brig. Gen. Matthew Kemp Deichelmann, 331A.
Maj. Gen. Leland Samuel Stranathan, 406A.
Maj. Gen. Edward Holmes Underhill, 421A.
Maj. Gen. Roy Henry Lynn, 492A.
Brig. Gen. Merrill Davis Burnside, 495A.
Maj. Gen. Robert Oswald Cork, 523A.
Maj. Gen. Paul Ernest Ruestow, 548A.
Maj. Gen. Wiley Duncan Ganey, 553A.
Maj. Gen. Walter Campbell Sweeney, Jr., 555A.
Maj. Gen. Morris John Lee, 556A.
Maj. Gen. David Hodge Baker, 557A.
Brig. Gen. Daniel Francis Callahan, 579A.
Maj. Gen. Gordon Aylesworth Blake, 582A.
Maj. Gen. John Paul McConnell, 611A.
Maj. Gen. Kenneth Burton Hobson, 616A.
Maj. Gen. Hunter Harris, Jr., 624A.
Maj. Gen. Robert Broussard Landry, 635A.
Maj. Gen. William Oscar Senter, 648A.
Maj. Gen. Joseph Francis Carroll, 23161A.

IN THE NAVY

Adm. Lynde D. McCormick, United States Navy, to have the grade, rank, pay, and allowances of a vice admiral while serving as President, Naval War College.

Vice Adm. Jerauld Wright, United States Navy, to have the grade, rank, pay, and allowances of an admiral while serving as commander in chief, Atlantic and United States Atlantic Fleet.

Vice Adm. John H. Cassady, United States Navy, to have the grade, rank, pay, and allowances of an admiral while serving as commander in chief, United States Naval Forces, Eastern Atlantic and Mediterranean.

Vice Adm. Thomas S. Combs, United States Navy, to have the grade, rank, pay, and allowances of a vice admiral while serving as a fleet commander.

Rear Adm. Edmund T. Wooldridge, United States Navy, to have the grade, rank, pay, and allowances of a vice admiral while serving as a fleet commander.

Vice Adm. Matthias B. Gardner, United States Navy, to have the grade, rank, pay, and allowances of a vice admiral while serving as Deputy Chief of Naval Operations (Plans and Policy).

Vice Adm. Robert P. Briscoe, United States Navy, to have the grade, rank, pay, and allowances of a vice admiral while serving as Deputy Chief of Naval Operations (Fleet Operations and Readiness).

Vice Adm. William M. Callaghan, United States Navy, to have the grade, rank, pay, and allowances of a vice admiral while serving as commander, Naval Forces, Far East.

Rear Adm. Thomas G. W. Settle, United States Navy, to have the grade, rank, pay, and allowances of a vice admiral while serving as commander, Amphibious Force, Pacific Fleet.

NAVAL RESERVE

The following-named officers of the Naval Reserve for temporary promotion to the grade of rear admiral in the line and staff corps indicated, subject to the prescribed qualifications:

IN THE LINE

John J. Bergen
Leon J. Jacobi
George M. Wauchope

IN THE DENTAL CORPS

Charles R. Wells

IN THE SUPPLY CORPS

William L. Nelson

IN THE CHAPLAIN CORPS

Maurice S. Sheehy

IN THE MARINE CORPS RESERVE

PERMANENT APPOINTMENT

To be major general subject to qualification therefor as provided by law

Karl S. Day

To be brigadier generals subject to qualification therefor as provided by law

John D. Macklin
Bertrand T. Fay

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

TUESDAY, APRIL 6, 1954

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

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

Almighty God, we are entering upon this new day with gratitude for the many blessings and bounties of Thy divine providence.

Thou art acquainted with and canst supply all our needs. Wilt Thou teach us so to ask that we may receive and so to seek that we may find every needed blessing.

Grant unto us the spirit of patience and obedience to Thy holy will. In our times of perplexity and uncertainty, be Thou our guide and counselor, and in our times of despair, be Thou our refuge and strength.

Sustain us with a confident and hopeful frame of mind as we labor to hasten the dawning of that day when nations shall dwell together under the sovereignty of the Prince of Peace.

Hear us in His name. Amen.

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

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Carrell, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment bills of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 962. An act for the relief of Gabrielle Marie Smith (nee Staub);

H. R. 1148. An act for the relief of Antonino Cangialosi (or Anthony Consola);

H. R. 1529. An act to facilitate the development of building materials in Alaska through the removal of volcanic ash from portions of Katmai National Monument, Alaska, and for other purposes;

H. R. 1568. An act to amend section 6 of chapter 786 of the act of June 6, 1900, entitled "An act making further provision for a civil government for Alaska, and for other purposes" (31 Stat. 323; title 48, sec. 108, U. S. C.);

H. R. 2351. An act for the relief of Sam Rosenblat;

H. R. 2441. An act for the relief of Husnu Ataullah Berker;

H. R. 2747. An act to amend title 17 of the United States Code entitled "Copyrights" with respect to the day for taking action when the last day for taking such action falls on Saturday, Sunday, or a holiday;

H. R. 3045; An act for the relief of Nickolas K. Ioannides;

H. R. 3306. An act to provide for the relief of certain reclamation homestead entrymen;

H. R. 3961. An act for the relief of Margherita Di Meo;

H. R. 4024. An act to change the name of the Appomattox Court House National Historical Monument to the "Appomattox Court House National Historical Park";

H. R. 4056. An act for the relief of Manfred Singer;

H. R. 4707. An act for the relief of Lee Yim Quon;

H. R. 4738. An act for the relief of Gabriel Hittrich;

H. R. 4886. An act for the relief of Ingrid Birgitta Maria Colwell (nee Friberg);

H. R. 4984. An act to remove certain limitations upon the sale or conveyance of land heretofore conveyed to the city of Miles City, Mont., by the United States;

H. R. 5085. An act for the relief of Mrs. Marie Tcherepnin;

H. R. 5529. An act to preserve within Manassas National Battlefield Park, Va., the most important historic properties relating to the battles of Manassas, and for other purposes; and

H. R. 6434. An act to amend sections 401 and 701 of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act so as to simplify the procedures governing the establishment of food standards.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, bills of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 1067. An act to authorize the Supreme Court of the United States to make and publish rules for procedure on reviews of decisions of the Tax Court of the United States;

H. R. 6436. An act to amend the Communications Act of 1934, as amended; and

H. R. 6702. An act to authorize the care and treatment at facilities of the Public Health Service of narcotic addicts committed by the United States District Court for the District of Columbia, and for other purposes.

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

H. R. 3575. An act to enable the people of Hawaii to form a constitution and State government and to be admitted into the Union on an equal footing with the original States.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the foregoing bill; requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. BUTLER of Nebraska, Mr. MILLIKIN, Mr. CORDON, Mr. MURRAY, and Mr. ANDERSON to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed bills and joint resolutions of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 53. An act for the relief of Lewis Roland Edwards;

S. 95. An act for the relief of Mrs. Donka Kourteva Dikova (Dikoff) and her son Nicola Marin Dikoff;

S. 110. An act for the relief of Christopher F. Jako;

S. 203. An act for the relief of Yvonne Linnea Colcord;

S. 246. An act for the relief of Gerrit Been;

S. 347. An act for the relief of George Taipale;

S. 366. An act for the relief of Sister Concepta (Ida Riegel);

S. 435. An act for the relief of Setsuko Kinoshita;

S. 447. An act for the relief of Vasiliki Tountas (nee Vasiliki Georgion Karoumbali);

S. 483. An act for the relief of Miss Elvira Bortolin;

S. 496. An act for the relief of Dr. Samson Sol Flores and his wife, the former Cecilia T. Tolentino;

S. 507. An act for the relief of Mrs. Eleanor Emilie Nell;

S. 587. An act for the relief of Carlos Fortich, Jr.;

S. 614. An act for the relief of Eero and Tina and Karina Waskinen;

S. 628. An act for the relief of Aloisia Schlotter;

S. 653. An act for the relief of Metorima Shizuko;

S. 661. An act for the relief of Nino Sabino Di Michele;

S. 769. An act for the relief of Mrs. Robert M. Roskos (formerly Maria E. Laedel);

S. 803. An act for the relief of Donald R. Dyson and Kenneth M. Dyson;

S. 804. An act for the relief of Antonios Vasillos Zarkadis;

S. 809. An act for the relief of Vittoria Sperti;

S. 860. An act for the relief of Jaunita Lach and Leticia Androda Lach;

S. 891. An act for the relief of Albina Sicas;

S. 917. An act for the relief of Stefan Burda, Anna Burda, and Nikolai Burda;

S. 939. An act for the relief of Njdeh Hovhanissian Asianian;

S. 1063. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to review the records of commissioned naval officers who failed of advancement during the war, and for other purposes;

S. 1073. An act for the relief of Mary Shizue Hirano;

S. 1126. An act for the relief of Sandy Michael John Philip;

S. 1135. An act for the relief of Stamatios James Bratsanos;

S. 1141. An act for the relief of Hildegard Noble;

S. 1155. An act for the relief of Giuseppe Bentivegna;

S. 1225. An act for the relief of Brunhilde Walburga Golomb, Ralph Robert Golomb, and Patricia Ann Golomb;

S. 1290. An act for the relief of Ruth Sonin;

S. 1296. An act for the relief of Elfriede Hall;

S. 1313. An act for the relief of Olga Balabanov and Nicola Balabanov;

S. 1321. An act for the relief of Michajlo Dzieczko;

S. 1352. An act for the relief of Siegfried Rosenzweig;

S. 1362. An act for the relief of Rev. Ishai Ben Asher;

S. 1395. An act for the relief of Manasseh Moses Manoukian, Elize Manoukian, nee Kardzair, and Socra' Manoukian, also known as Socrates Manoukian;

S. 1477. An act for the relief of Gerhard Nicklaus;

S. 1600. An act for the relief of Esther Saporta;

S. 1808. An act for the relief of Hildegard Monti;

S. 1850. An act for the relief of Dr. John D. MacLennan;

S. 2070. An act for the relief of the estate of Givens Christian;

S. 2198. An act for the relief of (Sister) Jane Stanislaus Riederer;

S. 2243. An act for the relief of Seiko Nagai and her minor child;

S. 2307. An act for the relief of Harold George Wetzlmair;

S. 2308. An act to authorize and direct the investigation by the Attorney General of certain offenses, and for other purposes;

S. 2340. An act for the relief of Alphonsus Devlin;

S. 2360. An act for the relief of Jacob Vandenbergh;

S. 2411. An act for the relief of Ruth Berndt;

S. 2438. An act for the relief of Maria Teresa Rossi;

S. 2469. An act for the relief of Francisco Vasquez-Dopazo (Frank Vasquez);

S. 2499. An act for the relief of Hua Lin and his wife, Lillian Ching-Wen Lin (nee Hu);

S. 2596. An act for the relief of Lucy Mao Mei-Yee Li;

S. 2777. An act to provide transportation on Canadian vessels between Skagway, Alaska, and other points in Alaska, between Haines, Alaska, and other points in Alaska, and between Hyder, Alaska, and other points in Alaska or the continental United States, either directly or via a foreign port, or for any part of the transportation;

S. 2844. An act to amend the act of December 23, 1944, authorizing certain transactions by disbursing officers of the United States, and for other purposes;

S. 3096. An act to further amend section 4 of the act of September 9, 1950, in relation to the utilization in an enlisted grade or rank in the Armed Forces of physicians, dentists, or those in an allied specialist category;

S. J. Res. 69. Joint resolution requiring the preparation of an estimate of the cost of reconstructing Ford's Theater in Washington, D. C.;

S. J. Res. 119. Joint resolution to validate conveyance of a 40-acre tract in Oskaloosa County, Fla.; and

S. J. Res. 130. Joint resolution requesting the President to proclaim the week May 2 to May 8, inclusive, as National Mental Health Week.

FREE DISTRIBUTION OF WALL MAPS

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I am hopeful of finding out during the day whether or not the bill, H. R. 8680, making appropriations for the Department of the Interior, contains any hidden items, such as was undoubtedly contained in the bill we passed last year.

While this administration preaches economy, we find that the Secretary of the Interior has authorized the printing of 30,000 wall maps of the United States which he announces are to be given to Members of Congress for free distribution. The newspaper release stating that there will be 40,000 of these maps printed, says that 10,000 will be on sale at the Government Printing Office for $4 each, indicating that a fair value of the maps which are to be given away by Members of Congress are worth $120,000, though I imagine if there was any way of computing the value of the personal services going into the production of these maps it would be far more than that.

While I have no way of knowing definitely, I believe I am expressing the views of a large majority of Members of Congress when I say they would prefer that this free distribution be made some other way than through Members of Congress, if each Member is to be limited to approximately 50 copies. Already, I have received more than that number of requests, and I know there will be probably several hundred requests before the maps are actually available for mailing.

Despite the fact that I have explained in my weekly newsletter that few persons have any practical use for the large 5- by 7-foot map, which is unmounted and printed in two sections which are folded, nevertheless there is always a line forming for anything that is free.

Surprisingly enough I did receive 1 request in the mail this morning accompanied by a check for $4 to be forwarded to the Government Printing Office for 1 of these maps.

I feel that if this administration is to be consistent in its announced intention to support economy measures, all of these maps should be sold at a price which will result in no loss to the Government.

MRS. ROSA O. SHANNON

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I call up House Resolution 490 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

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

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

SPECIAL COMMITTEE TO INVESTIGATE TAX-EXEMPT FOUNDATIONS

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I call up House Resolution 433 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That the further expenses of conducting the studies and investigations authorized by House Resolution 217 incurred by the Special Committee To Investigate Tax-Exempt Foundations, acting as a whole or by subcommittee, not to exceed $120,000, including expenditures for employment of such experts, special counsel, and such clerical, stenographic, and other assistants shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House on vouchers authorized by said committee and signed by the chairman of the committee, and approved by the Committee on House Administration.

SEC. 2. The official stenographers to committees may be used at all hearings held in the District of Columbia, if not otherwise engaged.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 5, strike out the sum and insert "$65,000."

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, I assume this is a privileged resolution. I see no need to take a great deal of time on it. It is a resolution which provides additional funds for the investigation authorized by the House of tax-exempt foundations. I might say the committee has already had $50,000, practically all of which was expended. The committee asked for $120,000, and the Committee on House Administration saw fit to reduce the amount to $65,000, as indicated by the committee amendment.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the committee amendment.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution.

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

GRANTING STATUS OF PERMANENT RESIDENCE TO CERTAIN ALIENS

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 238) granting the status of permanent residence to certain aliens, and ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers on the part of the House be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT. No. 1453)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 238) granting the status of permanent residence to certain aliens, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered (7) and (8).

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered (1), (2), (3), (4), (5), and (6) and agree to the same.

LOUIS E. GRAHAM,
RUTH THOMPSON,
FRANCIS E. WALTER,
Managers on the Part of the House.

ARTHUR V. WATKINS,
ROBERT C. HENDRICKSON,
PAT MCCARRAN,
Managers on the Part of the Senate

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 238) granting the status of permanent residence to certain aliens, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon by the conferees and recommended in the accompanying conference report:

The Committee on the Judiciary of the House of Representatives was advised by the Commissioner of Immigration and Naturalization on December 4, 1953, that the two aliens to whom the granting of permanent residence was proposed under the amendments of the Senate numbered (7) and (8) had been granted permanent residence administratively by complying with the pertinent provisions of the general immigration laws. Therefore, congressional action on the two cases is no more necessary.

LOUIS E. GRAHAM,
RUTH THOMPSON,
FRANCIS E. WALTER,
Managers on the Part of the House.

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

PRIVATE CALENDAR

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

The Clerk called the bill (S. 1432) for the relief of Peter Penovic, Milos Grahovac, and Nikola Maljkovic.

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

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

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. GRAHAM: Page 1, line 4, after the word "act", strike out the name "Peter Penovic."

The amendment was agreed to.

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

The title was amended so as to read: "For the relief of Milos Grahovac and Nikola Maljkovic."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ANDREW D. SUMNER

The Clerk called the bill (S. 1208) for the relief of Andrew D. Sumner.

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

Be it enacted, etc., That Andrew D. Sumner, of Brandy, Va. (Army service No. O-364738), be, and he is hereby relieved of all liability to refund to the United States any part of the moneys erroneously paid by the United States to his former wife, Mrs. Ila Frances Sumner, as class E allotments, for the period from July 1, 1942, to January 31, 1944, inclusive.

SEC. 2. That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to the said Andrew D. Sumner the sum of $196.09, which represents a like amount refunded by him to the United States on account of the erroneous payments of class E allotments to the said Mrs. Ila Frances Sumner for the period from July 1, 1942, to January 31, 1944, inclusive: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

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

FRANZ GERICH AND WILLY GERICH

The Clerk called the bill (S. 1231) for the relief of Franz Gerich and Willy Gerich, his minor son.

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

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Franz Gerich, the sum of $202.38, in full settlement of all claims against the United States for hospital and medical expenses incurred by him; and to Willy Gerich, his minor son, the sum of $5,000, in full settlement of all claims against the United States for personal injuries, pain, and suffering sustained by him as the result of an accident which occurred on May 25, 1945, in the vicinity of Lauderbach, Czechoslovakia, when a United States Army tank collided with a vehicle in which Willy Gerich was riding: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

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

J. A. VANCE CO.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1107) for the relief of the J. A. Vance Co.

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

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to the J. A. Vance Co., Winston-Salem, N. C., the sum of $10,281.93. The payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims of such company against the United States for refund of the Federal income taxes which it was required to pay for the taxable year 1944 as a result of the refusal of the Treasury Department to allow, as a deduction from gross income under section 23 (p) of the Internal Revenue Code, the contribution made by such company to its profit-sharing employees' trust for such taxable year: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 6, strike out the sum and insert "$7,341.53."

The amendment was agreed to.

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

MARY K. REYNOLDS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2874) to confer jurisdiction upon the Court of

Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of Mary K. Reynolds, as successor in interest to the Colonial Realty Co.

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

Be it enacted, etc., That (a) notwithstanding any statute of limitation or lapse of time, any provision of law to the contrary, any release, or any prior acceptance by the claimant of partial performance by the United States, jurisdiction is hereby conferred upon the Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of Mary K. Reynolds, as successor in interest to the Colonial Realty Co., against the United States resulting from the alleged failure of the Secretary of the Interior to complete the exchange of lands authorized and directed by the act entitled "An act providing for an exchange of lands between the Colonial Realty Co. and the United States, and for other purposes," approved March 23, 1933 (48 Stat. 1295), as supplemented by the act entitled "An act giving credit for water charges paid on damaged land," approved June 14, 1933 (48 Stat. 1300), in the manner and to the extend required by such acts.

(b) Jurisdiction is hereby conferred upon said court (1) to proceed as a court of equity jurisdiction in the adjustment of accounts between the claimant and the United States, (2) to enter such order or decree granting equitable relief as justice and right shall require, and (3) to enforce any such order or decree in any manner or by any proceeding available to a district court of the United States for the enforcement of its orders and decrees.

SEC. 2. (a) Suit upon such claim may be instituted hereunder not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this act. Except as otherwise provided herein, proceedings for the determination of such claim, and review and payment or performance of any judgment, order, or decree thereon shall be had in the same manner as in the case of claims over which such court has jurisdiction under section 1491 of title 28 of the United States Code.

(b) Payment of any judgment rendered hereunder for damages and compliance by the United States with any order or decree entered hereunder for equitable relief shall constitute a full and complete satisfaction of all claims and demands of the Colonial Realty Co., its successors and assigns, arising from the acts cited in subsection 1 (a) of this act.

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

ESTATE OF PRESTON LEON STUBBLEFIELD

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 6086) for the relief of the estate of Preston Leon Stubblefield.

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

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to the estate of Preston Leon Stubblefield, late of Little Rock, Ark., the sum of $5,000. The payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims of the estate against the United States arising out of the death of Preston Leon Stubblefield in a fire which destroyed dormitory Q of the housing authority of the city of Richmond, Calif., on January 10, 1944. The fire was caused by a defective flue in the dormitory, which was constructed under the supervision of the Federal Works Administrator during World War II. No part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

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

HAROLD J. DAVIS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 7413) for the relief of Harold J. Davis.

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

Be it enacted, etc., That, in the administration of the Federal Employees' Compensation Act of September 7, 1916 (39 Stat. 742; 5 U. S. C. 51), as amended, Harold J. Davis, of Tulsa, Okla., shall be held and considered to have been an employee of the United States on the 3d and 4th day of July 1944, within the meaning of section 40 of that act and the injuries sustained by him on those dates shall be deemed to have been sustained in the performance of his duty in accordance with the first section of that act.

SEC. 2. Claim for compensation under this act may be filed any time within 1 year after the date of this act.

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert the following: "That sections 15 to 20, inclusive, of the act entitled "An act to provide compensation for employees of the United States suffering injuries while in the performance of their duties, and for other purposes," approved September 7, 1916, as amended (5 U. S. C. 765–769), are hereby waived in favor of Harold J. Davis for compensation for disability alleged to have been sustained by him on the 3d and 4th of July 1942, while serving in line of duty under orders of the United States Navy as fire chief on the United States naval air station, Dutch Harbor, Alaska, during enemy air attacks.

"SEC. 2. That no benefits except medical expenses shall accrue prior to the enactment of this act. Claim for compensation under this act may be filed any time within 1 year after the enactment of this act."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

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

SISTER CONSTANTINA

The Clerk called the bill (S. 208) for the relief of Sister Constantina (Teresia Kakonyi).

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

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

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

GIULIO SQUILLARI, MRS. MAGGIORINA BARBERO SQUILLARI, ROSANNA SQUILLARI, AND EUGENIO SQUILLARI

The Clerk called the bill (S. 532) for the relief of Giulio Squillari, Mrs. Maggiorina Barbero Squillari, Rosanna Squillari, and Eugenio Squillari.

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

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the immigration and naturalization laws, Giulio Squillari, Mrs. Maggiorina Barbero Squillari (his wife), and Rosanna Squillari and Eugenio Squillari (their minor children) shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fees. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such aliens as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct four numbers from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

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

DR. UHENG KHOO

The Clerk called the bill (S. 1209) for the relief of Dr. Uheng Khoo.

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

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

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

REV. FRANCIS T. DWYER AND REV. THOMAS MORRISSEY

The Clerk called the bill (S. 1937) for the relief of Rev. Francis T. Dwyer and Rev. Thomas Morrissey.

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

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Rev. Francis T. Dwyer and Rev. Thomas Morrissey shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act upon payment of the required visa fees. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such aliens as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State

shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct two numbers from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

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

DORA VIDA LYEW SEIXAS

The Clerk called the bill (S. 2534) for the relief of Dora Vida Lyew Seixas.

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

Be it enacted, etc., That, notwithstanding the provisions of subsection (b) of section 202 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Dora Vida Lyew Seixas shall be classified as an immigrant under the provisions of section 101 (a) (27) (C) of that act.

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

AUTHORIZING SALE OF CERTAIN LAND IN ALASKA FOR USE AS A HOSPITAL SITE

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2009) to authorize the sale of certain land in Alaska to the Ninilchik Hospital Association, of Ninilchik, Alaska, for the use as a hospital site and related purposes.

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

Be it enacted, etc., That the Ninilchik Hospital Association, of Ninilchik, Alaska, is hereby authorized for a period of 1 year from and after the effective date of this act to apply for the purchase of, and the Secretary of the Interior is hereby authorized and directed to convey to the association, for use as a hospital site and related purposes, the following-described land situated in Alaska: The northeast quarter northeast quarter southwest quarter southwest quarter and the northwest quarter northeast quarter southeast quarter southwest quarter of section 34, township 1 south, range 14 west, Seward meridian, Alaska, containing five acres.

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

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 8, following the word "purposes", insert the words "and for so long as same is devoted to such use by said association."

Page 2, line 6, strike the figure "$1.25" and insert in lieu thereof the figure "$10."

Page 2, line 14, strike the period, insert in lieu thereof a colon, and add the following: "*Provided further*, That said conveyance shall not be made unless or until said proposed grantee shall have complied with all applicable statutes and regulations of the Territory of Alaska pertaining to associations of the general class of said proposed grantee.

"SEC. 3. Notwithstanding any of the provisions of this act, the Secretary shall convey the lands to the Ninilchik Hospital Association of Ninilchik, Alaska, only if the hospital pays the price fixed by the Secretary within 5 years after notification by the Secretary of the price.

"SEC. 4. If, at any time following conveyance of such lands to the Ninilchik Hospital Association, the Secretary of the Interior makes a determination that the association or its successors is no longer using such lands for the purposes specified in section 1 of this act, title to the lands conveyed shall revert to the United States. This reverter provision, however, shall cease to be in effect as to such lands 25 years after issuance of patent therefor."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

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

AUTHORIZING SECRETARY OF INTERIOR TO SELL CERTAIN LAND TO THE BOARD OF NATIONAL MISSIONS OF THE PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH IN THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2016) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to sell certain land to the Board of National Missions of the Presbyterian Church in the United States of America.

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

Be it enacted, etc., That, upon the filing of an application within 1 year from the date of this act and the payment of the purchase price within such period, the Secretary of the Interior shall sell and convey to the Board of National Missions of the Presbyterian Church in the United States of America for church purposes, the following-described land situated in Alaska:

The northeasterly half of block 10 of the East Government Hill Subdivision at Anchorage, Alaska, comprising lots 7, 8, 9, and 10 of block 10, as shown on the official plat drawn by the Alaska Railroad, and described as follows: Beginning at the northeasterly corner of block 10, which is located at the intersection of the southerly side of Hollywood Drive with the westerly side of Elm Street; thence south fifteen degrees thirty-eight minutes west, one hundred sixty-nine and seventy-one one-hundredths feet along the westerly side of Elm Street; thence south sixty degrees thirty-eight minutes west, fifty seven and fifty-seven one-hundredths feet along the northwesterly side of Elm Street; thence north twenty-nine degrees twenty-two minutes west, two hundred seventy-seven and fifty-seven one-hundredths feet along the northeasterly side of the alley through block 10; thence north sixty degrees thirty-eight minutes east, twenty feet to a point on the southerly side of Hollywood Drive; thence south seventy-four degrees twenty-two minutes east, two hundred twenty-two and eighty-four one-hundredths feet along the southerly side of Hollywood Drive to the point of beginning, containing an area of twenty-nine thousand six hundred and seventy-four square feet or sixty-eight one-hundredths acre, more or less.

SEC. 2. The purchase price for each lot shall be the appraised value of such lot, exclusive of any increased value resulting from the development or improvement of the lot by the Board of National Missions of the Presbyterian Church in the United States of America.

With the following committee amendment.

Page 3, line 4, change the period to a comma and add the words "plus the cost of survey."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

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

AUTHORIZING CONVEYANCE OF CERTAIN LANDS TO BOARD OF EDUCATION OF PRINCE GEORGES COUNTY

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 4496) to authorize and direct the conveyance of certain lands to the Board of Education of Prince Georges County, Upper Marlboro, Md., so as to permit the construction of public educational facilities urgently required as a result of increased defense and other essential Federal activities in the District of Columbia and its environs.

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

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare is authorized and directed to convey by quitclaim deed or other appropriate means to the Board of Education of Prince Georges County, Upper Marlboro, Md., upon such terms and conditions as she may deem necessary, all right, title, and interest of the United States of America in and to those portions of Lot No. 3 and Lot No. 4 of the Godding Croft property located east of Indian Head Road, Maryland, and now under the control and jurisdiction of Saint Elizabeths Hospital, as the Secretary shall determine to be needed and usable by the Board of Education of Prince Georges County for educational purposes, upon payment by such board to the Secretary of an amount equal to the cost to the United States of the property to be so transferred plus the cost of all improvements placed upon the property by the United States.

SEC. 2. The instrument of conveyance to be delivered by the Secretary shall contain appropriate provisions whereby there is reserved to the United States of America (a) all right, title, and interest in and to any and all oil, gas, hydrocarbons, minerals, or other ores, and source of fissionable materials and substance, together with the right to prospect for, mine, extract, and remove the same, and (b) the option to revert title to the property so conveyed in the event the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare determines that the Board of Education of Prince Georges County, its successors or assigns, fails to commence use of the said property for educational purposes within a reasonable time (as determined by the Secretary) after the delivery of the instrument of conveyance or thereafter fails for a period of 1 year to utilize the property for educational purposes.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 2, line 8, strike out "cost."

Page 2, line 9, strike out "to the United States" and insert in lieu thereof "fair market value."

Page 2, strike out lines 10 and 11.

Page 2, line 14, strike out "(a) all."

Page 2, strike out lines 15, 16, and 17.

Page 2, line 18, strike out "for, mine, extract, and remove the same, and (b)."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

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

FAVORING THE SUSPENSION OF DEPORTATION OF CERTAIN ALIENS

The Clerk called Senate Concurrent Resolution 60, favoring the suspension of deportation of certain aliens.

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

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the Congress favors the suspension of deportation in the case of each alien hereinafter named, in which case the Attorney General has suspended deportation for more than 6 months:

A-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-Rodriquez, 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, Depetrillio, 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-8021829, 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 Gonzalez 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-7505162, 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 Igntaieff.
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 You.
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-2760848, Makota, Mita or Shinichi Misumi.
A-7967332, Malinconico, Carolina.
0300-185373, Mapp, Leslie.
A-4196314, 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, McLaughlin, 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-5349845, Mickelson, Edith Esther (nee Bjorklund) or Michols.
E-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.
E-2760272, Quan, Suet Ying (nee Suet Ying Lu).
E-42710, Ramirez, Emerenciana or De Martinez or vda, De Martinez or Valenzuela or Medel 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–800105, 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, Kojire 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, Biodia 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, Kahn, 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–9545289, 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 Homes) 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, Filinich, 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, Holnberg, 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-Cepeda, 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 Goforth (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. Armand, 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 Baladad 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-3898658, 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, Claridad, 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 Foy.
A-5190582, Fonoimoana, Toa Gimamao.
A-5190588T, Fonoimoana, Line.
T-2659451, Fortin, Jeannine, Marie.
V-162922, Friedle, Garlina Marie.
T-2760256, Fulton, Robert Harper.
A-6847783, Fung, Hsien-Shi 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, Giorello, 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, Oy 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, Tomas.
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–49882, 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–2384755, 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, Choing or Fat Chong or Chaing Fart.
A–4652050, Fonoimoana, Mataniu Api or Mataniu Api Tuia.
A–1593703, Franz, Kurt Erwin Otto.
A–5305997, Friedrich, Josefa (nee Riesenhuber) 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, Gonzalez, 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, Ligila (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 Juli 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-9556548, 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 Vilani).
A-71371644, Plumeri, Rosina (nee Plumeri).
T-1497350, Poy, Chow Gum or Sam Poy Low.
A-5645701, Primis, Angeline Paul.
A-9683972, 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, Taualii, Eneleata.
A-51214225, 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-3696512, 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.

With the following committee amendments:

On page 2, line 13, after the number "A-4037830" strike out the name "Benndetti," and substitute the name "Benedetti."

On page 46, at the end of the bill, add the following names:

"A-6988016, Nicolaou, Kaliope Mosas nee Kaliope Nikolaos Karavokirou."

"A-6775542, Satyendra, Kudumalakunte Narasinagaro."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

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

FAVORING THE SUSPENSION OF DEPORTATION OF CERTAIN ALIENS

The Clerk called Senate Concurrent Resolution 61, favoring the suspension of deportation of certain aliens.

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

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the Congress favors the suspension of deportation in the case of each alien hereinafter named, in which case the Attorney General has suspended deportation for more than 6 months:

E-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-6982873, 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 Marie 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.
0300-1464.5, 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-1194829, 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-4862794, 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 Vasquia, or Manuel Rodriguez, or Manual 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 Anniros 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 of 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-8282069, 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, Regueira-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-3286238, 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 Epifianio 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, Reyanldo.
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-6843554, 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, Adella 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-1431648, 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-1812038, 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 Hinoposa-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 Lavine.
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.
A-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-Colio, 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, Valesquez, 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, Le 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 Liarraga.
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, Bozch, 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 Van or Ivan Dacoff or Ioannis Daikopolos.
A-5494277, Diaz, Andrea or Andrea Celestina Diaz De Leon Y Brunet.
T-1496340, Diaz-Robles, Pedro.
T-1496339, Diaz, Jovita Soto.
A-7379204, Dineli, 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-1496808, 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 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, Papas, 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-1096870, 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.
T-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-965411T, Ascencao, Manuel.
A-5965863, Barragan, Felipa or Sister Mary Emmanuel.
A-4132980, Bauseler, Elizabeth (nee Elliott).
A-6769945, Bradford, Anna Marie 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-5818826, 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-5036098, Gallardo, Benjamin Mosqueda.
A-5050854, Gariffo, Carlo.
0300-387757, Geong, Leong or Geong Leung or Yick Cheung Leong.
T-2753737, Gomez, Cipriano.
A-6472070, Gonzalez, 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, Huang, 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 Yung).
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, Seisum.
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, Schwartzmann, 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-7744615, 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 Theophilous.
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.

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

MRS. ROMOLA NIJINSKY

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 675) for the relief of Mrs. Romola Nijinsky.

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

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

With the following committee amendment:

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

The committee amendment was agreed to.

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

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill for the relief of Mrs. Romola Nijinsky and Paul Bohus-Vilagosi."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MRS. KEIKO INOUYE

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 689) for the relief of Mrs. Keiko Inouye.

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

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

With the following committee amendments:

On page 1, lines 3 and 4, strike out the words "immigration and naturalization laws," and insert in lieu thereof the words "Immigration and Nationality Act."

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

The committee amendments were agreed to.

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

NINA MAKEEF, ALSO KNOWN AS NINA BERBEROVA

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 692) for the relief of Nina Makeef, also known as Nina Berberova.

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

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the immigration and naturalization laws, Nina Makeef, also known as Nina Berberova, shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee and head tax. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of

State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

With the following committee amendments:

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

On page 1, line 8, after the word "fee", strike out the words "and head tax."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

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

DR. IGNACY ADAM, MRS. AMALYA ALEXANDER ADAM, AND GEORGE ADAM

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 707) for the relief of Dr. Ignacy Adam, Mrs. Amalya Alexander Adam, and George Adam.

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

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the immigration and naturalization laws, Doctor Ignacy Adam, Mrs. Amalya Alexander Adam (his wife), and George Adam (their minor son) shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fees and head taxes. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such aliens as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota officer or officers to make appropriate deductions from the first available appropriate quota or quotas.

With the following committee amendments:

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

Page 1, line 9, after the word "fees", strike out "and head taxes."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

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

HAROLD DONAGHY BISHOP

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 737) for the relief of Harold Donaghy Bishop.

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

Be it enacted, etc., That, notwithstanding the provisions of paragraph (3) of section 212 (a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Harold Donaghy Bishop may be admitted to the United States for permanent residence if he is found to be otherwise admissible under the provisions of that act: *Provided*, That a suitable and proper bond or undertaking approved by the Attorney General be given as prescribed by section 213 of that act.

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

FAIGA KUNDA

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 792) for the relief of Faiga Kunda.

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

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

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

SISTER ISABEL

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 807) for the relief of Sister Isabel (Purificacion Montemayor Maceo).

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

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

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

JOSEPH VYSKOCIL

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 808) for the relief of Joseph Vyskocil.

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

Be it enacted, etc., That the Attorney General be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to record the lawful admission for permanent residence in the United States of Joseph Vyskocil at the port of New York as of April 23, 1950, upon payment by him of the required visa fee and head tax.

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

With the following committee amendment:

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

The committee amendment was agreed to.

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

NICHOLAS KATEM ET AL.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 848) for the relief of Nicholas Katem, Theodosia Katem, Basil Katem, and Josephine Katem.

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

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

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

MRS. STELLA REBNER

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 849) for the relief of Mrs. Stella Rebner.

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

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

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

ABUL K. BARIK

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 897) for the relief of Abul K. Barik.

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

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

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

ROBERT GEORGE BULLDEATH AND LENORA PATRICIA BULLDEATH

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 967) for the relief of Robert George Bulldeath and Lenora Patricia Bulldeath.

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

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the immigration and naturalization laws, Robert George Bulldeath and Lenora Patricia Bulldeath shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon the payment of the required visa fees and head taxes. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such aliens as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct two numbers from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota as available: *Provided*, That for the purposes of this act and the immigration and naturalization laws Robert George Bulldeath and Lenora Patricia Bulldeath, who were born in China of British parents, shall be deemed to have been born in Great Britain.

With the following committee amendments:

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

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

The committee amendments were agreed to.

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

MARTHA FARAH

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1144) for the relief of Martha Farah.

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

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

With the following committee amendments:

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

Page 1, line 8, strike out "and head tax" and insert "*Provided*, That a suitable and proper bond or undertaking, approved by the Attorney General be deposited as prescribed by section 213 of the said act."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

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

NJDEH HOVHANISSIAN ASLANIAN

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1189) for the relief of Njdeh Hovhanissian Aslanian.

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Speaker, this bill is identical with S. 939 which has passed the Senate. I ask unanimous consent that the bill S. 939 be substituted for H. R. 1189.

The Clerk read the title of the Senate bill.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

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

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

A motion to reconsider and a similar House bill (H. R. 1189) were laid on the table.

ALWINE REICHENBAUCH

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1348) for the relief of Alwine Reichenbauch.

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

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

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

ANTONIO MESSINA

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1657) for the relief of Antonio Messina.

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

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

With the following committee amendment:

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

The committee amendment was agreed to.

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

REV. ROGER KNUTSEN

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1699) for the relief of Rev. Roger Knutsen.

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

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

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

MRS. FUNG HWA LIU LEE

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1948) for the relief of Mrs. Fung Hwa Liu Lee.

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

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the immigration and naturalization laws, Mrs. Fung Hwa Liu Lee shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon the payment of the required visa fee and head tax. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the number of displaced persons who shall be granted the status of permanent residence pursuance to section 4 of the Displaced Persons Act, as amended (62 Stat. 1011; 64 Stat. 219; 50 U. S. C. App. 1953).

With the following committee amendments:

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

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

Beginning on page 1, line 11, after the words "from the", strike out the remainder of the bill and substitute in lieu thereof the following: "appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

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

ANNIE LITKE

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2427) for the relief of Annie Litke.

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

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

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

LAJOS SCHMIDT AND HIS WIFE, MAGDA

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2505) for the relief of Lajos Schmidt and his wife, Magda.

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

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the immigration and naturalization laws, Lajos Schmidt and his wife, Magda, shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fees and head taxes. Upon the granting of permanent residence to each such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct two numbers from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

With the following committee amendments:

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

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

The committee amendments were agreed to.

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

DR. JAMES K-THONG YU

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2875) for the relief of Dr. James K-Thong Yu.

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

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

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

ELIZABETH JUST MAYER

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2907) for the relief of Elizabeth Just Mayer.

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

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

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

JOSIP STANIC

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 4701) for the relief of Josip Stanic.

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

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

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

HELGA ROSSMANN AND HER CHILD

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1465) for the relief of Helga Rossmann and her child.

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

Be it enacted, etc., That, notwithstanding the provision of the 11th category of section 3 of the Immigration Act of 1917, as amended, Helga Rossmann and her child may be admitted to the United States for permanent residence if she is found to be otherwise admissible under the provisions of the immigration laws; provided that her marriage to her United States citizen fiance shall occur not later than 6 months after the enactment of this act.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, strike out all after the enacting clause and insert the following: "That, in the administration of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Helga Rossmann, the fiance of Sgt. Kenneth T. Brown, a citizen of the United States, and her child shall be eligible for visas as nonimmigrant temporary visitors for a period of 3 months: *Provided*, That the administrative authorities find that the said Helga Rossmann is coming to the United States with a bona fide intention of being married to the said Sgt. Kenneth T. Brown and that they are found otherwise admissible under the immigration laws, except section 212 (a) (9) of the Immigration and Nationality Act shall not be applicable to the said Helga Rossmann: *Provided further*, That this exemption shall apply only to a ground for exclusion of which the Department of State or the Department of Justice have knowledge prior to the enactment of this act. In the event the marriage between the above-named persons does not occur within 3 months after the entry of the said Helga Rossmann and child, they shall be required to depart from the United States and upon failure to do so shall be deported in accordance with the provisions of sections 242 and 243 of the Immigration and Nationality Act. In the event that the marriage between the above-named persons shall occur within 3 months after the entry of the said Helga Rossmann, and her child, the Attorney General is authorized and directed to record the lawful admission for permanent residence of the said Helga Rossmann and her child as of the date of the payment by them of the required visa fees."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

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

BARBARA GENE COSTER

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3026) for the relief of Barbara Gene Coster.

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

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

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

MRS. OLYMPIA CUC

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3038) for the relief of Mrs. Olympia Cuc.

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

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

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

WESLEY HOWARD LEAHY

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3131) for the relief of Wesley Howard Leahy.

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

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

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 7, after the word "fee.", strike out the balance of the bill.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

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

KATHARINA LINK

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3249) for the relief of Katharina Link.

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

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

With the following committee amendment:

Page 2, line 11, strike out "241 and 242" and insert "242 and 243."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

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

SISTER IOLANDA SITA ET AL.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3903) for the relief of Sister Iolanda Sita, Sister Guerrina Brioli, Sister Pasqualina Coppari, Sister Anna Urbinati, Sister Ida Raschi, and Sister Elvira P. Mencarelli.

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

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Sister Iolanda Sita, Sister Guerrina Brioli, Sister Pasqualina Coppari, Sister Anna Urbinati, Sister Ida Raschi, and Sister Elvira P. Mencarelli shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fees. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such aliens as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct six numbers from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

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

NAHI YOUSSEF

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 4236) for the relief of Nahi Youssef.

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

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

With the following committee amendments:

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

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

The committee amendments were agreed to.

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

MRS. HELEN KON

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 4510) for the relief of Mrs. Helen Kon.

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

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

With the following committee amendments:

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

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

The committee amendments were agreed to.

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

GIO BATTA PODESTA

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 4747) for the relief of Gio Batta Podesta.

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

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

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

RADU FLORESCU AND NICOLE ELIZABETH MICHEL FLORESCU

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 4813) for the relief of Radu Florescu and Nicole Elizabeth Michel Florescu.

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

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

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

MRS. BERT I. BIEDERMANN

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 4869) for the relief of Mrs. Bert I. Biedermann (nee Ermenegilda Vittoria Cernecca).

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

Be it enacted, etc, That, notwithstanding the provisions of section 212 (a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Mrs. Bert I. Biedermann (nee Ermenegilda Vittoria Cernecca) may be admitted to the United States for permanent residence if she is found to be otherwise admissible under the provisions of such act.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 3, after "(a)" insert "(9)."

Page 1, line 8, insert "*Provided*, That this exemption shall apply only to a ground for exclusion of which the Department of State or the Department of Justice have knowledge prior to the enactment of this act.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

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

MARGARETE HOHMANN SPRINGER

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 5265) for the relief of Margarete Hohmann Springer.

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

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

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

EVA GYORI

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 5355) for the relief of Eva Gyori.

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

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

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

HATSUKO KUNIYOSHI DILLON

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 5578) for the relief of Hatsuko Kuniyoshi Dillon.

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

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

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 7, after the colon insert "*Provided*, That a suitable and proper bond or undertaking, approved by the Attorney General, be deposited as prescribed by section 213 of the said act."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

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

MICHAEL K. KAPRIELYAN

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 5820) for the relief of Michael K. Kaprielyan.

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

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

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

GERTRUD O. HEINZ

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 6026) for the relief of Gertrud O. Heinz.

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

Be it enacted, etc., That, notwithstanding the provision of section 212 (a) (9) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Gertrud O. Heinz may be admitted to the United States for permanent residence if she is found to be otherwise admissible under the provisions of that act and if she marries her United States citizen fiance, Samuel Kaoo Kahikina, within three months following the date of the enactment of this act: *Provided*, That this exemption shall apply only to a ground for exclusion of which the Department of State or the Department of Justice have knowledge prior to the enactment of this act.

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

NICK JOSEPH BENI, JR.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 6478) for the relief of Nick Joseph Beni, Jr.

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

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

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

GREGORY HARRY BEZENAR

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 6636) for the relief of Gregory Harry Bezenar.

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

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

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

ERNA WHITE

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 6998) for the relief of Erna White.

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

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

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

NICOLE GOLDMAN

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 7012) for the relief of Nicole Goldman.

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

Be it enacted, etc., That, notwithstanding the provision of section 212 (a) (1) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Nicole Goldman may be admitted to the United States for permanent residence if she is found to be otherwise admissible under the provisions of that act: *Provided*, That a suitable and proper bond or undertaking, approved by the Attorney General, be deposited as prescribed by section 213 of the said act.

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

KURT FORSELL

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 7500) for the relief of Kurt Forsell.

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

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

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

AUTHORIZING THE POTOMAC ELECTRIC POWER CO. TO CONSTRUCT CERTAIN RAILROAD TRACKS

The Clerk called the bill (S. 1691) to authorize Potomac Electric Power Co. to construct, maintain, and operate in the District of Columbia, and to cross Kenilworth Avenue NE., in said District, with certain railroad tracks and related facilities, and for other purposes.

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

Be it enacted, etc., That the present or future public convenience and necessity require or will require the construction and operation of the crossings, tracks, and other facilities authorized by this act, and that—

SECTION 1. Potomac Electric Power Co., a corporation organized and existing under the laws of the United States of America relating to the District of Columbia and a domestic corporation of the Commonwealth of Virginia, its successors and assigns, is hereby authorized to construct, operate, and maintain in the District of Columbia railroad tracks providing a direct connection between the area bounded by Kenilworth Avenue NE., Benning Road NE., Foote Street NE., and the Anacostia River (hereinafter called the Benning plant area) and the right-of-way of the Pennsylvania Railroad Co. in parcels 176/100 and 176/101 in said District; to construct, operate, and maintain an overhead bridge carrying such tracks across said Kenilworth Avenue NE.; and to construct, operate, and maintain in the Benning plant area all such industrial sidetracks, switches, crossings, tracks, turnouts, extensions, branch tracks, spurs, sidings, and connections as in the opinion of said Potomac Electric Power Co., its successors or assigns, may be or become necessary or expedient or advisable for the development and use of the Benning plant area for such uses as may now or hereafter be permitted by or under the zoning regulations and maps of the District of Columbia as now or at any time hereafter in effect; and said Potomac Electric Power Co., its successors and assigns, is hereby further authorized, until said overhead bridge is completed and ready for operation, to construct, operate, and maintain across said Kenilworth Avenue NE., in the District of Columbia, a railroad track crossing at grade to provide a direct connection between the Benning plant area and said right-of-way of the Pennsylvania Railroad Co., and from said crossing at grade to construct, operate, and maintain in the Benning plant area industrial sidetracks, switches, crossings, tracks, turnouts, extensions, branch tracks, spurs, sidings, and connections to the extent hereinabove authorized; and said Potomac Electric Power Co., its successors and assigns, is hereby further authorized, in connection with the tracks, crossings, and other facilities herein authorized, to construct, operate, and maintain such electrical or other equipment and installations as in its opinion may be necessary, expedient, or advisable for the operation of said tracks, crossings, and other facilities: *Provided,* That upon completion of said overhead bridge, but not later than 1 year from the date of approval of this act or within such further period of time as the Commissioners of the District of Columbia shall permit, said Potomac Electric Power Co., its successors and assigns, shall remove from said Kenilworth Avenue said temporary railroad track crossing said avenue at grade authorized by the provisions of this section.

SEC. 2. Before any portion of the construction work authorized by section 1 of this act shall be begun on the ground, a plan or plans for such portion shall be submitted to the Commissioners of the District of Columbia for their approval, and only to the extent that such plan or plans shall be approved by said Commissioners shall such portion of the construction work herein authorized be permitted or undertaken: *Provided, however,* That such approval shall not be unreasonably withheld by said Commissioners.

SEC. 3. Said Potomac Electric Power Co., its successors and assigns, is hereby authorized to permit any railroad company or companies to use the bridge, Kenilworth Avenue grade crossing, industrial sidetracks, switches, crossings, tracks, turnouts, extensions, branch tracks, spurs, siding, and connections authorized by section 1 of this act to the extent deemed necessary or expedient or advisable by said Potomac Electric Power Co., its successors or assigns.

SEC. 4. The authority granted herein shall not be construed to authorize any construction or relocation or removal of railroad track or tracks, or the construction of any structure which will prevent continuous rail transportation by standard railroad equipment by and between the railroad tracks of the Baltimore & Ohio Railroad and the premises of the Benning plant of the Potomac Electric Power Co. via the tracks of the East Washington Railway Co. and the Capital Transit Co., except that this section shall not preclude the construction of an overpass at Deane Avenue, or preclude temporary interruption of the railroad transportation service described in this section when necessary to any construction on Kenilworth Avenue, or when necessary for construction of facilities described in section 1 of this act.

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

VIKTOR R. KANDLIN

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 5842) for the relief of Viktor R. Kandlin.

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

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

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

HUA LIN AND HIS WIFE, LILLIAN CHING-WEN LIN (NEE HU)

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 7030) for the relief of Hua Lin and his wife, Lillian Ching-Wen Lin (nee Hu).

Mr. BONIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that S. 2499, which has been passed by the Senate, be substituted for H. R. 7030.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the Senate bill.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Hua Lin and his wife, Lillian Ching-Wen Lin (nee Hu) shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fees. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such aliens as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct the required numbers from the appropriate quota or quotas for the first year that such quota or quotas are available.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. BONIN]?

There was no objection.

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

A similar House bill (H. R. 7030) was laid on the table.

HANNA WERNER AND HER CHILD, HANNA ELIZABETH WERNER

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 7802) for the relief of Hanna Werner and her child, Hanna Elizabeth Werner.

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

Be it enacted, etc., That, in the administration of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Hanna Werner, the fiance of Wayne Picht, a citizen of the United States, and her child, Hanna Elizabeth Werner, may be eligible for visas as nonimmigrant temporary visitors for a period of 3 months: *Provided,* That the administrative authorities find that the said Hanna Werner is coming to the United States with a bona fide intention of being married to the said Wayne Picht, and that they are found otherwise admissible under the immigration laws, except that section 212 (a) (9) of the Immigration and Nationality Act shall not be applicable to the said Hanna Werner: *Provided further,* That this exemption shall apply only to a ground for exclusion of which the Department of State or the Department of Justice have knowledge prior to the enactment of this act. In the event the marriage between the above-named persons does not occur within 3 months after the entry of the said Hanna Werner and her child, Hanna Elizabeth Werner, they shall be required to depart from the United States and upon failure to do so shall be deported in accordance with the provisions of sections 242 and 243 of the Immigration and Nationality Act. In the event that the marriage between the above-named persons shall occur within 3 months after the entry of the said Hanna Werner and her child, Hanna Elizabeth Werner, the Attorney General is authorized and directed to record the lawful admission for permanent residence of the said Hanna Werner and her child, Hanna Elizabeth Werner, as of the date of the payment by them of the required visa fees.

With the following committee amendment:

On page 2, line 1, after "section 212 (a)" strike out "(9)", and substitute in lieu thereof "(12)."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

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

SALE OF PUBLIC LAND TO COMMUNITY CLUB OF CHUGIAK, ALASKA

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2014) to authorize the sale of certain public land in Alaska to the Community Club of Chugiak, Alaska.

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

Be it enacted, etc., That the Community Club of Chugiak, Alaska, is hereby authorized for a period of 1 year from and after the effective date of this act to file with the Secretary of the Interior an application to purchase, and the Secretary of the Interior is hereby authorized and directed to issue patent to it, for use as a community recreation center and for other community purposes, a tract of land described as lot 21 of section 9, township 15 north, range 1 west, Seward meridian, Alaska, containing four and ninety-three one-hundredths acres.

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

With the following committee amendment:

Page 2, strike all of lines 7 to 11, inclusive, and insert in lieu thereof the following: "land laws. The Secretary shall have the appraisal made on the basis of the value of the lands at the date of appraisal, exclusive of any increased value resulting from the development or improvement of the lands.

"SEC. 3. Notwithstanding any of the provisions of this act, the Secretary shall convey the lands to the Community Club of Chugiak, Alaska, only if the club pays the price fixed by the Secretary within 5 years after notification by the Secretary of the price."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

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

SALE OF LAND TO ALASKA EVANGELIZATION SOCIETY

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2010) to authorize the sale of certain land in Alaska to the Alaska Evangelization Society, of Levelock, Alaska, for missionary purposes.

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

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. BONIN]?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. That completes the reading of the Private Calendar.

CONGRESSIONAL INVESTIGATIONS A PEOPLE'S FORUM

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD at this point. I want to call the attention of the President to his unfounded fear concerning congressional committees.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN]?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, last night the President intimated the American people were unduly fearful of congressional investigations and apparently himself looks askance at them.

My experience has demonstrated that congressional committees and congressional investigations are the only remedy available to the citizens outraged by some bureaucratic ruling or action.

Of course, the President is entitled to his opinion, and so am I. During the last 19 years I have seen more than one situation where some bureaucrat, sometimes an officer in the armed services, arbitrarily has disregarded basic rights of the individual citizen.

A certain section of the press is complaining continuously and viciously about the alleged improprieties of congressional committees, especially one which has been exposing the activities of Communists and communism, which bureaucrats have been coddling and protecting for at least a half-dozen years.

Members of congressional committees hold office for but 2 years. If they get out of line, the people of their districts can throw them out of office, discipline them. The bureaucrats stay on and on. Some are now in the Federal Government who came in in 1935, or before, and a few, from their actions, seem to think they are dictators. Let the President take care of them before he jumps on congressional committees.

Individuals connected with the executive departments are among those who are now fighting some who have attempted to expose Communists, attempted to give the public the facts in connection with the racketeering and extortion so widely practiced.

I wish someone in the executive department would tell me where the average citizen can go for a hearing of his complaints, other than to his Congressman or to a congressional committee.

SLASHING MINES BUREAU APPROPRIATIONS

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. KELLEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, the appropriations recommended in the Interior Department appropriation bill for use of the Bureau of Mines are substantially below the amounts provided by the Congress last year and in previous years, and also substantially below the amounts requested by President Eisenhower in his budget.

The President, I think, made a big mistake—at least, his Interior Department leadership made a big mistake—in asking for about 10 percent less than the Bureau actually needs for its many and extremely varied research programs for the development of America's natural resources and the conservation of our natural wealth. The hearings of the Appropriations subcommittee reveal clearly that the experts in the Bureau of Mines will be sorely handicapped for lack of funds even if the full budget amount is appropriated.

Actually, of course, the Appropriations Committee slashed these inadequate funds even further. Instead of the $22,713,000 we provided the Mines Bureau last year, the President asked for only $20 million. In this bill, we are providing only $18,414,000. So it is a cut of more than $4 million below last year and of $1½ million below the budget requests.

If the Republican Party wants to take responsibility for undermining the effective work of the Bureau of Mines by starving it for funds, there is little those of us on the Democratic side can do about it except voice our deepest regrets and cite the danger. But I am sure before very long the administration and its leadership here in the House—as well as the Senators will be hearing the word from industries throughout the country how this false economy on essential research is going to hurt the steel, aluminum, magnesium, coal, copper, and every other industry dependent upon Mines Bureau research for progress toward lower costs and better production methods.

Whether that word will come through in time to reverse over in the Senate the shortsighted action here in the House, I am sure that before the next budget is drawn up downtown, you will see these mistakes corrected—just as we saw the 80th Congress in 1948 put back into the Mines Bureau appropriation just about everything that same Congress had taken out of it in 1947. You would think the economizers would learn from that experience, but here we are going through it again.

ATTACK ON INFORMATION ACTIVITIES

I should like, Mr. Speaker, to direct the attention of the House to the section of the Appropriations Committee report on this bill calling for a severe reduction in the information activities of the Bureau of Mines. The report says the Bureau has been putting out an excessive volume of press releases, miscellaneous statistical data, and other information about its program and personnel and says it is wasting money in these activities.

I do not know how generally the Bureau circulates its press releases—whether, for instance, it sends data on coal-mining operations to weekly papers

in areas where no coal is mined. In Westmoreland County, Pa., I do not believe they send us data on gold mining, but, as I said, I am not sure how the distribution of its releases are handled or whether there is duplication or unnecessary distribution.

But I do know that the material the Bureau sends out on coal and related activities is not just casual reading matter for us in the coal areas—it is material of basic importance to our economy. I think the same goes with other types of material the Bureau sends out.

None of the newspapers in my area—and many of them are quite hostile to what they call Government extravagance—has ever complained to me that material they receive from the Bureau of Mines is wasteful. Rather, they feature it prominently in their news columns, for it is news of utmost importance to us.

What I am afraid the committee's report means is that the Bureau should no longer send out press releases on mine safety inspections, which give to the people of a community the true facts on the conditions of nearby mines, which give to the miners the full report on the status of safety conditions in the mine in which they work and risk their lives. Are these releases to be cut out?

Are we to know about the condition of some mine only after a disaster has struck, and then go back to the files and discover the Bureau had issued a warning about these conditions, but it had never seen the light of day in the newspapers?

The newspapers perform a great public service in printing these reports, and I think they should continue to receive them.

What all this attack on Mines Bureau information activities seems to add up to, Mr. Speaker, is that if a corporation can afford to have representatives down here in Washington who can go over to the Bureau of Mines and get the facts on what the Bureau is doing, it does not seem to matter whether the general public—the people who are paying for this service—get the facts or not. I object to that kind of approach. I think unless the committee is prepared to tell us exactly how the Bureau has been abusing its press release function, it should not demand that we throttle the facts and not get them out to the people.

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR APPROPRIATION BILL, 1955

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 8680) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1955, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 8680, with Mr. HOEVEN in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. When the Committee rose on yesterday the Clerk had read the first paragraph of the bill. If there are no amendments to this paragraph, the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Operation and maintenance, Southwestern Power Administration

For necessary expenses of operation and maintenance of power transmission facilities and of marketing electric power and energy pursuant to the provisions of section 5 of the Flood Control Act of 1944 (16 U. S. C. 825s), as applied to the southwestern power area, $275,000, and in addition $775,000 shall be transferred to this appropriation from the appropriation "Construction, Southwestern Power Administration"; *Provided*, That not to exceed $550,000 shall be available for personal services.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. JENSEN: On page 2, line 21, strike out "$275,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$625,000", and in line 24 strike out the semicolon, insert a period, and strike out the proviso which begins on that line.

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Chairman, may I say to the gentleman from Iowa that we have nothing to say. We are pleased with the amendment, and we thank the gentleman very much.

Mr. JENSEN. I thank the gentleman.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

Oil and gas divsion

For necessary expenses to enable the Secretary to discharge his responsibilities with respect to oil and gas, including cooperation with the petroleum industry and State authorities in the production, processing, and utilization of petroleum and its products, and natural gas, $100,000.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. JENSEN: Page 3, after line 11, insert:

"Emergency flood and storm repairs: To enable the Secretary of the Interior to reimburse applicable appropriations for the cost of personnel, supplies, and facilities, diverted for the repair, reconstruction, rehabilitation, or replacement of structures, buildings, or other facilities, including equipment, damaged or destroyed by flood or storm, $100,000, to remain available until June 30, 1955."

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Montana [Mr. D'EWART] will explain the purpose of the amendment.

Mr. D'EWART. Mr. Chairman, this is for the purpose of reimbursing the President's Emergency Relief Fund for funds advanced for repair of flood damage that occurred a year ago to the Fort Shaw and Glasgow Districts, Montana. Similar legislation was written into the appropriation bill in 1953 when it was introduced by Senator YOUNG of North Dakota. The amendment would enable the President to have his Emergency Fund reimbursed to the amount that he advanced for repairs due to floods on these irrigation projects. If these irrigation projects had been privately owned, this legislation would not be necessary. However, the Solicitor has ruled that it is necessary under these circumstances.

I appreciate very much the committee's offering this amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. JENSEN].

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

Administrative provisions

Appropriations of the Bonneville Power Administration shall be available to carry out all the duties imposed upon the Administrator pursuant to law. Appropriations made herein to the Bonneville Power Administration shall be available in one fund, except that the appropriation herein made for operation and maintenance shall be available only for the service of the current fiscal year.

Other than as may be necessary to meet local emergencies, not to exceed 12 percent of the appropriation for construction herein made for the Bonneville Power Administration shall be available for construction work by force account or on a hired-labor basis.

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Chairman, I have great respect for the onerous burden which the Subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee on the Interior Department has had to deal with in covering the numerous requests for funds to carry on the operations of this important Department. I regret, however, that the committee has seen fit to cut the budget recommendations for the Bonneville Power Administration so heavily that I fear the efficient operation of this department will be crippled in the next ensuing fiscal year.

The subcommittee has recommended for the next fiscal year $18,915,000, which is a reduction of $11,285,000 below the budget estimate of $30,200,000 and which is $19,951,000 below the 1954 appropriation. Personal services are limited in the bill to $6 million and travel to $500,000.

While I share the objective of the committee to make cuts in every department and every activity where the same can be made without crippling the efficiency of the department, making it impossible for the department to carry on the needed activities, in this instance, for the preservation and full utilization of our natural resources. In my judgment these cuts are too heavy and the budget recommendations should be restored. It should not be overlooked that the Bureau of the Budget, representing the administration, is also endeavoring to reduce the costs of Government and make cuts in appropriations wherever possible and the Bureau recommendations are already below the needs of the department as presented by the officers in charge. It seems that the Bonneville

Power Administration has been the subject of heavier cuts than any other agency. The budget recommendations and the reductions are shown in the following table which appeared in the report of the committee on page 5:

Facility	Budget program	Reduction	Program approved in bill
Chief Joseph-Snohomish	$6,000,000	$2,000,000	$4,000,000
Bellingham substation	324,000	324,000	
The Dalles area service	2,578,000	2,578,000	
Upper Willamette Valley service	4,428,000	428,000	4,000,000
Oregon City-Chemawa	101,000	101,000	
Coos Bay area service	1,183,000	1,183,000	(1)
McNary-Walla Walla	933,000	933,000	
McNary-La Grande	45,000	45,000	
General structures and improvements	810,000	400,000	410,000
Communication facilities	648,000	248,000	400,000
Tools and equipment	945,000	445,000	500,000
Preliminary engineering studies	100,000	100,000	
All other items	13,336,000	500,000	12,836,000
Total	31,431,000	9,285,000	22,146,000
Carryover balance from the Snohomish-Kitsap facility to be applied to the approved 1955 program			2,000,000
Other carryover funds and reimbursements to be applied to the approved program			1,231,000
Appropriated funds required			18,915,000

[1] Use of 1954 carryover funds is authorized.

Mr. Chairman, these heavy cuts, particularly in transmission facilities and Bonneville operations, bring to the front an important problem which is facing the Nation, namely, what is to be our long range program for the conservation, development and full utilization of our natural resources and particularly water resources and hydroelectric power. In the last decade we have witnessed outstanding development in the water resources of the Pacific Northwest, particularly of the Columbia River and its tributaries with special emphasis on hydroelectric power. The development of these resources is the key to the economy and prosperity of the Pacific Northwest, an area of immense proportions and one that has made a valuable contribution to the economy of the United States, both in peace and war.

While we have several projects under construction in the Columbia River Basin which will provide additional hydroelectric power when completed, it is true that we must have some new starts for other projects which will bring into production hydroelectric power if we are not to have a dearth of electric energy in 1958 and the following years. The cuts made in the appropriation for the Bonneville Power Administration will hamper the distribution of the power now being developed in the McNary, The Dalles and the Chief Joseph projects and these cuts should be restored in order to avoid that calamity.

The development of the natural resources of the Pacific Northwest and particularly the water resources, has resulted in a rapid growth of that area in population and in economic development. The growth of power requirement in the Northwest is the result of an extremely rapid growth in population coupled with expansion in electrification of farms, businesses, and industries in the area. In population growth, the Pacific Northwest has far outstripped the United States as a whole. In the period between 1940 and 1950, which is the major development period of the Bonneville Power Administration, the population of the State increased almost 50 percent. Besides having a population increase, more electricity than ever before is being used by all classes of customers. Farm, business, and industrial enterprises are rapidly finding new uses for power, and home consumption is steadily increasing.

I feel justified in having been a vigorous advocate of the development of these great resources of the Northwest not alone because they spell prosperity for the area, but because they are sound investments for the Nation as a whole. This Nation in the exercise of wisdom, instead of curtailing the development of these great revenue-producing projects should make available the necessary funds for full development as rapidly as the demand for electric energy requires. Federal funds invested in these public works is in the interest of economy.

The Columbia River and its tributaries has the greatest potential storehouse of electric power of any waterway in the Nation, some 20 million kilowatts, of which only 11 percent has been developed, as I have said. The remainder of this great source of energy and power is flowing to the sea without let or hindrance with a resulting loss of untold wealth to our people and the loss of millions in revenues which would come into the coffers of the United States. The Bonneville plant during the war turned out 570,000 continuous kilowatts, which is equivalent in energy to 8,800,000 barrels of oil. Only 15 units of the Grand Coulee plant is equivalent to 28 million barrels annually. When McNary Dam is completed the oil saving will be about 15,500,000 barrels annually. The usable steam generation in the Pacific Northwest is about 275,000 kilowatts and when this capacity is running to meet low-water conditions 5 million barrels will be consumed. If this displacement energy were developed, the oil saving would be, in round numbers, 290 million barrels annually, or about 95 percent of the total European consumption, or a quarter of our own prewar consumption. I cite these facts to show the importance of undeveloped hydropower in our future economy.

Unfortunately we have no large deposits of gas, coal, or oil in the Pacific Northwest, but the enormous pool of hydroelectric power stored in the Columbia and other rivers compensates for this loss. The McNary Dam project alone will provide the necessary energy for industries which will have a total investment of $100 million and which will supply employment to 100,000 residents of the Northwest. It is estimated that benefits to navigation from this great dam will reach a million dollars a year, and it will reduce pumping costs for the lands adjacent to the pool approximately $300,000 a year. The power alone generated at this huge project will return to the Government $17,500,000 a year to produce which 3 million tons of coal or 11 million barrels of oil would be required. It is significant to recall that hydroelectric power is not expendable like oil, gas, or coal, and that as long as the sun shines and water falls this great source of energy will work around the clock in the interests of the great industries of the Pacific Northwest.

With each passing year it is more plainly evident that the most dynamic influence on the economy of the Northwest is coming from the harnessing of the great power potentials of its large and numerous streams. The Columbia River and its tributaries carry an amount of water which represents approximately one-fourth of the annual runoff of the major power streams of the country. When fully developed this great river alone can provide approximately 30 percent of the hydroelectric power generation of the entire country. When other streams of the Northwest are added the total is in excess of 40 percent. As of January 1, 1953, only 11.6 percent of this total capacity had been utilized through operating plants. Projects now under construction or authorized will bring this total to near 15 percent of the potential.

But this partial harnessing of the great power resources has been sufficient to literally electrify or energize the economic life of the Northwest and to demonstrate the essentials of future plans for logical and orderly development.

Not only are the installed capacities and undeveloped potentials impressive when compared with the country as a whole, but the low costs of power generation make this the area of lowest power prices in the United States.

The benefits of this low-cost hydropower have been made widely available to the domestic consumers of the Northwest and a matching low level of rates has been provided for industry. This has had great significance in the Nation's war and postwar defense program.

Large heavy-power-consuming industries have grown rapidly to transform the Northwest from a position of little importance industrially to the strategic center of some of the Nation's most strategic and fast-growing industries.

With the large block of low-cost power available from the Grand Coulee and Bonneville and other projects soon to come into production, large new plants for alumina reduction and aluminum

fabrication brought the Northwest, in the brief period between 1940 and 1945, to the No. 1 position in the Nation.

Again, the magic force of large blocks of low-cost power shows its great influence in the recent rapid growth in electrochemical and electrometallurgical industries in the Northwest. Some of the most outstanding of these are aluminum refining, copper and zinc refining, ferroalloys, iron and steel castings, calcium carbide and chlorine and caustic soda.

The rapid growth of the aluminum reduction industry in the Pacific Northwest is the result of alert action by leaders of the region and progressive development of cheap hydroelectric power. There were no aluminum-reduction plants in the area prior to 1940. However, by 1944 the Pacific Northwest's capacity to produce aluminum from alumina—shipped in from other areas—amounted to 310,000 net tons, or 28 percent of the national total. By December 1952, the region's capacity had grown to 498,300 tons, an increase of 58 percent over 1944, and to 41 percent of the national capacity. The big three of the aluminum industry—Alcoa, Kaiser, and Reynolds—have been in the region for some time. It is expected that 104,000 tons of new capacity may be added during 1953–54; by the Harvey Machine Co.—54,000 tons, and the Anaconda Copper Co.—50,000 tons.

Mr. Chairman, I know the opposition encountered in attempting to secure amendments to appropriation bills on the floor, and for that reason I am not attempting to restore the budget recommendations for the Bonneville Administration at this time. I know, however, that the bill will receive most careful consideration in the other body and that every item in the bill will be checked and rechecked with the evidence which will be presented to the Senate committee and I most sincerely hope that when the bill comes back to us and before it is completed in conference and goes to the President for signature, the budget recommendations will be restored for the Bonneville Power Administration, which will enable that agency to function with efficiency and to preserve these valuable resources of the Pacific Northwest upon which our prosperity depends.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resources management

For expenses necessary for management, development, improvement, and protection of resources and appurtenant facilities under the jurisdiction of the Bureau of Indian Affairs, including payment of irrigation assessments and charges; acquisition of water rights; advances for Indian industrial and business enterprises; and development of Indian arts and crafts as authorized by law: $12,592,910.

Mr. FERNANDEZ. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I am going to speak somewhat out of order since the matter to which I shall address myself will not come up until a little later in the bill. Judge Hatch, Federal district judge in New Mexico, when he was a Senator here in Washington called the Park Service one time and said, "We would like for you to settle a dispute we have here today." He said, "We have a dispute as to which is the largest cavern or cave, the Carlsbad Caverns or the Mammoth Cave?" The gentleman who had answered the phone said, "Senator, I am sorry but I cannot, under the rules, make comparisons between parks, but I can tell you this without violating the rule, and that is that the Carlsbad Caverns are the largest in the world." And it is the largest cavern in the world. Our friends and neighbors, the Texans, claim that they have the first of everything. Well, that is one thing they do not have the biggest of because Carlsbad Caverns lies just across the line in New Mexico. Of course, our Texas friends did claim the land under which the caverns are located for many years, but we finally beat them out of it. Of course, they did not know that the Carlsbad Caverns were located under it or they would never have jarred loose of it. The land belonged to New Mexico. In the early twenties, the Legislature of New Mexico very generously passed a resolution authorizing the conveyance of the park to the Federal Government for a national park. Of course, the other day Tony Albert, one of the State land office attorneys, was in my office and he said that they had been looking for the records high and low and they had not been able to find a conveyance of Carlsbad Caverns to the Federal Government. So, it may still belong to New Mexico, and maybe it would be in order for the Federal Government to return the Carlsbad Caverns to the State of New Mexico for operation. If they did so, they could do it without losing one dime because in the few years that it has been in operation, the fees from the park have paid for every dollar of maintenance, every dollar of upkeep, every dollar of operation and every dollar of installations that have been placed there. So that they could return it to New Mexico without losing a dime. Of course, they will not do it. We do not expect them to. But the situation is that the park has netted the Government in the last few years a quarter of a million dollars per year net profit to the Government. I am inserting in the RECORD a tabulation for the years 1943 to 1953, showing the tremendous and rapid increase in the number of visitors. They have increased every year. In 1943 it was 89,126; 1944, 122,467, and so on down until 1951 when there were 493,000. In 1952 they exceeded a half million, and in 1953 it exceeded a half million. All of that increase has come about since we installed a couple of elevators down there. We are now installing two more elevators which will treble the capacity of the caverns.

It has been able to do that, why? Because Carlsbad Cavern is not only the greatest cavern in the world but it is one of the most gorgeous sights in the world. I have here a picture of what is known as the Big Room. You go in there some 800 feet below the ground and you find 7 miles of lighted trail winding through enormous rooms, filled with breathtaking scenes, ever changing in their beauty.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New Mexico has expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. FERNANDEZ was granted 5 additional minutes.)

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

Mr. FERNANDEZ. I yield to the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. HILL. I would like to associate myself with the gentleman in speaking about the grandeurs of Carlsbad Cavern. Mrs. Hill and I visited them and we know what a wonderful place it is. Every American should find time somewhere in his vacation trips to visit this mammoth cave situated in the gentleman's State.

Mr. FERNANDEZ. I thoroughly agree with the gentleman, and I thank him for his remarks. The time will come when a million people will visit these caverns every year, and they will have to be opened at night, to accommodate the public.

I have in my hand a two-page picture in the National Geographic magazine, that shows the Big Room. The figures I am pointing to are figures of men. They look like pygmies in comparison with the stalagmites that come up from the floor. Away up here you see the ceiling, 280 feet high. The room is at some points 2,000 feet long and 1,000 feet wide. Away in the back there is another group of people and this shows the stalagmites going up from the floor all around.

I remember the first time I went into that cavern some 20 years ago, and into that Big Room. We paused, just as this picture shows, here; and one group at one end and another group at the other, of that tremendous cathedral-like cavern. The guide said, "Everybody keep silent, the lights are going out." The lights went out and there was complete blackness. You could hear a pin drop. Then from the group at the other end we began to hear the singing of Rock of Ages. Then the lights came on, almost as if we were standing in the universe before there was any light or life at the very moment when the Lord said, "Let there be light," and there was light. You felt like shouting with the joy of life. You felt like crying for the glory of God, from that wonderful feeling that you get in that big cavern. Unfortunately the singing of the Rock of Ages, by the stalagmite you see here, known as the Rock of Ages, is no longer possible because of the size of the groups. I hope someday, when we quit penny pinching, they will pipe down organ music and the singing of Rock of Ages once again.

There is another big room called the King's Palace and another called the Queen's Chambers, and another one called the Papoose Room.

In the other room shown by this picture there are stalactites hanging from the ceiling meeting stalagmites growing up from the floor forming columns, the most fascinating columns I have ever seen. There is one stalactite groping down from the ceiling toward a stalagmite reaching up from the floor that come within the breadth of a knife blade of meeting and kissing each other. They stopped growing, however, at that point; they never did kiss, and they are destined never to kiss. These columns are called the frustrated lovers. That is the way I feel when I read this report of the committee, like a frustrated lover.

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

Mr. FERNANDEZ. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. I have been enjoying the description the gentleman has been trying to give of this tremendous cave, but I think it defies description. One can appreciate it only by seeing it. It is the most stupendous thing of its kind in the entire world. I have been there several times due to the fact that I have relatives who live near there.

I wish every Member of Congress—every American—could visit Carlsbad and see the stupendous natural wonders in those caves. It is impossible either to write about it and give an adequate portrayal of it or to speak about it and describe its grandeur and beauty. Again I say I appreciate the effort the gentleman is making in trying to educate the Members of the House in regard to the wonderful work of nature you have there in New Mexico.

Mr. FERNANDEZ. I appreciate the gentleman's kind words and support. I know I lack the vocabulary; I know I have not the training; I know I have not the ability to describe these caverns in such manner as to make my listeners appreciate the beauty, the grandeur, the magnificence of this spectacle. I would, however, refer you to last October's edition of the National Geographic magazine. They did a marvelous job in photographically portraying in natural colors some of the majesty and beauty of these caves. That article is worth a million dollars in advertising for our national parks.

Later this afternoon when we reach that point in the bill I intend to offer an amendment to restore the cut that was made in this item. I have thus far tried to give you a brief idea of what lies beneath the surface in this area; when I offer my amendment I shall try to describe what is on top of the ground and to discuss how we have done our best with what the Lord left for us to do on top of the ground and what needs to be done.

As I say, my amendment will be to restore the appropriation which the Bureau of the Budget had approved but which the subcommittee cut some 95 percent. I hope you can go along with me despite the feebleness of my efforts to bring the inspiring glory of this marvel of nature to you as I would like to have done. I hope you will go along with me on my amendment, so that proper facilities, long delayed, may be constructed to give the visitors from all over the Nation what they are entitled to receive when paying their good money to visit this national park.

The Clerk read as follows:

Tribal funds

In addition to the tribal funds authorized to be expended by existing law, there is hereby appropriated $3 million from tribal funds not otherwise available for expenditure for the benefit of Indians and Indian tribes, including pay and travel expenses of employees; care, tuition and other assistance to Indian children attending public and private schools (which may be paid in advance or from date of admission); purchase of land and improvements on land, title to which shall be taken in the name of the United States in trust for the tribe for which purchased; lease of lands and water rights; compensation and expenses of attorneys and other persons employed by Indian tribes under approved contracts; pay, travel and other expenses of tribal officers, councils, and committees thereof, or other tribal organizations, including mileage for use of privately owned automobiles and per diem in lieu of subsistence at rates established administratively but not to exceed those applicable to civilian employees of the Government; relief of Indians, without regard to section 7 of the act of May 27, 1930 (46 Stat. 391), including cash grants; and employment of a recreational director for the Menominee Reservation and a curator for the Osage Museum, each of whom shall be appointed with the approval of the respective tribal councils and without regard to the classification laws: *Provided*, That in addition to the amount appropriated herein, tribal funds may be advanced to Indian tribes during the current fiscal year for such purposes as may be designated by the governing body of the particular tribe involved and approved by the Secretary: *Provided, however*, That no part of this appropriation or other tribal funds shall be used for the acquisition of land or water rights within the States of Nevada, Oregon, Washington, and Wyoming, either inside or outside the boundaries of existing Indian reservations, if such acquisition results in the property being exempted from local taxation.

Mr. KIRWAN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I want to call the attention of the membership to this bill. There is something wrong somewhere, but I do not know where. The original request was for $538 million. The budget reduced that by $116 million, and the committee reduced it by an additional $58 million; that is a total reduction of $175 million. Whether the fault lies on the floor of Congress, in the Bureau of the Budget, or in the Department, it does not seem right that there should be a cut of $175 million on a bill of this size.

If we had a $6, $8, or $10 billion bill before us and cut it by $200 million that would be within expectation, but when you cut a request for $538 million by $175 million, there is something very wrong somewhere, and I do not think it is the Department.

One of two things is going to happen. The agencies that come under that department are going to be in a lot of trouble or the Senate is going to restore more money to this bill than the House has in the bill. One of those two things is bound to happen. You cannot cut off $175 million without one of those results happening. There is somebody here who does not know his job and there is going to be a lot of suffering if it ever comes back from conference the way it is written now.

That is one of the reasons why I take these 5 minutes.

The other thing I want to refer to is a series of articles starting yesterday in the New York Times, known as one of the world's great newspapers. They sent a man out to every national park in the United States. They referred to Yellowstone National Park in today's paper. So far as Yellowstone is concerned, the superintendent said it would take $35 million to operate the park this year and do the things that are necessary to be done in that park. There is a man who knows; yet we only have a few million dollars in the bill for Yellowstone. He said what I said on the floor here yesterday that the man who is collecting the $3 at the gate went home when his time was up and all the rest got in there free. As the New York Times states this morning, had the Congress appropriated an additional $10,000 last year toward the Yellowstone National Park they would have collected $47,000 more in fees. That is not good economy.

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

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

Mr. JOHNSON of California. I also read the article which appeared yesterday in reference to the Grand Canyon National Park, and I was rather astounded at some of the figures that the gentleman who wrote the article gave. Could the gentleman tell us whether or not the fees that are taken in at the various parks, and they vary, the highest being at Yellowstone Park, go to a large degree in caring for the expenses of the parks?

Mr. KIRWAN. It goes back into the Treasury.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. It goes into the Treasury or does it go in the park fund?

Mr. KIRWAN. To take care of the parks, yes.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. It goes into the Treasury, so we have to rely on appropriations?

Mr. KIRWAN. They come up with the necessary funds that are appropriated. They tell you in today's paper about Yellowstone.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. This year they estimate the number of tourists will be 50 million.

Mr. KIRWAN. It will be 50 million. Forty-five million people entered the national parks last year.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. I want to get this clear in the RECORD. The money that is collected goes to the Treasury, so in order to get an adequate amount of money to administer the parks properly, we have to have appropriations?

Mr. KIRWAN. That comes from the Committee on Appropriations. Forty-five million people entered the parks last year. In 1939 there were only 15 million people entered the parks, yet we had more employees on the parks' payroll in 1939 than we had last year and 45 million people entered the parks. There are 17 less people on the Yellowstone Park payroll this year than there were in 1937. That is not good business, that is not good judgment, it is not good anything.

Mr. Chairman, it is time we take a little inventory of what we are appropriating and what we are doing here. Reference was made to the Grand Canyon National Park where the same thing happened. The man quit taking the $3 and went on home. All the rest of them went in free. Down there they have a restaurant that will only take care of 600 people. Some days they have as many as 25,000 in the park and it is 60 miles to the nearest town, Williams, Ariz.

I am asking every one of you to give this matter thought and to read the five articles that will appear in the New York Times.

The Clerk read as follows:

BUREAU OF RECLAMATION

For carrying out the functions of the Bureau of Reclamation as provided in the Federal reclamation laws (act of June 17, 1902, 32 Stat. 388, and acts amendatory thereof or supplementary thereto) and other acts applicable to that Bureau, as follows:

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word, and would like to have the attention of the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. BAILEY]. I am sure he wants the RECORD to be correct.

Mr. BAILEY. Certainly.

Mr. JENSEN. The gentleman made a statement yesterday that Yellowstone Park made a profit.

Mr. BAILEY. That statement should apply, as I recall, to the year 1950 when I was trying to provide school facilities for the people employed in the park. It was in my mind that they turned back into the Treasury of the United States, after paying their operating expenses, either $72,000 or $142,000. I may be wrong about that. If I am wrong I want to be corrected, but those figures stick in my mind, and I have a very good memory.

Mr. JENSEN. I would not say that the gentleman is not right for the year 1950. I thought the gentleman meant 1953, so I asked for those figures. Now, here are the figures from the Department: in fiscal 1953 Yellowstone Park had total expenditures of $1,524,502, and the revenues were $960,257.

Mr. BAILEY. Does the gentleman have the figures for 1950?

Mr. JENSEN. I do not have them available, no. I thought the gentleman meant 1953, so I just got those.

Mr. BAILEY. I was limiting it to 1950.

Mr. JENSEN. I am not saying that the gentleman is wrong on the figures which he quoted for 1950.

Mr. BAILEY. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, this subcommittee on appropriations is due a lot of credit for the long weeks and months the members work each year on this important bill. I think the committee always does a good job with this reservation; from my standpoint the committee is too conservative in providing funds that might to a greater extent provide for the development of this great country of ours. Of course, I do not advocate that we ignore fiscal considerations. In fact the greater our commitments become in military affairs and in the field of world responsibility, the more important become our needs for development and conservation of our own internal resources.

Mr. Chairman, sometime ago I introduced a bill which would provide for a study of the feasibility of bringing surplus waters from the Missouri River Basin to the Great Plains areas of the Southwest for the purposes of irrigation and municipal water supply, flood control, and so forth. That was only a couple of weeks ago and I would not expect that any provision would be made in this bill at this time for this sort of program. However, I rise to mention the bill at this time because I hope that in a future bill we can make a comprehensive study of ways and means to greatly develop our program for utilizing the great water resources of this Nation. Such a course is in my opinion absolutely necessary for our future development. There is not an area of the country that does not have a water problem, and I think we need a much more ambitious program of study in order to develop the resources of the country, in order to provide a backlog of essential and important public works, and in order to meet the requirements of the future. It would be, of course, unwise, since the committee has had no opportunity to study the proposal which I have in mind, to offer an amendment at this time. Moreover, the budget request for investigations by the Bureau of Reclamation has been very drastically curtailed by the committee. So, I do not offer the amendment, but I hope, if I may, to in some measure, shall I say, propagandize the House and the committee toward the viewpoint of a more ambitious study of our water resources for irrigation purposes and otherwise. We have by no means taken adequate and necessary steps to conserve and develop our water resources.

The Clerk read as follows:

Construction and rehabilitation

For construction and rehabilitation of authorized reclamation projects or parts thereof (including power transmission facilities) and for other related activities, as authorized by law, including payments under the act of August 15, 1953 (67 Stat. 592), to remain available until expended, $114,479,700, of which $55,626,197 shall be derived from the reclamation fund: *Provided*, That, during the current fiscal year, not more than $24,000,000 of the funds available under this appropriation heading shall be available for personal services and not more than $800,000 shall be available for travel: *Provided further*, That no part of this appropriation shall be available for other than the completion of field engineering, survey work, and preliminary designs of the Southwest Contra Costa County Water District System and no repayment contract shall be executed or construction begun until plans have been submitted to and approved by the Congress through its legislative and appropriation procedures, after submission of a report to the Congress by the Secretary of the Interior (1) on the cost and feasibility of said project, including the necessary distribution system, and (2) on the rates required to be charged to the ultimate consumers: *Provided further*, That no part of this appropriation shall be used to initiate the construction of transmission facilities within those areas covered by power wheeling service contracts which include provision for service to Federal establishments and preferred customers, except those transmission facilities for which construction funds have been heretofore appropriated, those facilities which are necessary to carry out the terms of such contracts or those facilities for which the Secretary of the Interior finds the wheeling agency is unable or unwilling to provide for the integration of Federal projects or for service to a Federal establishment or preferred customer: *Provided further*, That in order to promote agreement among the States of Nebraska, Wyoming, and Colorado, and to avoid any possible alteration of existing vested water rights, no part of this or of any prior appropriation shall be used for construction or for further commitment for construction of the Glendo unit or any feature thereof, until a definite plan report thereon has been completed, reviewed by the States of Nebraska, Wyoming, and Colorado, and approved by Congress: *Provided further*, That no part of this or prior appropriations shall be used for construction, nor for further commitments to construction of Moorhead Dam and Reservoir, Mont., or any feature thereof until a definite plan report thereon has been completed, reviewed by the States of Wyoming and Montana, and approved by the Congress.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. FERNANDEZ: At the end of page 13, line 24, add a new paragraph, as follows:

"Alamogordo Dam: For construction on the Alamogordo Dam Spillway in New Mexico to be nonreimbursable under appropriate finding by the Secretary of the Interior under section 7 of the Reclamation Project Act of 1939, $300,000."

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the amendment.

Mr. FERNANDEZ. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman from Iowa reserve his point of order so that I may state my views on this item?

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, I must say that it is not authorized by law.

Mr. FERNANDEZ. Will the gentleman reserve his point of order for the time being?

Mr. JENSEN. I reserve the point of order against the amendment, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. FERNANDEZ. Mr. Chairman, the Bureau of Reclamation requested, and the Bureau of the Budget approved, $300,000 toward the completion of the Alamogordo Dam spillway in New Mexico, a flood-control feature of the Bureau of Reclamation dam.

Reading the hearings I gather the very distinct impression that the subcommittee members felt the spillway is necessary and should be constructed, and that they were well disposed to approve it. Indeed, I think it may be said that the administration and everyone concerned feel this work has been too long delayed and is absolutely necessary for protection from flood damages which are likely to occur.

However, in the hearings the question of authorization at the present time arose, and the Solicitor for the Department of the Interior ruled a short time ago that there was no authorization for this appropriation.

I cannot help but disagree with the opinion of the Solicitor, but I have consulted with the Parliamentarian and am advised that in view of the Solicitor's opinion, the Chair would be constrained to rule the amendment which I have proposed would be legislation on an appropriation bill, and that such a provision in the bill would be ruled out of order. Consequently, there is no point in my pressing for the amendment.

However, I hope that before the bill reaches the Senate, the Senate committee will look carefully into the statutes, and I hope they will deem it proper to include this item in the bill.

The dam was authorized by the act of August 11, 1939 (53 Stat. 1414), as a

reclamation dam with authority to make nonreimbursible the amount of the total cost which would be properly allocable to flood control. The dam was constructed, all of the cost was charged to the irrigators and is being paid by them. The only feature of the dam which would be allocable to flood control and therefore nonreimbursable, is the cost of the spillway. Before that was constructed, the war intervened and the completion of the dam by the construction of the spillway was postponed throughout all these years. It is our contention that this portion of the work having been authorized in connection with that reclamation project and not completed, it is still authorized and appropriations may be provided therefor in this bill.

The statute under which the dam was constructed, and under which we contend it should be constructed is the act of August 11, 1939 (53 Stat. 1414, 33 U. S. C. 707), which reads as follows:

SEC. 7. (Alamogordo Dam authorized.) That the Alamogordo Dam and Reservoir on the Pecos River, N. Mex., is hereby authorized and declared to be for the purpose of controlling floods, regulating the flow of the Pecos River, providing for storage and for delivery of stored waters, for the reclamation of lands, and other beneficial uses, and said dam and reservoir shall be used, first, for irrigation; second, for flood control and river regulation; and third, for other purposes. The Chief of Engineers and the Secretary of War are directed to report to the Congress the amount of the total cost of said Alamogordo Dam and Reservoir which is properly allocable to flood control. The appropriation and transfer of such amount from the general fund of the Treasury to the reclamation fund, for credit by reduction of the maximum obligation of the Carlsbad Irrigation district to repay the total cost thereof, is hereby authorized.

I hope the Senate will study the statutes and figure out whether or not we may be able to put it in before the bill is completed.

In view of the circumstances at the moment, however, and since the amendment would be ruled out of order if pressed, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw it.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Mexico to withdraw his amendment?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

No funds appropriated to the Bureau of Reclamation for operation and maintenance, except those derived from advances by water users, shall be used for the particular benefit of lands (a) within the boundaries of an irrigation district, (b) of any member of a water users' organization, or (c) of any individual, when such district, organization, or individual is in arrears for more than 12 months in the payment of charges due under a contract entered into with the United States pursuant to laws administered by the Bureau of Reclamation.

Not to exceed $225,000 may be expended from the appropriation "Construction and rehabilitation" for work by force account on any one project or Missouri Basin unit and then only when such work is unsuitable for contract or no acceptable bid has been received and, other than otherwise provided in this paragraph or as may be necessary to meet local emergencies, not to exceed 12 percent of the construction allotment for any project from the appropriation "Construction and rehabilitation" contained in this act shall be available for construction work by force account.

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. NORRELL. Mr. Chairman, I am advised that there continues to be very serious concern by many citizens of California regarding the effects recently executed contracts with public agency customers will have on the Central Valley project in California. Reports persist that such contracts may have a very damaging affect on the water users of the project.

I am informed that the contract with one major public agency commits the major portion of the project power to this one customer and at a special discount—5 percent—not available to any other customer, Federal, public, or private.

I have been further informed that this rate is available for a 10-year period.

In the Flood Control Act of 1944 the Secretary is authorized "to construct or acquire only such transmission lines and related facilities as may be necessary in order to make the power and energy generated at such projects available in wholesale quantities for sale on fair and reasonable terms to facilities owned by the Federal Government, public bodies, corporations, and privately owned companies."

This provision would indicate that facilities of the Federal Government should have prior or equal rights to power generated at Federal projects. In spite of this, I am informed that a very large Federal Defense Establishment—the Ames Aeronautical Laboratory—does not have assurance of being supplied with Federal power subsequent to 1957 because of the contract with the one large public agency customer. The term of this contract with this public agency customer is for 40 years.

Mr. Chairman, I am not personally familiar with the facts involved in this matter. However, those in authority may desire to look into the existing facts and determine what, if anything, further can or should be done.

The Clerk read as follows:

GEOLOGICAL SURVEY

Surveys, investigations, and research

For expenses necessary for the Geological Survey to perform surveys, investigations, and research covering topography, geology, and the mineral and water resources of the United States, its Territories and possessions; classify lands as to mineral character and water and power resources; give engineering supervision to power permits and Federal Power Commission licenses; enforce departmental regulations applicable to oil, gas, and other mining leases, permits, licenses, and operating contracts; and publish and disseminate data relative to the foregoing activities; $25,362,685 of which $3,800,000 shall be available only for cooperation with States or municipalities for water resources investigations: *Provided*, That no part of this appropriation shall be used to pay more than one-half the cost of any topographic mapping or water resources investigations carried on in cooperation with any State or municipality.

Not to exceed $75,000 of the unexpended balance of the funds appropriated under this heading in the Interior Department Appropriation Act, 1954, is hereby continued available until expended for preparation of plans and specifications for a building or buildings to meet the special needs of the Geological Survey in the metropolitan area of Washington, D. C., subject to the enactment of lease-purchase or other authorizing legislation.

Mr. HILL. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, on February 11, 1954 I appeared as a witness before the subcommittee on appropriations on Interior Department appropriations for 1955, supporting the appropriation for the Colorado-Big Thompson project and in the report on page 1343 you will find my entire testimony, as well as the testimony on page 1417 of J. M. Dille, who is Secretary-Manager of the Northern Colorado Conservancy District. Mr. Dille has been connected with this organization since its inception.

I wish to include in the RECORD excerpts from my testimony, as well as remarks made by the secretary-manager, Mr. Dille:

Mr. HILL. My appearance this afternoon, of course, is concerning the appropriation for the Colorado-Big Thompson project. The figures indicate that it is between 93 percent to 97 percent completed. In other words, we are on our last lap.

I can give you in just a few words what we would like to see this committee do, realizing as I do that the Budget Bureau has recommended, as I recall, $750,000 for this year. But the truth of the matter is, that is just a million dollars short. And, knowing the administration leaders, and this subcommittee, I am fearful that you will write down $750,000 and forget the fact that we are on the last lap, and that about $4 million more will complete the project.

I notice one particular thing that I am proud of in this project: In 1953 we had a very severe drought, but through the fine operation of the Colorado-Big Thompson, thus far completed, we delivered to the eastern slope through the tunnel—and you gentlemen have visited that area and know what I mean by a 13-mile tunnel through the Continental Divide—178,000 acre-feet of water this last season, and it saved the crops in that whole irrigated area, because it furnished us supplementary water for the last irrigation necessary for good cutting of alfalfa hay and beets and potatoes, etc.

So it was fortunate that we had water coming through that tunnel, and the 178,000 acre-feet simply means that water 1 foot deep over that number of acres would be quite a rain. And we are glad the project was so far along.

Mr. JENSEN. I must say, in all fairness and truthfulness, that this committee has always been quite liberal in appropriating funds for a project that has reached the completion stage so nearly as this project has at the present time.

Just what the committee will do, of course, Mr. HILL, we can't say today, but we will certainly give your request a lot of consideration.

Mr. HILL. I might say in closing, Mr. Chairman, that this committee has always been excellent. I have appeared before no committee where I felt I had better reception than before this great committee.

Mr. JENSEN. You have such a convincing manner. If everybody that came before this committee was as convincing as you are, I think we might spend too much money.

Mr. HILL. Thank you for those kind words.

But here is the sticker: You are not saving the taxpayers any money by holding us back because of lack of funds for contracting work, because the sooner we have this finished, the quicker we will start paying the money back.

This last power plant should be finished quickly, and then we will start getting more money immediately. And if we can bring over 300,000 acre-feet of water, you can see what it means in income from the higher taxes that will be collected, both State and National, because of the good crops.

Mr. Dille said on pages 1417 and 1418:

As you know, this is a combined power and irrigation undertaking where the United States retains all the power features and income and the conservancy district obtains the use of the water for supplemental irrigation.

The water diverted from the Colorado River through the Alva B. Adams 13-mile tunnel operates the powerplants on its fall down the eastern slope of the Rocky Mountains and is then stored for irrigation use in the district.

Construction work started in 1938 and has continued through the 16 years as funds have been provided by the Congress.

The five powerplants are now in operation and producing energy which is fed into the interconnected Colorado-Wyoming system of the Bureau of Reclamation, returning revenue to the Treasury.

Under the terms of a temporary arrangement with the Bureau, the district is renting and distributing the water to those parts of the district that can be served by the incomplete distribution system. These rentals are remitted to the United States and are in addition to the future construction payments.

However, under the terms of the repayment contract between the district and the United States, the repayment of the district's share of the construction costs cannot begin until the project is complete and water can be delivered to all parts of the district.

The project is now over 97 percent complete and only about $4 million is necessary for the remaining work.

The last features are the Boulder Creek supply canal and the South Platte supply canal. These features must be completed before we can serve the large farming areas in the Boulder Creek and South Platte River Valleys.

A part of the Boulder Creek Canal is now under construction, but we understand that unless the $750,000 item for the project in the 1955 President's Interior Department budget is considerably increased, the Bureau will not have sufficient funds to complete this unit or to start work on the South Platte Canal.

We respectfully suggest to the committee that they consider whether it will not be sounder economy for the Government to supply the funds to complete the remaining work as soon as possible, permit the repayment to the United States to begin and eliminate the heavy overhead expenses of the Bureau offices in administering an extended small construction program.

Mr. JENSEN. Thank you, Mr. Dille. I must say that Congressman HILL, of Colorado, appeared before the committee a few days ago, and expressed the same wishes that you have expressed, and we went into the matter quite extensively at that time.

I presume that any questions we might ask now, and your answers would be repetitious of the record that has already been made, but you are, of course, backing up the statements made by Mr. HILL, as you will see when you read the record.

The Clerk read as follows:

BUREAU OF MINES

Conservation and development of mineral resources

For expenses necessary for promoting the conservation, exploration, development, production, and utilization of mineral resources, including fuels, in the United States, its Territories, and possessions; developing synthetics and substitutes; producing and distributing helium; and controlling fires in inactive coal deposits on public lands, and on private lands, with the consent of the owner; $12,564,000: *Provided*, That the Secretary is hereby authorized and directed to make suitable arrangements with owners of private property or with a State or its subdivisions for payment of a sum equal to not less than one-half the amount of expenditure to be made for control or extinguishment of fires in inactive coal deposits from funds provided under the authorization of this act except that expenditure of Federal funds for this purpose in any privately owned operating coal mine shall be limited to investigation and supervision.

Mr. HARRISON of Wyoming. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I do this in order to ask the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. JENSEN], the chairman of the subcommittee handling this bill, a question.

I notice that there has been a reduction in the appropriations for the carrying on of research on extracting oil from shale and alumina. I have received several requests from my State of Wyoming asking what effect this will have on the Laramie, Wyo., research plant and whether it will affect its operation in any way. Will it reduce the work the plant does or will personnel be removed from the plant?

Mr. JENSEN. I should like to have the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FENTON] reply to the question because he is chairman of the subcommittee in charge of the Bureau of Mines.

Mr. FENTON. I would say it would not have any effect at all on the operation. As a matter of fact, the reduction in the amount for research is only about $40,000 out of an estimated amount of $476,800 for the whole oil shale problem. As far as the processing is concerned, it is only $119,000 taken out of $1,119,000, leaving $1 million. I understand the Department itself is curtailing to a little extent.

Mr. HARRISON of Wyoming. I understand the committee found from the testimony that the process used at Laramie was approximately 10 years in advance of the process at Rifle.

Mr. FENTON. That is absolutely right.

Mr. HARRISON of Wyoming. It was not the intention of the committee to curtail in any way the operation of the plant at Laramie?

Mr. FENTON. Absolutely not.

Mr. JENSEN. If the gentleman will yield, may I say that from what I understand about the plant at Laramie it has now reached the point where the extraction of oil from shale has advanced further at the Laramie plant than at any other plant in the United States, and that with further exploration, which is in the offing now, it would appear that the Laramie plant will stay out ahead of every other plant in the Nation as far as the economical operation of taking oil from shale is concerned.

Mr. HARRISON of Wyoming. I thank the gentleman.

The Clerk read as follows:

General administrative expenses

For expenses necessary for general administration of the Bureau of Mines, including such expenses in the regional offices, $850,000: *Provided*, That no part of this appropriation shall be used in connection with maintenance of regional offices in which the total expenditure for personal services of employees in administrative positions exceeds one-half the expenditure for such purpose in the fiscal year 1954.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BAILEY: On page 22, line 8, strike out "$850,000" and insert "$1,250,000," and strike the proviso beginning on line 8 down to and including line 12.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Chairman, if the need for economy is as great as the members of the subcommittee would have us believe, then the budget cuts should be distributed equally. We have here a total budget estimate for the fiscal year 1955 of $422 million in round numbers, which was reduced by the committee to the total of $363 million or an overall cut of $58 million. This represents a cut of 14 percent. What makes this even worse is that a large part of the cuts were in general administrative expenses, particularly in the Bureau of Mines where the amount available for the fiscal year 1955 is $450,000 less than the current budget. This is an approximate 35 percent slash compared to the overall cut of 14 percent. When we look at the Bureau of Mines item, which is only one of many activities of the Department of the Interior, we find quite a story, and I might add a punitive approach as indicated by the language of the committee report. I want at this time, Mr. Chairman, to read some of their comments.

They say on page 14 of their report that, "The regionalization of this Bureau, which took place several years ago, has been constantly under question by the committee with respect to its contribution to efficiency and lower administrative costs. Little or no evidence along this line has been forthcoming to date."

May I say that the committee is dealing with a matter here which belongs properly to the Committee on Education and Labor, and if legislation is needed to outline what the Bureau of Mines shall do, that committee could supply that legislation. You are attempting to do here by an appropriation bill what ought to be done, if it should be done, by legislation.

Let me go ahead to read the remainder of the report:

The committee has included language in the bill to provide that not more than half of the total amount of money, including direct appropriations and transferred funds that were used for administrative positions in the regional offices during the fiscal year 1954, shall be available in the current fiscal year for this purpose.

Let me say to the gentleman that we have the largest division of the Bureau of Mines located in my district at Mount Hope, W. Va. The 1st session of the 83d Congress passed a greatly enlarged mine-safety bill which is working very well and which has to be implemented. That is going to call for at least the same, if not an increased, personnel within the regional offices, unless it is the intention of the committee to force the abolition of this regional office completely.

I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FENTON] if he has any explanation to offer as to what the committee is driving at.

Mr. FENTON. Referring to regional offices in your congressional district, I am sure the gentleman does not mean that.

Mr. BAILEY. I mean the district office.

Mr. FENTON. The regional office is in Pittsburgh.

Mr. BAILEY. I mean the district office.

Mr. FENTON. Well, we are not talking about district offices; we are talking about regional offices.

Mr. BAILEY. So it appears to me, Mr. Chairman, that the committee was peeved because of the failure of the Bureau to reduce expenses in personnel in the regional offices. The proviso found on page 22 of H. R. 8680 reads:

Provided, That no part of this appropriation shall be used in connection with maintenance of regional offices in which the total expenditure for personal services of employees in administrative positions exceeds one-half of the expenditure for such purposes in the fiscal year 1954.

If that is not subject to a point of order, it is at least a classical example of a strict limitation designed to punish without justification.

My amendment would not only restore the items of the budget to the figure of $1,250,000 for expenses in the Bureau of Mines—that is, general expenses in the Bureau of Mines—but it would also strike this restrictive proviso which applies in the same paragraph.

I am opposed to the committee idea of enforcing the committee mandate in this amendment, and I trust that my colleagues will join with me in restoring this item and removing this obnoxious provision.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from West Virginia has expired.

Mr. FENTON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment offered by the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. Chairman, the committee has no desire to obstruct the workings of the Bureau of Mines.

Certainly no one can accuse me of being an enemy of the great Bureau of Mines. As I have said many times on the floor, I appreciate the work of the Bureau of Mines. I said yesterday, that during the last couple of years there seems to be some apathy, not only on the part of the Bureau of Mines but the entire Department of the Interior, to bring us information which is required by this subcommittee to enable us to intelligently evaluate the justifications and try to bring out a bill that would not be so complicated.

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

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

Mr. BAILEY. Is the gentleman now saying in so many words that you did this as a move to punish them for not giving you information?

Mr. FENTON. Absolutely not. I am not saying that. What I am saying is that we cannot, throughout this whole bill, properly evaluate the amount of money that should go into the various items. For the past year or two we have tried to get some information regarding the regional office. The gentleman is confused in his own mind on the regional office and the area offices. This does not touch the area offices. We are trying to improve the area offices by taking away from the regional offices the money allotted to the area projects. So you people do not get the amount of money that you should get in the particular office in your district.

Do I make myself clear?

Mr. BAILEY. That clarifies the situation, but what difference is there between the regional office in Pittsburgh and the office at Mount Hope in West Virginia? They are both divisions.

Mr. FENTON. One is regional and the other is area, as I told you before, and the area has nothing to do with this particular item. We are trying to get the regional offices to give us data showing the amount of personnel they have, and the amount of money they are extracting from the other areas.

Mr. BAILEY. Does 50 percent of the personnel service in the regional office at Pittsburgh amount to $450,000?

Mr. FENTON. I may say we are trying to get that estimate from the Bureau of Mines. They have failed to bring it up. We have pleaded with them to give us a report of the survey team, and to this date it has not been forthcoming. I was one of those who did not want to write up this bill until we could get that information. I am not antagonistic to the Bureau. I am its friend, if the gentleman realizes it, and I am trying to get some method of consistency in the Bureau, trying to clear this problem up.

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

Mr. FENTON. Yes; I yield to the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. NEAL. May I ask this question relative to the amount that goes to the extent of this particular division of government: Would the closure of such a large number of mines throughout the various parts of the country have anything to do with the ultimate amount of money that would be necessary to administer this proposition?

Mr. FENTON. What does the gentleman refer to?

Mr. NEAL. The amount of money you are appropriating that goes to pay salaries of mine inspectors, for example.

Mr. FENTON. No. It does not affect the mine inspectors at all.

Mr. Chairman, I think the action of the subcommittee should be upheld until we get the proper information.

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

I would simply like to call the attention of the membership to the items which the Bureau of Mines will now have to administer. The committee's action was simply a reduction of administrative expenses for the Bureau of Mines.

The Bureau of Mines budget, which it requested and upon which the committee acted, for conservation and development of mineral resources is $2,178,180 below the appropriation for fiscal year 1954. Also, the Bureau of Mines this year does not have any construction program. In that regard their budget request is $425,000 below the money appropriated for fiscal year 1954.

The committee has been generous in its allowances for all activities of the Bureau of Mines, including appropriating the entire $5 million as requested in the budget for the health and safety program; however, due to reduction in the other fields of activities in the Bureau of Mines, as shown by their budget presented to the committee, the committee's action was simply an attempt to bring in line the overall administrative expenditures of the Bureau of Mines with the programs being carried on by the Bureau.

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

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

Mr. BAILEY. Does the gentleman think the committee can justify a 35-percent slash in this expense as applied to the Bureau of Mines? That is what it represents. It is a 14 percent overall reduction in the entire budget for the Department of the Interior.

Mr. BUDGE. On yesterday the gentleman from West Virginia was complaining about a cut which did not exist in the health and safety program. I know that if we took what he would call a percentage or meat-ax cut the gentleman would likewise object to that. We are simply attempting to reduce the administrative expenses of the Bureau. We are not attempting to reduce any of the programs of the Bureau. The committee was satisfied that the Bureau could be administered with the funds provided if it would make the savings indicated in the regional offices.

Mr. BAILEY. I would say that a slash of 35 percent is a meat-ax approach.

Mr. BUDGE. By "meat ax" I do not know whether the gentleman refers to the individual appropriation or to the entire bill. I know that the gentleman would object if we had attempted a percentage cut. Actually, the committee's action here is simply to bring the administrative provisions of the budget in line with the programs which the Bureau of Mines has requested. The funds provided are sufficient. The economies which can be made in the regional offices will in no way affect the important programs of the Bureau of Mines.

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

Mr. BUDGE. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Did the gentleman have testimony before his committee upon the effect of some of the experimental programs in reference to oil and natural gas which would follow the cut

in the petroleum and natural gas experimental station's program?

Mr. BUDGE. We did have such testimony. Of course, some of those programs have been cut. That would be another reason why the administrative items could be cut. We do not need as many people to supervise the activities of those actually doing the work when some of the programs have been diminished.

Mr. EDMONDSON. There was comment yesterday from the chairman of the committee on the high salary scale that prevails in this experimental work. Of course, the committee is aware of the fact that very high technical skills are required for the work that is being carried on by the Bureau of Mines in the way of experimental work.

Mr. BUDGE. The subject which the gentleman is discussing would not be involved in the amendment offered by the gentleman from West Virginia because these are purely administrative funds which would have nothing to do with the funds spent on research.

Mr. EDMONDSON. I went into this question of conservation and development because of the gentleman's own reference to it in the remarks he made. The cut which you are imposing here on petroleum and natural gas research is completely out of line with the cuts which have been imposed on coal, liquid fuels, helium, and minerals. Personally, I do not feel the explanation given yesterday in connection with the activities of the Petroleum Administration for defense amply justify the drastic cut which has been imposed in this field of 27¾ percent.

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

Mr. BUDGE. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 additional minute.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Idaho?

There was no objection.

Mr. BUDGE. I would simply like to point out again to the gentleman that the item which he is discussing is not involved in the amendment offered by the gentleman from West Virginia. These are simply the administrative funds. Your committee feels that proper management within the Bureau of Mines will permit the operation of the Bureau as it should be operated in the next fiscal year.

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

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from West Virginia.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. BAILEY) there were—ayes 24, noes 43.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. D'EWART. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word, and ask unanimous consent that I may proceed for 5 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Montana?

There was no objection.

Mr. D'EWART. Mr. Chairman, I am going to address my remarks to page 24, the items in line 2 and line 11 having to do with the National Park Service. It was my intention to offer an amendment to raise these two items but after talking it over with my colleagues I am not going to offer the amendment, but I do want to address some remarks explaining these two items because I believe they should be raised to the amount in the budget.

I notice in reviewing the Interior appropriation bill that the management and protection item of the National Park Service was reduced $750,000 by the committee below the allowance of the Bureau of the Budget, and the amount approved was only $130,450 above that appropriated for 1954. I also notice that under maintenance and rehabilitation the committee reduced the Bureau of the Budget's allowance by $850,000, or $300,000 below that appropriated in 1954. These two items provide the funds necessary to protect both the natural and historic areas that are a part of our national park system, and which are visited and enjoyed by increasing hundreds of thousands of people each year.

I would like to point out that during 1954 fiscal year the National Park Service had 23 percent less man-years of employment than it had in 1941, and that in 1953 over 46 million travelers visited the areas of the national park system as compared with 21 million in 1941. If the recommendations received from the Bureau of the Budget had been approved, the National Park Service would still have had 15 percent less man-years to do the work of maintaining, protecting, and operating the parks than it had in 1941.

I have read much in recent years of the rundown conditions of the national park facilities, and have seen with my own eyes the gradual deterioration of facilities in Yellowstone and Glacier National Parks in my own State of Montana. I believe that the request submitted by the Bureau of the Budget was a very modest one. I notice that the Bureau of the Budget allowance for the National Park Service was $5,385,000 below what this Congress appropriated for this fiscal year. While they cut the National Park Service as a whole by about 16 percent, they at the same time made adjustments between the various items so as to provide for better care of the facilities that they already have. Now the committee comes along and cuts these increased adjustments out and by so doing wipe out the management improvement program which the Bureau of the Budget had in mind.

I have already pointed out that the Bureau of the Budget cut reduced the National Park Service budget by 16 percent, while the overall cut by the Bureau of the Budget below the Interior Department appropriation for funds for 1954 amounted to only 3 percent.

As chairman of the Subcommittee of the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee that handles the National Park Service legislation, I am well acquainted with that organization and with the people that make up that organization. In my opinion, they get every cent's worth out of the money we give them. They are not extravagant. The funds they have do not properly or adequately take care of the facilities which are gradually deteriorating to a point where they are a hazard and a danger to our people who visit the parks. I know that the staff of this organization is greatly overworked, and I know they are greatly concerned over the care of these properties that we have entrusted to them, and the care of the millions of people who visit the parks and historic sites each year.

Another thing that they have done is to try to provide money for these areas through the actual solicitation of funds from outside sources. Money to do work in the parks that belong to all of the people and for which we do not provide the necessary appropriations. I have encouraged them to do this; in fact, Congress has set up a national park trust fund for this very purpose. Furthermore, Secretary Douglas McKay has had a study made of the National Park Service organization and that Service is now in the process of putting that reorganization plan into effect. It is a good program as it puts more money and people right out into the areas to better take care of the properties. However, in order to properly carry out this plan, and rightfully so, there are certain common services for the parks that can be better and more economically handled from a central location, such as regional offices.

I am not asking for an amendment to the appropriation bill at this time, as the time is too short to debate these questions, but I do wish to say that I believe the National Park Service has received too severe a cut, and I most sincerely hope that the Senate will restore the funds requested in the President's budget under the items of "Management and protection," "Maintenance and rehabilitation," and "General administrative expenses," and remove the special limitation placed upon the Department of the Interior and the National Park Service as to how they can spend these funds, and that, if the Senate does so, the House will accept these restored items and changed language in conference.

As I say, Mr. Chairman, I hope that if the Senate sees fit to increase these funds in the appropriation bill, that the committee of conference will agree to it.

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

Mr. D'EWART. I yield to the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. HILL. I just want to say that in our own Rocky Mountain National Park, with the increase we have had in visitors into the park in the last few years, it is absolutely impossible to take care of the park grounds, to police the campsites, and take care of the roads and the gates into the park with the number of employees we are able to have under the present appropriation. Now, if you cut the appropriation down like they are doing in this particular appropriation, there is going to be no way in the Rocky Mountain Park to keep up the facilities. I would like to just mention one thing. We found last year, 1953, that a great number of people were waiting until after 6 p. m. to slip into the park, because after 6 o'clock the gates cannot be

manned because of the lack of manpower.

Mr. D'EWART. I will say to the gentleman that that is true in many of the national parks and that is why we are making this plea today.

Mr. HILL. And, it has also added another thing I would like to mention, and that is the trouble happening in the park by way of law violations that are committed inside of the park. You cannot even take care of the actual criminals, because they too creep into the park in the evening and remain in hiding so it is impossible to properly guard the parks.

Mr. D'EWART. I agree with the gentleman entirely.

Mrs. CHURCH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. D'EWART. I yield to the gentlewoman from Illinois [Mrs. CHURCH].

Mrs. CHURCH. I would like to commend the gentleman for his well-chosen words, and express the hope that the Park Service will be given adequate appropriations to insure safety and service for the entire program. Has the gentleman in mind introducing an amendment to increase the amount?

Mr. D'EWART. No. I consulted with my colleagues, and they advised me not to. But, I express the hope that this appropriation will be raised to the extent of the budget in the Senate and then that the conferees agree to it.

Mrs. CHURCH. I appreciate the gentleman's forebearance. I am sure there would be wholehearted support for the amendment.

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

Mr. D'EWART. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. JENSEN. Did I understand the gentleman to say that we had agreed to agree with the Senate in conference?

Mr. D'EWART. No. I expressed the hope that you would.

Mr. JENSEN. All right.

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

Mr. D'EWART. I yield to the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. ASPINALL. I wish to commend my colleague from Montana for bringing this matter to the attention of the House. I join with him in his desire and hope that certain increases may be made in the Senate which will be agreeable in conference. For the life of me, I do not see how we can continue to take care of an increase in the matter of visitations to our national monuments and national parks and reduce our expenses at the same time. It does not make commonsense. I know from my own knowledge that in areas in my district we are losing money because we are not keeping park personnel on the job at the right time of the day. I thank the gentleman for his courtesy.

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

Mr. D'EWART. I yield to the gentleman from California, a member of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, which has legislative jurisdiction over the national parks.

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. Chairman, I wish to commend the gentleman on his remarks and associate myself with his views with respect to the funds necessary for the National Park Service. I have more national parks and monuments in my district than there are in any other district in the United States. I know that the Park Service has been short of funds and in many cases they have not been able even to maintain the necessary sanitary facilities in the parks for the service of the people. I do hope that adequate funds will be made available for the thousands and thousands of visitors who are using the parks throughout the United States.

Mr. D'EWART. I thank the gentleman.

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

Mr. D'EWART. I yield to the chairman of the subcommittee.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, I am sure the gentleman knows that every member of this committee appreciates the value of the national parks. This committee has been very active in seeing to it that adequate facilities in every park are available for every class of people, people with large families. We have leaned over backward to make those places of recreation and comfort available to the poorer people of America.

Let me read just what we have done in the past few years for the national parks, since so much has been said about them.

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

Mr. D'EWART. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for an additional 5 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Montana?

There was no objection.

Mr. JENSEN. After all, there are times when the committee must defend itself. This is one of those times. I appreciate the great interest that the gentleman from Montana [Mr. D'EWART] has in the parks, and in every other item in the bill. But after all, here are the facts and they must be brought out at this time in all fairness to the committee and to the Congress.

Appropriations for management and protection of the national parks and monuments have been steadily increased from approximately $2,500,000 in 1945 to approximately $9 million in 1954.

Appropriations for maintenance and rehabilitation of physical facilities have steadily increased from approximately $1,500,000 in 1945 to approximately $8 million in 1954.

Appropriations for construction of new roads and trails and parkway buildings and utilities varied in magnitude from $11 to $17 million between 1950 and 1954.

Mr. D'EWART. Mr. Chairman, I should like to say to the gentleman that those figures are correct but they give the wrong impression. At that time, 1945, we were at war and we were not appropriating funds for parks to the extent we should have during those years. You compare that war year when recreation appropriations were not made to a year like 1953 when people visited the parks by the millions. There were 46 million people who visited the parks in 1953 and it is hardly fair to make a comparison with a year when funds were not made available because of the war. Also in those times there were funds made available to other agencies that were used for maintenance in one way or another that are not available to the Park Service now. In order to make a fair comparison, we should include those funds made available to other agencies with those used in the parks.

Mr. JENSEN. In order to justify the action of the committee, it must be recognized that we are today spending annually over $40 billion for preparations for defense; that is something else to consider. All of us would like to spend more money for the parks; of course we would. We would like to spend more money for the development of our national resources, our national monuments, the beauty spots and the great places that we have in this country that should be preserved for posterity, for the benefit of the people, and for the enjoyment of the people. But I know the gentleman from Montana is one of the most economy-minded Members of Congress. I also realize and appreciate the fact that he has a great interest in the national parks. After all, however, I must defend the action of the committee by making the statements I have.

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

Mr. D'EWART. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Another point I think the gentleman could have added was that since 1945 we have had inflation. That is what makes more dollars required.

A point was made here earlier in the day that the only way we can get money for parks is through appropriated funds. All the vast amount of money that is collected through fees in these parks goes into the general Treasury. The only way we can relieve the congested situation in the parks, that is very bad, in my opinion, is by getting more money appropriated. I hope those on the other side of the Capitol will listen to our plea. This is the most impersonal criticism that a man can make. There is nothing we get out of it individually. We want this for the people of America. They are entitled to it, we believe.

Mr. JENSEN. We have since 1941 increased appropriations for national parks over 300 percent, while the revenues have increased only about 100 percent. Maybe we had better try to get some more revenues out of these parks from the people that can afford to pay.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. There have been two reductions, one below what the President requested. The Budget Bureau cut that down by several million dollars. Then there was another $2,500,000 on top of that. It is obvious that this is not enough money to run the parks adequately, according to the testimony of the park directors, whom I follow.

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

Mr. D'EWART. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. ENGLE. May I make the observation that any of the war years is not a fair standard to apply in connection with

the appropriations received by the Park Service. Nobody could travel during the war years. Everything was at a standstill during those years. As a matter of fact, the facilities in the parks then deteriorated and almost fell to pieces. So using 1941 and 1942 would not seem to me to be a fair standard of comparison as to what an adequate appropriation for the Park Service should be during these years since the war when people are back on the roads and traveling again.

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Charman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. D'EWART. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. PELLY. Can the gentleman tell me how much we spend on ski lifts and improving resorts in foreign lands such as Austria and Italy, while our own parks are being neglected?

Mr. D'EWART. I wish I could, but I do not have the figures.

The Clerk read as follows:

Administrative provisions

Appropriations and funds available to the Bureau of Mines may be expended for providing transportation services in isolated areas for employees, student dependents of employees, and other pupils, and such activities may be financed under cooperative arrangements; temporary and emergency contracts for personal services and employment of persons without regard to civil-service regulations as required in the conduct of programs for the control of fires in inactive coal deposits and flood prevention in anthracite mines; purchase and bestowal of certificates and trophies in connection with mine rescue and first-aid work: *Provided*, That the Secretary is authorized to accept lands, buildings, equipment, and other contributions from public and private sources and to prosecute projects in cooperation with other agencies, Federal, State, or private: *Provided further*, That the sums made available for the current fiscal year to the Departments of the Army, Navy, and Air Force for the acquisition of helium from the Bureau of Mines shall be transferred to the Bureau of Mines, and said sums, together with all other payments to the Bureau of Mines for helium, shall be credited to the special helium production fund, established pursuant to the act of March 3, 1925, as amended (50 U. S. C. 164 (c)): *Provided further*, That the Bureau of Mines is authorized, during the current fiscal year, to sell directly or through any Government agency, including corporations, any metal or mineral product that may be manufactured in pilot plants operated by the Bureau of Mines, and the proceeds of such sales shall be covered into the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I rise to commend the committee and particularly our distinguished colleague from Iowa, the chairman of the subcommittee which formulated the bill that is before us. The budget estimate for the Interior Department covered a wide range of activities many of which have highly technical and complicated backgrounds. The subcommittee made very careful review and examination of those many complicated subjects.

I believe, however, that the committee may not have been fully informed on some of the items that have come up for close attention before the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs of which I am chairman. I refer to the item on "Operation and maintenance, Bureau of Reclamation," particularly that portion of the item for operation and maintenance of irrigation and water-supply facilities. The committee report on the bill, page 11, states that the budget estimate of $23,154,000 is reduced to $19 million as a means of forcing greater energy on the part of the Bureau of Reclamation in transferring projects to water users' organizations for operation and maintenance. Presumably, the reduction of $4,154,000 will be applied proportionately between irrigation and power resulting in somewhat more than $1,200,000 reduction in the funds available for operation and maintenance of irrigation and water-supply facilities, with the balance applied to power operations.

As an individual Member, and on behalf of the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee, of which I am chairman, I am wholeheartedly in accord with the gentleman from Iowa in bringing about greater and more rapid transfer of projects to water users. That is a matter which my committee also has looked into. Some further progress still is needed, but the record of the Bureau already is very good on that score. Of 75 projects in the operating stage, 64 projects will have been transferred to water users by the end of this year. Those transfer actions are going on right now, two of them having been completed during the past winter, and one is scheduled for this month.

I feel that the Bureau of Reclamation is evidencing sincere effort in carrying out the congressional policy of leaving local matters such as operation and maintenance to the local water user organizations. There are a very few cases in which water users are not yet prepared or willing to assume their responsibilities for project works. Those few cases are characterized by peculiar local conditions, such as, for example, on the Rio Grande project in New Mexico and Texas where the irrigation canals are astride the State boundary, making it impossible for an irrigation district to operate in two different States. In that case only the Federal Bureau of Reclamation is in a position to handle water across the State line.

Another special case is the main canals of the Central Valley project in California. Those canals carry and deliver water to about 30 different irrigation districts strung along some 300 or 400 miles. Ultimately, I am sure, that group of irrigation districts will work out their own organization qualified to take on the job of operating the big canals. At the present time, however, because of the many engineering and legal complications no such organization of the interested irrigation districts exists to do the job. I think that we need not be too concerned about that particular case, however, because, while the Bureau of Reclamation does that work, it is no burden on the Federal Treasury. All of the cost of operation and maintenance on the two projects that I have just mentioned are actually paid by the water users benefited.

Water charges for the Central Valley project in fiscal year 1955 are estimated to yield over $4½ million in comparison with less than $2 million which will be spent by the Government for their operation. The few other cases in which the Bureau of Reclamation continues operation and maintenance of irrigation and water supply facilities are similar to those I have discussed. For that reason, I believe it would be unfortunate to reduce the appropriation available to carry on this important work. Reduction in funds would not save the Government money because the water users pay the bill during the same year in which the expenditure is made. Reduction of funds would, however, be a very costly economy because neglect of annual maintenance inevitably will lead to serious deterioration of the facilities and the necessity for even more costly repair work at an early date in the future.

The funds requested for power operation and maintenance for fiscal year 1955 are for the continued operation and maintenance of existing facilities, the Alcova Powerplant going into initial service in 1955, and the first full year operation of Canyon Ferry, Pole Hill, and Flatiron Powerplants. Wheeling service alone amounts to $2,341,600, an increase of $1,584,949 over fiscal year 1954 to service executed contracts. The budget contains $1,436,450 for purchase power, based on an average water year. During the past years, the Bureau has consistently reduced its costs, and a reduction in the appropriation of this amount would force a diminishment of service and deferment of maintenance requiring greater sums to overcome this situation in future years.

Mr. BERRY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I commend the committee for including in this bill funds for the improvement of Mount Rushmore National Park. This great shrine is one of the most inspirational spots in America. Since this appropriation will be repaid to the Treasury of the United States, it is a good investment.

The development program has been envisioned by the Mount Rushmore National Memorial Society, working with the National Park Service. The Mount Rushmore National Memorial Society is a nonprofit corporation whose efforts have been largely responsible for the giant carvings on the mountainside.

When the carvings were first completed, the facilities at the base of the mountain were quite ample to accommodate the crowds but the visitors who come to Mount Rushmore have increased each year, until last year nearly a million people came to view this magnificent shrine. As a matter of fact, President Eisenhower himself was one of the visitors at this shrine last year.

Included in the construction plan is an amphitheater, trails, walks, and overlooks, a service road, a concession building, and a dormitory. It is estimated that the concession building will cost approximately $180,000. The dormitory, which will be used for those who are employed in the concession business, will cost approximately $180,000. When the amphitheater is constructed, it will

cost approximately $125,000. The trails, walks, and overlooks will run approximately $40,000.

There are other costs, including the reconditioning of the sculptor's studio, which at the present time is being used for the concession. This will cost approximately $25,000. Extension of utilities, a service road, and so forth, will add to the cost.

The actual total construction will probably run in excess of $569,000. The Rushmore National Memorial Society will contribute $50,000 directly from the funds of the society, the balance of $19,000 over and above that advanced by appropriation, will likewise be raised by the society.

The total amount of $500,000 which is contemplated through the appropriation of $250,000 this year and a similar appropriation next year will be returned to the Treasury over a 20-year period. This money will be raised by the society through its concession contract. It is expected that the concession will yield well in excess of $25,000 a year since that is approximately the amount which was produced during the past season when the facilities were so badly crowded that it was impossible to give the kind of service the public needed and the society and the park service would like to give.

This entire development program is the result of the cooperation between the National Park Service, the Mount Rushmore National Memorial Society, and friends of this great shrine in an effort to accommodate the increasing numbers of visitors who come each year, and to provide facilities for holding patriotic gatherings at the base of the great mountain memorial.

The Clerk read as follows:

Maintenance and rehabilitation of physical facilities

For expenses necessary for the operation, mainenance, and rehabilitation of roads (including furnishing special road maintenance service to defense trucking permittees on a reimbursable basis), trails, buildings, utilities, and other physical facilities essential to the operation of areas administered pursuant to law by the National Park Service, $8 million: *Provided*, That none of the funds herein appropriated shall be used for maintenance of roads, other than national parkways, outside the boundaries of national parks and monuments.

Mr. D'EWART. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the language on page 24, starting with the word "*Provided*," on line 11 and ending on line 14.

Mr. Chairman, I do this regretfully because I am in accord with the objective of the committee in putting the language in, which is to make the States take care of and operate and maintain the roads outside of the park. But in Montana we have two instances where there will be access roads to national parks which will be left totally without maintenance, and which will be used by a great many people. One of them is the road from Red Lodge to the Cook City entrance to Yellowstone National Park, that portion of it in Wyoming. This language would prevent the use of funds for the maintenance of that road. It is a road used by hundreds of thousands of people. There will be no maintenance on it, which will make it exceedingly dangerous. The other road is in Glacier Park which connects the Canadian National Park with our Glacier National Park. If this language is left in the bill no funds will be available for the maintenance of the roads; therefore, I make the point of order that the language is contrary to existing law found in Public Law 230, 83d Congress, 1st session.

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

Mr. D'EWART. I yield.

Mr. BUDGE. Mr. Chairman, I regret that the gentleman from Montana has seen fit to make this point of order. I see no justification for the Federal Government being called upon to maintain the access roads which are located outside the boundaries of the national parks, particularly when some of the States are charging a sales tax on sales made inside the boundaries of the park, and thereby deriving a very substantial revenue to the State. For that reason, I feel the language should remain in the bill. It was put in the bill for the purpose of making the States maintain the roads which are outside the boundaries of the national parks. Again, as I say, I regret that the gentleman from Montana has seen fit to make the point of order against this language.

Mr. D'EWART. Mr. Chairman, I agree with the objectives of the committee, but I am compelled to insist upon the point of order.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, may I be heard on the point of order?

Mr. Chairman, the language which appears on page 24 which the gentleman from Montana seeks to strike out is purely a limitation upon this appropriation bill. It is purely and simply a limitation of an appropriation.

Mr. BUDGE. Mr. Chairman, I desire to be heard on the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman may proceed.

Mr. BUDGE. Mr. Chairman, it occurs to me that there is probably no statutory authority for the expenditure of Federal funds outside of the limits of the national parks. If there is no such statutory authority, the language would not be legislation on an appropriation bill, and the point of order would not lie.

Mr. D'EWART. Mr. Chairman, I will quote the law—Public Law 230, 83d Congress, 1st session:

SEC. 7. Wherein such rights-of-way as may be necessary to construct, improve, and maintain roads within the authorized boundaries of any area of said national park system and miscellaneous areas, and acquisition of lands and interest in lands adjacent to such rights-of-way, when deemed necessary by the Secretary to provide adequate protection—

And so forth.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, may I be heard?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will be glad to hear the gentleman.

Mr. JENSEN. Even though such expenditures are authorized by law, the fact still remains that you can provide a limitation on an appropriation bill, and I so contend.

Mr. BUDGE. Mr. Chairman, I should like to be heard further briefly on the point of order.

I have examined the provisions of Public Law 230, section 7, as read by the gentleman from Montana [Mr. D'EWART]. I do not interpret that language to be an authorization for the spending of Federal funds to maintain highways outside of the National Park Service. I do not think the language is subject to that construction.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. HOEVEN). The Chair is ready to rule. The Chair has carefully studied the point of order submitted by the gentleman from Montana [Mr. D'EWART]. The Congress, although it is authorized to make appropriations, can also deny the use of such appropriations by proper limitations.

The Chair feels that this is a limitation and not legislation upon an appropriation bill, and therefore overrules the point of order.

The Clerk read as follows:

Construction

For construction and improvement, without regard to the act of August 24, 1912, as amended (16 U. S. C. 451), of roads, trails, parkways, buildings, utilities, and other physical facilities; and the acquisition of lands, interests therein, improvements, and water rights; to remain available until expended, $8,056,099.

Mr. FERNANDEZ. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment which is at the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. FERNANDEZ: On page 24, line 21, strike out "$8,056,099" and insert "$8,556,099 and, in addition, the Secretary is hereby authorized to incur obligations and enter into contracts, not exceeding $950,000, to complete the construction of a public-use building and appurtenant facilities in Carlsbad Cavern National Park, N. Mex."

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the amendment: That it is legislation on an appropriation bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from New Mexico desire to be heard?

Mr. FERNANDEZ. I do, Mr. Chairman.

The first part of the amendment is to increase an appropriation which is made in this bill for the purpose of construction, which is clearly authorized by law, and the last part of the amendment is merely to give authorization to enter into contracts to finish construction, with appropriations to be made at a later time instead of having the appropriation for the full amount made now. The House often grants contract authority to contract ahead of appropriations. These buildings which are going to be built, and must be built sooner or later, may be built only in a period of 2 years, since it will be late before they can start in fiscal 1955, but bids for construction should be let for the full construction, even though the balance will not be expended until the following fiscal year. That is the only economic, businesslike way of doing it. So I say the amendment certainly is in order.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is ready to rule.

The Chair calls the attention of the gentleman from New Mexico to the following language in his proposed amendment: "and, in addition, the Secretary is hereby authorized to incur obligations and enter into contracts, not exceeding $950,000, to complete the construction of a public use building and appurtenant facilities in Carlsbad Caverns National Park, N. Mex.," which is clearly legislation upon an appropriation bill.

The Chair sustains the point of order.

Mr. FERNANDEZ. I offer a further amendment, Mr. Chairman.

I ask that the Clerk read the amendment without the authorizing language.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. FERNANDEZ: On page 24, line 21, strike out "$8,056,099" and insert "$8,556,099."

Mr. FERNANDEZ. Mr. Chairman, the purpose of the amendment is to restore a part of the appropriation for Carlsbad Caverns which was reduced by the committee from $1,500,000 to $50,000, plus $125,000 for roads.

The amendment restores only that amount of money which will be expended in this coming year if the construction is to go forward.

Awhile ago I tried to give as best I could a description of what lies under this ground. On top of this ground when these caverns were made a national park there were no elevators; there was a ravine, and on the north side of the ravine, as you will see in this map, there was a natural entrance. At that natural entrance some buildings were built by the CCC back in the thirties for quarters, a little over a dozen buildings, and a small dormitory. No public service buildings have been built there for offices because they always realized that eventually the main offices should be constructed where the elevators would be constructed, when the money was made available, across the ravine on the other side. So they have hobbled along with these buildings as best they could. Out of the dormitory they made a little office, but it is so small there is hardly room to hang your hat. They have a little building that is used as a ticket office. Last year there was an item authorized by the Bureau of the Budget for both elevators and public buildings, but it was reduced only to the elevators which are under construction and will be completed this coming winter or next spring. When completed it will be necessary to build new office buildings on the other side of the ravine, because the buildings that are now available are totally inadequate. They were inadequate in the beginning when they had 90,000 visitors a year, but they are totally inadequate now when they have over half a million visitors. When the new elevators are in operation the number of visitors will jump to 800,000 or a million.

The new building to be built across the ravine will contain a lobby accommodating 400 people and a small place for a concessionnaire; and, by the way, the Federal Government gets a share of the concessionnaire's revenues; it will also provide housing for the elevators. There will be a small auditorium, seating about 400 visitors, where lectures which are now given at the natural entrance will be given to the groups going down on the elevators. There will be a nursery for small children and aged people who have to wait the 4 or 5 hours when the rest of the family are in the caverns. They cannot sit out in the broiling sun, in the wind, or in the rain. Toilet facilities, of course, have to be provided. You must realize that on days like the Fourth of July and Labor Day as many as 7,000 or 8,000 visitors go in in 1 day, in groups as large as 1,000 or 1,200. Adequate facilities can operate more economically and in a more businesslike way, all in one operation and under one contract, instead of piecemeal.

That is the reason I had contract authorization in my original amendment for the balance of $950,000, which went out on a point of order. Since that was the case, we should have at least the amount necessary for the first phase of the construction which can be done in the first year of construction.

In time it is going to be necessary to open the caverns at night. In order to get to the natural entrance or to the ticket office presently used or to the office across the ravine, such as it is, they would have to walk almost a quarter of a mile. When you come out of that gorgeous cavern we do not want them to come out and find just a barren place there, and if it is raining have to rush a quarter of a mile to the ticket office or to where their cars are. The cars should be parked right where the elevators are, where the buildings are going to be built as called for by the plans. If a wind is blowing, and it blows often over there, it is a miserable thing for the people to come out in daytime hanging onto their hats, and at nighttime it would be worse.

Mr. Chairman, the sensible, the economical, the businesslike way to do it is to have this money available ready for the construction of these buildings when the elevators have been completed. As long as I am here as a Member of Congress I shall insist that this national park, which has netted a profit of $3 million to the Federal Government over and above all expenditures, be treated in a proper manner and given the right kind of facilities.

Mr. Chairman, under permission given earlier by the House in regular session, I insert in the RECORD a tabulation showing total receipts, total expenditures, and the number of visitors during the decade 1943 to and including 1953:

U. S. Department of the Interior, National Park Service—Comparative statement of obligations and revenues, Carlsbad Caverns National Park, fiscal years 1923–53, inclusive

Fiscal year	Obligations			Revenues			Revenues in excess of expenditures
	APM [1]	Developments	Total	Fees, etc.	Federal taxes	Total	
1923							
1924							
1925	$5,000		$5,000				−$5,000
1926	25,000		25,000	$3,718		$3,718	−21,282
1927	14,664	$7,700	22,364	32,628		32,628	10,264
1928	28,493	2,327	30,820	55,682		55,682	24,862
1929	63,490		63,490	84,983		84,983	21,493
1930	103,271		103,271	136,242		136,242	32,971
1931	124,221	3,016	127,237	143,780		143,780	16,543
1932	130,163	4,733	134,896	113,677		113,677	−21,219
1933	135,688	1,242	136,930	77,237		77,237	−59,693
1934	49,356	53,966	103,322	89,731		89,731	−13,591
1935	51,411	221,257	272,668	131,461		131,461	−141,207
1936	62,773	106,652	169,425	173,405		173,405	3,980
1937	62,634	26,010	88,644	238,706		238,706	150,062
1938	99,481	8,409	107,890	304,327		304,327	196,437
1939	92,030	49,738	141,768	273,856		273,856	132,088
1940	99,856	74,448	174,304	322,019		322,019	147,715
1941	99,605	53,941	153,546	352,949		352,949	199,403
1942	104,378	29,287	133,665	309,122	[2] $15,864	324,986	191,321
1943	90,151	2,184	92,335	119,314	[2] 11,436	130,750	38,415
1944	89,171	2,626	91,797	105,007	[2] 10,122	115,129	23,332
1945	94,056		94,056	136,757	[2] 12,470	149,227	55,171
1946	102,869	738	103,607	289,683	[2] 55,014	344,697	241,090
1947	147,434	4,483	151,917	407,590	[2] 83,119	490,709	338,792
1948	171,664	8,200	179,864	442,683	[2] 92,388	535,071	355,207
1949	200,396	18,258	218,654	441,906	94,480	536,386	317,732
1950	213,499	15,459	228,958	428,708	89,764	518,472	289,514
1951	230,665	77,120	307,785	397,709	82,399	480,108	172,323
1952	227,254	3,789	231,043	458,309	83,139	541,448	310,405
1953	263,953		263,953	406,759	82,035	488,794	224,841
Total	3,182,626	775,583	3,958,209	6,477,948	712,230	7,190,178	

Total net profit from fees, etc. $2,519,739
Total net revenue from Federal taxes 712,230
Total net revenue to Federal Government 3,231,969

[1] Administration, protection, and maintenance costs.
[2] Estimated on the basis of 20 percent of admission fees, as the information is not available in the Washington office.

Number of visitors Carlsbad Caverns National Park, 1943 to 1953

Calendar year:	Number
1943	89,126
1944	122,467
1945	193,237
1946	380,465
1947	405,266
1948	435,481
1949	431,187
1950	467,283
1951	493,618
1952	531,751
1953	510,318
Total	4,060,199

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment offered by the gentleman from New Mexico.

Mr. Chairman, it would be a wonderful thing if we had a few hundred million dollars or a billion dollars to spend for such things as the Carlsbad Caverns, as the gentleman would like to have us do. It so happens that we have places to spend that money that are much more important.

I may say that the committee saw fit to appropriate more money than the budget allowed for irrigation, reclamation, and flood-control in New Mexico. We have appropriated $50,000 for a shelter. You can build a pretty good shelter house for $50,000 if they do not spend it all on plans and specifications.

Mr. Chairman, I have visited the Carlsbad Caverns. I have been out there twice. It is a wonderful place and it is also true that it makes money. It is about the only national monument in this country that does make money. But what is wrong with saving a little of that money that we make from Carlsbad Caverns to kind of help along at other places where we need it so badly?

The gentleman referred to weather. Why, bless your heart, that is one reason we appropriated more money for irrigation in the State of New Mexico. In my humble opinion, if the gentleman would spend more time in an effort to get more money for irrigation in his State he would be spending his time to better advantage rather than trying to build buildings out at Carlsbad Caverns that we can get along without.

That is a very dry climate out there. You do not have to build a lot of facilities to take care of the people and to keep them from getting wet. They can sit in their automobiles, and all of them come in automobiles. They can sit in their automobiles within a city block from the point where you go down into Mother Earth at Carlsbad Caverns. You do not have to wait very long because the tour begins on the hour, as I remember. Now, what is so important about building a building that costs $1.5 million when we have got so many other places to spend this money? I am satisfied that 99 percent of the American people would say, "Yes, I know a lot of places where we can spend $1.5 million to much better advantage than to build this great, wonderful castle on top of Carlsbad Caverns."

Mr. DEMPSEY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I want to concur in what the gentleman from New Mexico has told you. The Carlsbad Caverns belong to the United States Government. It is a national park. Ordinarily, we create a national park for recreational purposes which require a large surface area. The caverns are no such park although they provide both education and recreation. They are underground and make the collection of a proper admission charge possible. There is this to be said about the Carlsbad Caverns: From the day the Federal Government took them over until today there has not been one dime of taxpayers' money put into them that has not been taken out, with interest. Everything has been paid for through collection of the admission fee. Furthermore, during the time we have had a 20 percent Federal tax on admissions the Government has received in excess of $700,000 from that tax alone.

Now, I would not disagree very much with our distinguished chairman of the Department of the Interior Subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations. I do not think there is a more fair man in the Congress of the United States. I do not think we have a better committee than that which he heads. The members have to consider every park in the United States, and probably the money available is insufficient to cover the needs of all. I recognize that, too. But, I do say this is an investment that returns—I will not use the words "dividends," because that is an offensive word right not—but it does return to the Government the investment plus a profit. We have only a few tours through the Caverns during the day. I would not attempt to describe the beauties of the caverns, because no one's words can do that. Interest in the caverns is increasing all the time. More people visit them every year.

The figures suggested to the committee do not come from anybody in New Mexico. The figures submitted to you are submitted as an estimate by the National Park Service to the Director of the Budget. I assume that it was somewhat cut there. But, the amount of $1.5 million was recommended by the Director of the Budget, and I am quite sure he is not wasing any money in these times.

Mr. Chairman, I sincerely trust that the committee will do something to bring about a situation where we can take care of thousands of the people who go to the Carlsbad Caverns in New Mexico and that they are at least made comfortable. It is true that there is not very much on the surface to view in the way of grandeur, but when people come up there in bad or hot weather, I think they should have facilities for cover and protection. People who pay to see a World Wonder that actually belongs to them are entitled to that much at least.

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

Mr. DEMPSEY. I yield to the gentleman from New Mexico.

Mr. FERNANDEZ. Will the gentleman point out that before they go into the caverns they have to wait for the start of one of the four trips scheduled daily? Sometimes there are 2,000, 3,000, 4,000, 5,000 people who have to wait in the lobby until these groups are formed. Where the elevators are now being built, they have only a little room which can take care of only about 100 people. There is simply no place for them to wait except out in the broiling sun. It is not fair to the visitors who come to Carlsbad Caverns to be required to do that. This is no luxury that is being requested. This is a facility absolutely necessary for properly carrying on the operations of the Caverns.

Mr. DEMPSEY. Mr. Chairman, I agree with the gentleman. A large group of visitors will assemble. They are not permitted to go through the caverns without guides. There are park rangers ahead and in back, in order to protect the visitors in the caverns, because it is quite easy to get lost. But we do need protection for the people who have to wait until the tour starts. It is their money that is making Carlsbad Caverns a paying proposition, of which this Government has far too few.

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

The committee last year appropriated very substantial sums for the Carlsbad Caverns, for what we thought were the most essential, the highest priority items for the Carlsbad Caverns. The particular appropriation item now before us was proposed to us by the National Park Service in a manner which was not convincing to any of the members of the committee. Particularly, we did not see fit to appropriate funds to build and operate kennels to house dogs while the people went down into the caverns. There is only so much money to spread around through the large national park system. We are already short of personnel, as has been pointed out here. I do not feel this appropriation, as requested in the amendment offered by the gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. FERNANDEZ] is justified when we take into consideration the overall picture of the Park Service.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. FERNANDEZ].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. FERNANDEZ) there were—ayes 42, noes, 52.

Mr. FERNANDEZ. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were refused.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. HAGEN of California. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. HAGEN of California: On page 24, line 21, after "expended", strike out "$8,056,099" and insert "$9,000,000."

Mr. HAGEN of California. Mr. Chairman, I offer this amendment to H. R. 8680 to increase the amount granted the Park Service for construction and improvement of various physical facilities from $8,056,000 to the total sum of $9 million. I am hopeful that you will join with me in this amendment.

It can be said without fear of contradiction that the Park Service has suffered a cruel blow in the recommendations of the committee not only on this item but with respect to all items of appropriation necessary to maintaining its function as the manager of our national parks and the best provider of mass entertainment and recreation for our millions of people who seek these values in outdoor surroundings.

If I am advised correctly the Secretary of the Interior admitted that his budget requests were not adequate to secure first-class park operation in the face of an anticipated gain in public use. In the face of this admission the committee has reduced his miserly requests.

The truth of the matter is that the Park and Forest Services which provide

essential recreation have long been the stepchildren of the Congress budgetwise. There has been a constantly growing gap between need and money appropriations. Not only have the agencies charged with administration of our forests and parks been handicapped in providing the new facilities for human comfort necessitated by increasing use; they have not even been permitted sufficient funds to adequately maintain existing facilities or to replace wornout facilities.

Woodsmen and conservationists report to me that mountain trails necessary to the best possible use of our wonderful back country by people of all sexes and ages have deteriorated to the point that many are hazardous and unusable. Public campgrounds have inadequate water, sewage and toilet facilities. In Sequoia National Park which is within my district there is an urgent need for replacement of outmoded toilet facilities with modern sanitary toilets. Much trail work needs to be done. Campgrounds need to be generally rehabilitated. These are examples of the kind of work which can and should be done with this extra money.

Have no fear that the money is not needed. No one has ever accused the Park Service of dishonesty or wasteful use of funds. I am certain that a total appropriation of $9 million would only be a small partial step toward completion of the work which needs to be done.

We cannot long afford to continue our neglect of vital natural resources in any field and this is particularly true of our parks which provide a welcome relief from the noise and confusion which are inherent in the metropolitan living of which most of our people are a part.

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

Mr. Chairman, it is difficult for me to understand from the statement made by the gentleman from California for just what purpose this almost a million dollar increase would be used. I call attention to the fact that the amendment offered by the gentleman from California is $400,000 ir. excess of the budget request. The committee has no means of justifying acceptance of such an amendment. We have no testimony before the committee as to where the funds would be expended that would be covered by this almost $1 million raise in this item. Therefore, I must object to the adoption of the amendment.

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

Mr BUDGE. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania

Mr. SAYLOR. If the Committee is looking for any reason to justify the need for this money, I might call attention to the fact that in one national park, Yellowstone National Park, the facilities were built and designed for 250,000 visitors a year. Last year Yellowstone National Park had almost 2 million visitors. Certainly the 46,000,000 American citizens who made use of our national parks in 1953 caused the facilities which exist to be over-extended. There is no doubt in my mind that if this fund is made available to the National Park Service they will be able to use it adequately not only for the betterment of existing facilities but to expand them to meet the ever-increasing demand that is being made on our national parks.

Mr. BUDGE. When the gentleman addresses himself to the facilities in Yellowstone National Park, I rather believe he is speaking of the facilities which are furnished by the concessionnaires, something over which this Committee has no control. I do not agree with the gentleman from Pennsylvania that the committee should simply give the National Park Service an additional $1 million and say, "You spend it where you see fit." That is somewhat contrary to the procedure here in the Congress where each department is asked to specifically justify expenditures which the department wants to make. We have no requests before the committee for the expenditure of this $1 million. We have no means of knowing where it would be expended. I would think we would be derelict in our duty as members of the Committee on Appropriations if we did not attempt to resist the adoption of such an amendment.

I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. HAGEN of California. By way of preface to my question, I may say that at Sequoia National Park, they have, and I trust that I may be pardoned in using this expression, a great many of these Chic Sale's type of latrine, which are definite health hazards and which should be replaced. Is it not a fact that the Secretary of the Interior, either before your committee or the committee of the other body, admitted that the funds asked in his budget were not adequate to take care of capital investment needs and ordinary maintenance needs of the park system?

Mr. BUDGE. As to the latter question, I do not recall that that representation was made to this committee. However, the situation which the gentleman refers to in the Sequoia National Park would certainly not account for $1 million which he seeks to place in this bill. Every department comes in with a statement that it cannot get along with the funds which it has. I know the Appropriations Committee would be very sympathetic to the gentleman from California and to the Park Service, if they come before the committee and tell us for what purpose they need the money and if we can justify it in our own minds, I know the sympathies of the committee would be with the Park Service. However, I think we simply cannot say, "Here is a million dollars, let the Park Service spend it as they see fit."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. HAGEN].

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to return to line 2, on page 24, for the purpose of offering a small amendment.

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

There was no objection.

The paragraph referred to is as follows:

NATIONAL PARK SERVICE

Management and protection

For expenses necessary for the management and protection of the areas and facilities administered by the National Park Service, including protection of lands in process of condemnation; and for plans, investigations, and studies of the recreational resources (exclusive of preparation of detail plans and working drawings) and archaeological values in river basins of the United States (except the Missouri River Basin), $9,000,000.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BONNER: On line 3, page 24, strike out "$9,000,000" and insert "$9,055,000."

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Chairman, I hesitated to ask for this permission of the splendid gentleman who has charge of this bill because I appreciate the great strain he is under and the handicap that he has suffered. We are all delighted to see him back on the floor of the House carrying on as usual, and showing his strong stalwart determination to bring about economy and efficiency in the departments of Government.

However, Mr. Chairman, I am sure that the little matter which is the subject of my amendment was merely an oversight on his part. In the State of North Carolina, we have given a million dollars, and certain foundations have matched that amount of money, to purchase property which is to be included in the national seashore park. It is the only area of its kind in the United States. It has 75 miles of ocean front for recreational purposes. Unless this park is created, the average citizen in the United States in time to come would not be able to get to salt water.

The Federal Government has invested no money at all. In this bill there is asked $110,000 for management and protection. You know there is a new business grown up in America. It is known as the driftwood business. In this area there are hundreds of old wrecks, ships that came ashore, sailing vessels, and so on, and there is now a business of people going down there and getting the wood from those vessels and selling it as driftwood. They are about to carry away all the old things that are left on the beach, and the Park Service really needs this money for protection and management of the area. Even last year before the Park Service took over the area, when it was known it was to become a national park, the State of Notrh Carolina had to put on four additional ferries in the area to take care of the tourists.

I do hope, since this is such a trivial matter and since it is such a meritorious item, that the splendid chairman of the subcommittee will agree to this slight amendment.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, I will have to object to this amendment offered by my good friend from North Carolina [Mr. BONNER]. He is one of God's noblemen in my book; but there are times when you just have to take issue

with your good friends, and this is one of those times. I am sure the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BONNER] does not know that there is $50,000 in this bill for construction, in addition to the $55,000 for management. Was the gentleman aware of that fact?

Mr. BONNER. Fifty-five thousand dollars for construction, where the State of North Carolina has put in a million dollars, and other citizens of North Carolina have given land. I imagine they must have some property there for the custodians to live in, and so forth. So I really think it is worthwhile to preserve the property, to have this money for protection and management of the property.

Mr. JENSEN. Then, in addition, we have $110,000 in here for maintenance for Cape Hatteras. I think the gentleman will have to admit that this is a rather new project.

Mr. BONNER. Yes, it is.

Mr. JENSEN. And it is always well to feel your way along for a while before you spend the taxpayers' money to any great degree; hold back a little bit and see how the folks who are running this thing operate. I hope the gentleman will not feel too bad if his amendment is defeated.

Mr. BONNER. No. I will not feel bad, but I wanted to bring this to the attention of the House, for I do feel that this $55,000 is well deserved and will be well spent and will redound 55 times that much to the scenic beauty.

Mr. JENSEN. We will see how they spend the money that is in the bill. It is possible the Senate may strike it all out and then we will have to compromise.

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

Mr. JENSEN. Yes; I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCORMACK. I think it is beautiful to witness this Damon and Pythias act. The gentleman said he hoped the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BONNER] would not be disappointed if his amendment were defeated.

May I ask my friend from Iowa, would the gentleman from Iowa be disappointed if his amendment is carried? The gentleman made reference to the friendships, and it is there. That recalled to my mind the statement that the Governor of North Carolina was purported to have said to the Governor of South Carolina, "What is the Constitution between friends?" In the matter of $50,000, is that such a great thing between friends?

Mr. JENSEN. Fifty thousand dollars out in my country is not hay, as we say. It is worth saving.

Mr. Chairman, I am compelled to object to this amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from North Carolina.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. BONNER) there were—ayes 32, noes 55.

So the amendment was rejected.

C——297

The Clerk read as follows:

FISH AND WILDLIFE SERVICE

Management of resources

For expenses necessary for conservation, management, protection, and utilization of fish and wildlife resources, and for the performance of other authorized functions related to such resources; operation of the industrial properties within the Crab Orchard National Wildlife Refuge (61 Stat. 770); maintenance of the herd of long-horned cattle on the Wichita Mountains Wildlife Refuge; purchase or rent of land, and functions related to wildlife management in California (16 U. S. C. 695–695c); and not to exceed $30,000 for payment, in the discretion of the Secretary, for information or evidence concerning violations of laws administered by the Fish and Wildlife Service; $6,137,000, of which not more than $4,250,000 shall be available for personal services and not more than $250,000 shall be available for travel; and in addition, there are appropriated amounts equal to 25 percent of the proceeds covered into the Treasury during the next preceding fiscal year from the sale of sealskins and other products, to remain available for expenditure during the current and next succeeding fiscal years for management and investigation of fish and wildlife resources of Alaska, including construction.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. LANTAFF: On page 25, line 20, after the semicolon and before the word "and", insert "leasing and management of lands for the protection of the Florida Key deer."

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, we have no objection to the amendment on this side of the aisle.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. D'EWART. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Montana?

There was no objection.

Mr. D'EWART. Mr. Chairman, the control of predatory animals and rodents harmful to agriculture is one of the activities adversely affected by the recommended reduction in the item "Fish and Wildlife Service, management of resources" in the bill making appropriations for the Department of the Interior, H. R. 8680. This item is recommended in the bill for 1955 appropriations in the amount of $6,137,000, a reduction of $863,000 below the amount appropriated for 1954. A pro rata application of this reduction to the control of predators and rodents would mean a reduction of approximately $117,000 in an essential activity that has already been curtailed below the level at which Federal responsibilities for protection of agriculture can be fully met.

This applies particularly in the West, where several million cattle and sheep are exposed to attacks by coyotes and other predators while grazing on the 400 million acres of public lands in the 11 Western States. Nearly 40 years ago, the Congress recognized the principle that the protection of livestock and game from attacks of wolves, lions, and other predators was a Federal responsibility in cooperation with the private enterprises affected. Thus, there was established and maintained to the present an outstanding example of teamwork between Government and industry.

During the past 10 years of this cooperation, ranchers have been obliged to carry an increasing portion of the load. There are now available some 110 fewer Federal hunters than at the beginning of 1946. Reductions in appropriations, coupled with inflationary costs, have forced abandonment of much of the Government's participation in predator and rodent control on public lands, except for supervision of work paid for by cooperating ranchers and local agencies. Cooperators are attempting to make up for Federal reductions by financing more than four-fifths of the cost of the work on private lands, but they should not be expected to assume such a heavy share on federally owned lands.

In 1946 the Government was maintaining its share of teamwork throughout the continental United States by an annual appropriation of $970,000, which was considerably less than 2 mills for each acre of the public domain—a portion went for control of rats and other harmful rodents on private and public property. This year there was $950,000 appropriated for such work in the United States and Alaska; $79,000 for the latter, leaving $871,000 for the States. This represents a net reduction of over 10 percent during the past 10 years of spiraling costs. Now the recommendation for an additional 13-percent reduction on the reduced base will, if sustained, necessitate abandonment of this type of Federal cooperation with agriculture over a large segment of the range country.

Restoration of $117,000 to the item of "Management of resources," bringing it to $6,254,000, of which not less than $950,000 should be made available for predator and rodent control, would permit continued cooperation, although at a scale considerably lower than in 1946 and earlier. It would be adequate to maintain the Federal portion of this cooperative work at present levels on nearly one-fifth of the public domain. Without it, an area roughly equivalent to all the public lands in the States of Montana, South Dakota, and Oregon—or Nevada and Washington; or Colorado, Utah, and Washington; or Arizona and Colorado—will lack Federal cooperation in the vital job of preventing agricultural losses due to destructive animals.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. METCALF: On page 25, line 23, after "Fish and Wildlife Service", strike out "$6,137,000" and insert the figure "$7,337,000."

Mr. METCALF. Mr. Chairman, I wish to call attention to a situation which disturbs me greatly and which I feel is totally unfair to the millions of sportsmen of the United States. I refer to the severe reductions in the appropriations proposed for the Fish and Wildlife Service. In studying this bill, I do not find

similar cuts below the amount available in 1954 in several other Bureaus in Interior, and I want to go on record as stating I believe the Appropriations Committee was entirely too severe in its treatment of the Fish nd Wildlife Service.

This is the Federal agency which deals with the valuable and popular fish and wildlife resources of the country, and the appropriations contained in this bill will determine how well or how poor that agency can carry out those responsibilities. While the demands for hunting and fishing are increasing as more and more hunters go afield with rod and gun, the Federal Government is actually decreasing its financial support to this great American industry.

In particular, I am disturbed about the ability of the Fish and Wildlife Service to continue its waterfowl-management program. This is a Federal responsibility under treaties with Canada and Mexico and one that cannot be lightly cast aside. Yet, in the face of more and more drainage of private agricultural land which is taking more and more nesting grounds out of production, and in spite of an increasing number of duck hunters going out each year, we find here that severe cuts have been made in the appropriated funds for this purpose.

Only 5 years ago, the sportsmen of this country, through their own organizations and with the strong backing of Congress, had the so-called Duck Stamp Act amended to double the income to the Service for waterfowl management purposes. Prior to that time, everyone who hunted ducks had to pay $1 to make his hunting sport legal. These sportsmen, on their own initiative, recommended and the Congress adopted an amendment increasing the price of the duck stamp to $2, all of which is appropriated annually to the Fish and Wildlife Service to buy more waterfowl areas, to improve the refuges acquired with these moneys, to do a better job of law enforcement, and to carry on basic research into management problems. Now, just as funds are beginning to be available for a greatly expanded refuge purchase and development program, as a result of that law, we find the Bureau of the Budget and the Appropriations Committee reducing regular funds to the point where these new sportsmen's dollars must go into maintaining the program which was financed by appropriations prior to that time. I have investigated the details of this situation, and I find the budget actions are a long way from those which the American sportsmen thought were going to happen when they voluntarily assessed themselves another dollar for the privilege of helping the duck situation. The Bureau of the Budget, in preparing next year's budget, lopped off of last year's amount $652,000 from the refuge item; $110,000 from essential river basin studies designed to help locate land and water for refuges; $100,000 from law enforcement; and $101,000 from research into problems of wildlife management. That comes to $963,000 taken out by the Bureau of the Budget. Now, the committee recommends a further reduction in the management item of $463,000 below the budget. Taking a fair share of around $125,000 out of this cut and applying it to the waterfowl management program, we find that in a single year, the Bureau of the Budget and the Appropriations Committee combined propose to reduce the waterfowl program by about $1,200,000.

My point is this: The only way the same level of administration can be attained in the fiscal year 1955 is for the Service to take that $1,200,000 cut out of the sportsmen's kitty, just to keep going on an even keel. This, I am sure, is not what the Congress intended when they increased the price of the duck stamp from $1 to $2 at the request of the sportsmen themselves.

Just a few days ago, both the Senate and the House refused to touch other earmarked funds set aside to benefit the sportsmen of the country. The original bill cutting excise taxes proposed to reduce the 11 percent tax on sporting arms and ammunition to 10 percent. Representatives of the arms and ammunition industry, together with those from sportsmen's groups, asked that the 11 percent be retained for the benefit of wildlife restoration by the States. An amendment was submitted to the bill while it was under consideration on the floor of the Senate, and it passed without a single dissent. The House agreed to the amendment in conference, with the result that the State game departments may continue to aid the millions of sportsmen of the Nation on the same basis as before. I wish to take similar action here and am submitting herewith an amendment for an increase of $1,200,000. This is the amount which will otherwise have to be taken from duck stamp funds if the Federal Government is to carry out its obligations to the millions of duck hunters and nature lovers who want this work continued in an efficient manner.

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

Mr. THOMPSON of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman may proceed for 5 additional minutes.

Mr. BUDGE. Mr. Chairman, I feel constrained to object on this particular amendment to the additional time.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, does the gentleman object to the extension of time or did he intend to indicate he was going to oppose the amendment at the proper time?

Mr. BUDGE. I shall oppose the amendment at the proper time and I do not intend to take 5 minutes in opposition. I did object to the extension of time.

Mr. WAINWRIGHT. Mr. Chairman, I am delighted to rise and support the amendment offered by my colleague from Montana [Mr. METCALF]. I am of the opinion that the general public is not aware of the great army of duck hunters that exists in our land today. Not only do these people follow in the traditions of their forefathers by remaining skilled and proficient in the use of firearms, but they also are a great economic addition to the society in which we live.

The duck-hunting population spends many, many millions of dollars on shotguns, shells, decoys, clothing, paint, rope, and a thousand-and-one other accessories that go along with the sportsmen in his field. Now, we hear much talk about a possible economic recession. In the first place, I do not believe that this is a serious threat, but at the same time I am of the opinion that the Congress of the United States should do everything within its power to continue to increase business incentives. Consequently, if this amendment is passed, the purpose of which is to provide additional duck-hunting areas, I believe that it will benefit the American business community 25 times greater than the actual amount that is requested for this particular program.

In the First Congressional District of New York we have some of the finest duck-hunting lands on the east coast. It was my privilege to present to the President of the United States two black duck, shot at Wainwright's Creek in Hampton Bays. The area between Smithtown and Montauk, Long Island, abounds with ponds and creeks. During the duck-hunting season these are filled to capacity. However, one grave drawback to this hunting is that the lands around these ponds and creeks are owned—in better than 95 percent of the cases—by private individuals. On the great bays such as Shinnecock, Peconic, Moriches, and Gardiner's the broadbill—known also as bluebill or scaup—are hunted, along with occasional canvasback.

Here again the question of private ownership plays a part, as most of the points, spits of land, and islands are privately owned. The moneys that would be spent at this time, as I understand it, could conceivably be used to establish a public refuge in the area of the First Congressional District of New York for hunters of that area.

One other additional thought that should be called to the attention of the Congress and the Secretary of the Interior is that we advocate at this time an increase in the limit from 4 to 6. The present limit is unrealistic and the law is more often breached than not. We advocate this because we believe that there is an adequate duck population at this time to support an increase in the legal limit. We also would advocate an additional 6 days, or a total of 65 days. The additional days should preferably be added to the beginning of the season. The ideal period for the First Congressional District of New York would be from October 29 of this year to January 1, 1955.

Mr. THOMPSON of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Montana [Mr. METCALF].

Mr. Chairman, I was the author of the duck-stamp bill which increased from $1 to $2 the amount which every duck hunter pays for the stamp he gets before he can hunt legally.

I have been checking back into the report that accompanied the bill when it was passed by the House. The principal purpose of the bill was to provide a means for more adequate development of

the migratory waterfowl resources of the country.

Then, reading from the basic legislation, I find that the moneys received for such stamps and so forth shall be received and set aside as a special fund to be known as the "Migratory bird conservation fund." There is no other purpose provided for. I would like to ask the gentleman from Montana this question: Without your amendment will those funds be diverted from the purpose for which they were originally intended?

Mr. METCALF. Without my amendment those funds are going to be used for operation and administrative expenses that were previously paid for by appropriations of this Congress.

Mr. THOMPSON of Texas. Then, the duck hunters, who have bought the stamps and who wrote in favor of the increase to every one of us who was here at that time, are not going to get what they thought they were getting when they bought the stamps unless this amendment is adopted. Under those conditions, I do not see how this House can do otherwise than adopt the amendment, because if they do not, they will break faith with all of these sportsmen.

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

Mr. THOMPSON of Texas. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. TOLLEFSON. The question comes to my mind that the legislation which the gentleman sponsored carried a provision which limited the amount of money out of the duck-stamp fund which could be used for administrative purposes and operation.

Mr. THOMPSON of Texas. It did in this way. It said in the basic act, to which mine was an amendment, that not less than 90 percent shall be available for the location, ascertainment, acquisition, administration, maintenance, and development of suitable areas for inviolate bird sanctuaries under the provisions of the Migratory Bird Conservation Act. That does not provide for general administrative expenses but only those incident to the areas in question.

Mr. TOLLEFSON. Is it my understanding then that funds can be diverted to other purposes?

Mr. THOMPSON of Texas. Not as I understand the law, which the gentleman helped get passed in that Congress.

Mr. TOLLEFSON. I do not recall what the provisions in the law were, and I thought perhaps the gentleman could enlighten us.

Mr. THOMPSON of Texas. They were not supposed to be diverted except for these purposes, and certainly general expenses for operating the Wildlife Service would not come under that head.

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

Mr. Chairman, at the outset, I should like to invite the attention of the membership to the fact that the funds with which we are here dealing make up only a small part of the total funds which are available to the Fish and Wildlife Service. The total amount available to the Fish and Wildlife Service for fiscal 1955 amounts to $38,173,271. Now, a lot of that money, in fact, the bulk of it, comes from sources over which the Committee on Appropriations has no control, because they are permanent appropriations, as the gentleman from Montana has pointed out. The reduction which is made here is a relatively small reduction under the present program, and if the amendment offered by the gentleman from Montana were to prevail, the amount included in this bill would then be $737,000 over the budget request which was made by the Fish and Wildlife Service to the Committee on Appropriations and the Congress. I do not feel that, as members of the Committee on Appropriations, we can permit the appropriation of $737,000 over the amount requested of us and for which we have no means of knowing for what purpose they would be used.

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

Mr. BUDGE. Not at this time. The total funds, amounting to over $38 million will still be available under the permanent appropriations, through the duck stamp and other revenues. I should like to repeat that if this amendment were to prevail it would place in this bill $737,000 which the Fish and Wildlife Service has not requested of the Congress in this appropriation item.

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I want to support the amendment of the gentleman from Montana [Mr. METCALF] striking the figure of $6,137,000 and inserting instead $7,337,000.

This increase of $1,200,000 in the committee's recommendations is not a true increase at all, but will merely provide the minimum amount by which Congress and the Federal Government can carry out its obligations to the tens of millions of Americans with the hunting and sporting instinct. Duck hunters, amateur and professional naturalists, and other sportsmen have a stake in the action of Congress on this item. We have an obligation to continue the program, at least at its present level.

As the population of this great Nation increases, so does the number of those who are interested in the work of, and will benefit by the activities of, the Fish and Wildlife Service. The amendment of the gentleman from Montana will benefit no special group of people, Mr. Chairman, but will be welcomed by citizens from all walks of life who have a right to enjoy some of the natural resources of this Nation.

I feel that the committee's action in cutting this appropriation breaks faith with millions of Americans who find recreation as sportsmen. What is the justification for the committee's action? None has been given to my satisfaction.

We are fortunate in that our Nation abounds in valuable fish and wildlife resources. But such must be carefully preserved and cared for in order that those who set out with rod and reel may be successful in their ventures, and those who take gun in hand for recreation may find their targets.

The committee's unjustified cut in funds for the Fish and Wildlife Service will not enable that agency to perform adequately its assigned functions. That agency has heavy responsibilities to manage efficiently some of our greatest natural resources, and they must be given the funds with which to do the job.

The waterfowl-management program, for which adequate funds have not been provided, is just one of the vital services performed by this agency. Adequate funds for this program should be put back in this bill.

It was upon the recommendation of sportsmen that the so-called duck stamp was increased from $1 to $2. The main purpose of this raise was to buy larger and more waterfowl areas, to do a more efficient job of law enforcement, and to carry on vital and necessary basic research in this field. Now, as a result of the committee's cut, in part, much of these duck-stamp funds will have to go into the maintenance of this program. This goes directly against the will of the sportsmen who pressed for the increase of the stamp from $1 to $2. I ask this administration, will no more waterfowl areas be purchased? It is estimated that the waterfowl program has been cut by $1,200,000. It is clear that this amount will have to come out of the funds built up by the sportsmen from the higher priced $2 duck stamp. This was never the intention of sportsmen, nor the Congress.

The amendment of the gentleman from Montana should carry in order to keep faith with the sportsmen of America. And the sportsmen of America, Mr. Chairman, comprise perhaps as much as one-fourth of the population of this country. The restoration of $1,200,000 is a small amount when compared with the number of persons who can benefit by it. I hope my colleagues in this body will join with me in support of this amendment.

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

Mr. PRICE. I yield.

Mr. METCALF. At the point where the gentleman from Idaho [Mr. BUDGE] was saying that this is an increase over the amount actually submitted in the budget of $700,000-odd, I requested him to yield and he declined. I would like to say for the benefit of the members of the committee that if this $1,200,000 is restored it will furnish just the same services for the next fiscal year that were provided for the last fiscal year.

As I outlined in my main statement $936,000 was cut by the Budget and the committee cut an additional $400,000-plus from the amount granted for the last fiscal year. If this is restored it will merely provide the people who voted to double the payment for the duck stamps, the services and the facilities and water-fowl refuges that they thought they were going to buy.

Mr. PRICE. I thank the gentleman. I think the gentleman is absolutely right.

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

Mr. Chairman, this is a case where the committee felt constrained to make a small saving. As everyone knows, we have a great responsibility in carrying on the many activities of this Government of ours and in connection with military matters all over the world.

I must say to the gentleman from Montana that I appreciate the fact that he would like to have more money for fish and wildlife. So would I. Everybody else would like to have it. But it just happens that these are times when we cannot spend all the money for these things even if we would like to. We are spending in Montana around $7 million for irrigation, reclamation, and transmission lines for the benefit of the people of that State. I am sure the gentleman from Montana appreciates that. Those are things which will greatly benfit the State of Montana and all the people generally.

I realize that it is a popular thing to ask for more money for fish and wildlife. I yield to no man in my desire to see to it that we have a good program on fish and wildlife, because I love to fish and I love to hunt just like almost everyone else; but after all, we have a business to operate here in this country and we have just so much money to operate that business.

Mr. THOMPSON of Texas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JENSEN. I yield.

Mr. THOMPSON of Texas. May I ask the gentleman just this one question: Does the gentleman realize we are talking about earmarked funds that were put up under the duck stamp law for a particular purpose?

Mr. JENSEN. Not altogether.

Mr. THOMPSON of Texas. But very close to it.

Then let me ask the gentleman one other question: Are those funds spent as they were intended to be spent or are more of them being taken out from the original intent?

Mr. JENSEN. The money that is coming in under the duck-stamp fund is all being spent for the purpose for which it was intended, but here we are appropriating money out of the general fund of the Treasury for this purpose.

Mr. THOMPSON of Texas. I think we are talking about two different things. I am talking about earmarked funds and the gentleman is talking about general funds. That is the difference.

Mr. JENSEN. The facts are that if we appropriate more money for this item it will come out of the general fund. I do not care how you want to keep your books, the facts are that the Treasury of the United States is now in the red about $271,784,000,000, and this will put it into the red a little more.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JENSEN. I yield to the gentlewoman from New York.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Is this curtailment of the funds going to change in any way the program for furnishing fish, stocking rivers, and so forth?

Mr. JENSEN. No, indeed.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. It will not curtail it?

Mr. JENSEN. Not at all.

Mr. DAWSON of Utah. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Utah?

There was no objection.

Mr. DAWSON of Utah. Mr. Chairman, President Dwight D. Eisenhower recently recognized that our domestic mining industry was in deep trouble. His announced intention to step up our metal stockpiling program was indeed good news to the thousands of workers in America trying to live on their unemployment compensation allowances.

But, Mr. Chairman, the stockpiling program is not the permanent answer.

It will temporarily keep our lead and zinc mining industry alive, but it will not restore its vitality and health. The domestic industry has been bled white by trade policies and past Government purchase programs which have—in effect—exported our miners jobs to South America and Africa.

Let me cite some figures. In 1951, the Nation's consumption of zinc was 934,000 tons of which 391,000 were imported. In 1953, consumption was 975,000 tons, but 743,000 tons were imports. The figures tell the story. One-fourth of the lead and zinc miners in America are out of a job. Many others have voluntarily taken a 15- to 20-percent cut in wages—have cut their standard of living—in order to assist the industry in its attempt to stay alive against competition from foreign mines which pay their workers as little at $1.50 per day.

Unless there is some protection against this competition, the stockpiling program cannot function to save the industry for long. This Nation cannot afford to stockpile the surplus lead and zinc production of the world at the expense of the American taxpayer.

For that reason, I have today introduced a bill that will restrict imports, that will limit purchases for stockpiling lead and zinc to that metal mined by American workers. The bill will stabilize the price of the metals at a reasonable level and assure the Nation of a strong mining industry.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I have pending at the desk an amendment to the last paragraph on page 26, which I ask unanimous consent to withdraw and direct my remarks to the amendment offered by the distinguished gentleman from Montana [Mr. METCALF].

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Chairman, let me say to my colleagues on the committee here this afternoon, I know of no segment of the American population that the Members of this Congress could more ill afford to anger than the followers of Isaac Walton. They have plenty of time while they are fishing or sitting along the banks of a stream to meditate as to whether they are getting a good deal, a square deal, or a raw deal. I am afraid if the opinions of this committee prevail here today, they will be forced to come to the conclusion that they are at least getting a bad deal. You were talking about the special fund paid in to maintain refuges for ducks for the purpose of duck hunting. Let me call your attention to another fund. We charge a dollar for the privilege of hunting in the forests owned by the Government. We have two of them in our State of West Virginia, the Monongahela and the George Washington. The proceeds from that matching money from the State Conservation Commission permits us to build lakes and permits us to stock those lakes with trout and with other fish. Our State Conservation Commission, working with the Federal Government, uses this money along with the money paid in for the hunting and fishing licenses in the State and are building or have just completed a lake with a surface of 23 acres and they are starting work on an additional lake with a surface area of 34 acres to be stocked with trout. I think this is true of practically everyone of my colleagues here who are getting scores of requests from your constituents to assist them in getting an allotment of fish from the Fish and Wildlife Service whose offices are up in Boston at the present time. And what do we get back? at least I get back replies from them saying that their supply of fish is running short and that their appropriations for the current year will not be sufficient, and that we may have to wait 6 months or longer to get the fish to stock the streams. In addition to that, I would like to remind my colleagues that we are developing over the Nation a nationwide program of building small ponds on farms. The demand for stocking those farms has exceeded the capacity of our State hatcheries. In my State, and I think this is true of all the other States, our State hatcheries are not in a position to stock the streams even in the forests owned by the United States. I am very much in accord with what the gentleman from Montana is proposing to do here. I want to say to the gentleman who addressed us just a moment ago, in answering a question from the gentlewoman from New York, said that it would not in any way affect our facilities for furnishing fish and game to stock our refuges and to stock our streams—if it does not affect that, I do not know what in the name of common sense it does affect.

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

Mr. BAILEY. I yield.

Mr. JENSEN. Of course, if your State is not providing their fair share of the fish, you would have that trouble.

Mr. BAILEY. We are providing more than our fair share of fish.

Mr. JENSEN. You just got through saying your State was not providing a sufficient number of fish to meet the demand.

Mr. BAILEY. That is because of the demand for stocking our farm ponds. And you have that in every State.

Mr. JENSEN. Yes, we have that in my State.

Mr. BAILEY. Why, certainly.

Mr. JENSEN. And we have that in every State. My State is spending some money on this kind of work.

Mr. BAILEY. All right, but the States are not spending any more on the streams in your federally owned forests for that stocking because there are no Federal fish available to stock the streams.

Mr. JENSEN. The gentleman knows as well as I do that in every department of the Government, or at least this has been the case in the past when somebody asks a question, "Why do you not do a certain thing?" They say, "Oh, Congress has not furnished enough money."

Mr. BAILEY. I think the chairman of the subcommittee and the members of the subcommittee ought to permit these fishermen and hunters the privilege of spending their own money that they paid in for hunting and fishing privileges.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from West Virginia has expired.

The question occurs on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Montana [Mr. METCALF].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. METCALF) there were—ayes 34, noes 58.

So the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

Investigations of resources

For expenses necessary for scientific and economic studies and investigations respecting conservation, management, protection, and utilization of fish and wildlife resources, including related aquatic plants and products; collection, compilation, and publication of information concerning such studies and investigations; and the performance of other functions related thereto; as authorized by law; $3,500,000.

Mr. BATES. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment, which is at the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BATES: On page 26, line 15, strike out "$3,500,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$4,027,000."

Mr. BATES. Mr. Chairman, I offer this amendment, because of the serious problems of the fishing industry in the United States. For some time it has been in a distressed and very critical condition.

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

Mr. BATES. I yield.

Mr. McCORMACK. May I say that I enthusiastically support the amendment offered by my distinguished friend from Massachusetts [Mr. BATES], and I hope it will be adopted.

Mr. BATES. I thank the gentleman.

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

Mr. BATES. I yield to the gentleman from Hawaii.

Mr. FARRINGTON. Mr. Chairman, I strongly support the gentleman's amendment because of the very great importance to the development of the fishing resources in the Pacific. I ask unanimous consent that at the conclusion of the gentleman's remarks I may offer a brief statement.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

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

Mr. BATES. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. LANE. I know that the gentleman understands the subject matter of his amendment. The gentleman has conducted many hearings on it. He has been before the Commission on many occasions. It is a subject matter that the gentleman from Massachusetts has lived with over a long period of time. I am satisfied his amendment is worthy of consideration by Members of the House.

Mr. BATES. I thank the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. WILSON of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BATES. I yield.

Mr. WILSON of California. I want to associate myself with the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. BATES] in asking for this increase in appropriation. I represent the tuna industry in Southern California. The tuna industry has been very hard hit by imports from foreign countries. We need to develop new resources of fish, so that we can compete with those imports.

I am in favor of the gentleman's amendment.

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

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

Mr. COLMER. The gentleman's amendment proposes to increase this amount by approximately a half million dollars?

Mr. BATES. Five hundred and twenty-seven thousand dollars.

Mr. COLMER. Could that be used for the purpose of studying the shrimp industry among other purposes?

Mr. BATES. If the gentleman will direct his attention to page 26 of the bill where this amendment applies, it states that this section involves expenses necessary for scientific and economic studies and investigations respecting conservation, management, protection, and utilization of fish and wildlife resources.

I should certainly think it would include the project the gentleman has in mind.

Mr. COLMER. What, of course, prompted me to interrogate the gentleman was that the shrimping industry has been corresponding with me now for several months about getting some additional funds for that purpose, and I may also direct the gentleman's attention in that connection to the fact that quite a few of his fishermen from up in the New England section are getting down into my gulf section now taking shrimp, and we are going to need more shrimp down there if we are going to take care of the New England fishermen.

Mr. BATES. I hope the gentleman gets fewer boats from my area.

Mr. BENNETT of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BATES. I yield.

Mr. BENNETT of Michigan. Does the gentleman's amendment specify for what purpose it must be spent other than any of the purposes referred to in the item?

Mr. BATES. I may say to the gentleman that my amendment in no sense changes the language; it merely increases the amount by $527,000.

Mr. BENNETT of Michigan. It leaves it within the discretion of the Fish and Wildlife Service to spend it for whatever purpose they see fit within the language of the item.

Mr. BATES. I would say the gentleman is correct.

Mr. BENNETT of Michigan. Would the gentleman say that would give the Fish and Wildlife Service authority to use part of this money for the so-called lamprey eel program in the Great Lakes?

Mr. BATES. I think the gentleman more properly should address that question to the chairman of the committee. This is general overall authorization for research, and I believe from looking at the language here and realizing what the gentleman has in mind that perhaps it comes within the purview of this particular section.

Mr. BENNETT of Michigan. The word "protection" is used in line 12, for example, "protection and utilization of fish and wildlife," etc.

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

Mr. BATES. I yield.

Mr. HALE. Could we not protect the lamprey eel in reverse?

Mr. BATES. I suggest that the gentleman from Maine discuss the matter with the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HALE. Will the gentleman permit me to say that I would like to compliment the gentleman for introducing this amendment which I think is a very wise one.

Mr. BATES. I thank the gentleman.

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

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

Mr. KEATING. I know the gentleman has made a great study of this question and I am very anxious to hear the reason for the gentleman's amendment before voting.

Mr. BATES. I would be delighted to accommodate the gentleman if I can get sufficient time.

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

Mr. BATES. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 3 additional minutes.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. BATES. Mr. Chairman, if I have yielded to everybody who wants to ask questions I would like to proceed with my remarks.

Mr. Chairman, in the 5 years I have been here in the Congress I think I have appealed to about every committee, board, and commission in Washington from the Tariff Commission, the Committee on Reciprocity Information, down to lesser boards and to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries of the House, yet in spite of that, I have seen the fishing industry of the United States drifting continuously into a more distressing condition.

Back in 1939 the imports from Canada and other countries of fish amounted to only some 9 million pounds. In 1952 the imports from these various countries amounted to 107 million

pounds, an increase of 1,200 percent since 1939.

In the meantime our fishing grounds off the Atlantic coast have become depleted until it has become necessary for fishermen to travel a thousand-mile round trip for a catch, taking some 10 days, as a consequence of the movement and depletion of fish. More research is needed into the habits of fish, and that is the purpose of this section.

The amount carried in the bill is $960,000 less than was carried in the 1954 appropriation.

My amendment will increase the amount that is currently in the bill by $527,000; nevertheless it will still be $433,000 less than we appropriated a year ago.

The gentleman from New York has inquired as to what research will be conducted. It will, of course, be research into all phases of fish and wildlife. As I said, I am particularly interested in learning something about the habits of fish. For instance, along the coast of Massachusetts for 5 years we have been unable to catch mackerel. We want to know something about ocean currents, the temperature of the water, and related subjects. We must increase this amount earmarked for experimental purposes.

If some of these things are done, perhaps the fishermen in New England will be able to survive, and this great industry which has been going on in my area for some 325 years will be able to continue. The difficulty we experience is that labor overseas is very much cheaper than ours. The fishermen have to move much farther than previously, and something must be done if this industry is to survive.

The industry has made certain advances, but unfortunately when it spends thousands of dollars on advertising in this country the imports reap the harvest, because all it does is to increase the amount of fish which the importers bring into the United States.

This amendment will provide funds to determine and capitalize on our indigenous advantages and put the industry on a competitive position. I hope the committee will accept my amendment.

Mr. FARRINGTON. Mr. Chairman, a sharp reduction has been made by the committee in the funds provided in this bill for fishery research.

This item, designated in the tabulation contained in the report of the committee as investigations of resources, is in the sections of the bill carrying appropriations for the Fish and Wildlife Service.

The total appropriated for this purpose in fiscal 1954 was $4,460,000. The Bureau of the Budget reduced the item in its recommendations to $4,027,000, and now the committee has cut it to $3,500,000.

If the recommendation of the committee stands, it will mean the appropriation for the investigation of the great fishery resources of this country will be reduced in fiscal 1955 by 21½ percent.

This is a cause of very deep concern of an energetic, resourceful, and far-seeing group of men in Hawaii and on the Pacific coast whose hope for establishing fishing as one of the basic industries of the Pacific area rests in large measure on present attempts to establish through scientific research the sources of life habits of the tuna. The knowledge of this fish and the means for its capture are thus far so limited as to constitute an element of uncertainty that threatens to retard one of our most promising industries. Its importance is not limited to Hawaii and the Pacific coast, as American Samoa, below the equator to the south, and the myriad of islands constituting the Trust Territory to the southwest and west, are likewise attempting to strengthen economies that are woefully weak and too dependent on Federal appropriations for survival by developing fishery resources as not only one of their industries but in many instances their basic industry.

Congress recognized this when it enacted on August 4, 1947, Public Law 329 of the 80th Congress, a bill which I introduced, which says:

> That it is the policy of the United States to provide for the exploration, investigation, development, and maintenance of the fishing resources and development of the high seas fishing industry of the Territories and island possessions of the United States in the tropical and subtropical Pacific Ocean and intervening seas, for the benefit of the residents of the Territory of Hawaii and Pacific island possessions and of the people of the United States.

The program undertaken under the authority of this legislation was the largest in the history of this Government and, justifiably so in view of our new responsibilities in the Pacific and the lack of knowledge of what is probably its most important resources.

It is with very great concern, therefore, that the men of this industry have seen appropriations for the Pacific oceanic fishery investigations steadily reduced so that today the sum requested for the next fiscal year is almost down to half of that appropriated originally in 1949. The figures show that the appropriation for the fiscal year 1949 was $1,010,000; for 1950, $911,900; for 1951, $828,050; for 1952, $753,905; for 1953, $755,414; for 1954, $722,422. In making allowance for the fact that the original appropriations involved considerable preliminary work and permanent construction, the fact remains that there has been a tendency to constantly cut down this appropriation.

The Federal Government now has invested close to $5 million in this important work and with very concrete and promising results already in evidence the wisdom of curtailing appropriations too sharply at this time can very properly be brought into question and justification found for doubts that this may be a policy that is penny wise and pound foolish.

One of the significant facts of the record, moreover, is that the reduction of funds for fishery research, within the Fish and Wildlife Service itself, has been by no means uniform. The figures show that the Pacific oceanic fishery investigations program has been steadily reduced while increases have been made in other programs, most of which have been conducted for a longer time.

The work of the Pacific oceanic fisheries investigations is by no means unrelated to the industry itself, and, in fact, is carried on in the closest kind of relationship with the latter. On February 15, 16, and 17 of this year an advisory committee consisting of representatives of the Pacific tuna industry met in Honolulu with the representatives of the Government to discuss the program of the Pacific oceanic fisheries investigations.

Those attending the meeting were as follows:

TUNA INDUSTRY ADVISORY COMMITTEE

Malcolm MacNaughton, chairman, president, Hawaiian Tuna Packers, Ltd.

Vernon E. Brock, director, division of fish and game, Territory of Hawaii.

William Kanakanui, manager, Tuna Boat Owners Association.

Donald T. Saxby, manager, California canned foods division, California Packing Corp.

James S. De Silva, Jr., president, California Fish Canners Association, Inc.

Thomas F. Sandoz, president, Columbia River Packers Association, Inc.

W. M. Chapman, director of research, American Tunaboat Association.

GOVERNMENT REPRESENTATIVES

Arnie J. Suomela, Assistant Director, Fish and Wildlife Service.

Lionel A. Walford, Chief, Branch of Fishery Biology, Fish and Wildlife Service.

O. E. Sette, Director, Pacific Oceanic Fishery Investigations, Fish and Wildlife Service.

Donald L. McKernan, Assistant Director, Pacific Oceanic Fishery Investigations, Fish and Wildlife Service.

The advisory committee noted with concern that the allotments for the entire Fish and Wildlife Service have increased by approximately $4 million since 1949 while those available for POFI have decreased from $1,010,000 in the first year to an estimated $642,000 in the year to come. Of the later amount the committee held that $65,000 is absolutely necessary for vessel rehabilitation, leaving only an estimated $577,000 for actual research under the Budget Bureau program.

After carefully studying the report of the POFI staff, the advisory committee reached the conclusion that if only the approximate $642,000 allotment, less $65,000 for vessel repairs, as recommended by the Budget Bureau, became available the entire program would have to be cut severely. It was the sense of the meeting, with all members agreeing, that the program was far too interrelated to agree to such deletions.

I was told that it was the belief of the advisory committee that the work that these scientists are doing is really just on the threshold of something very big, both in equatorial waters and in potential albacore waters north and east of Hawaii, and that it has the full support of the fishermen and canners up and down the entire Pacific Coast and Hawaii.

I desire to quote a few brief sections from the report made to the advisory

committee by the staff of POFI. They follow:

Yellowfin tuna has been under study the longest, and last year the mapping of a major tuna fishery resource was completed. This lies in the equatorial zone directly south of Hawaii and its relation to the ocean currents has been approximately defined. Effort has been shifted toward encouragement of private commercial development. One venture involving two west coast fishing vessels, aided by POFI financially to a very minor degree, is now fishing this yellowfin stock. Another west coast concern is making preparations and a leading Hawaiian fisherman is planning a sampan trip to these waters.

* * * Incidentally we turned up solid evidence that the skipjack resource is far larger and less localized than would appear from the local (Hawaiian) fishing fleet's activities.

A year ago the committee endorsed our proposal for a winter reconnaissance for albacore in waters north and east of Hawaii. This reconnaissance, involving concurrent sea work over a 3 million square mile area by four vessels, one of them operated by the California Department of Fish and Game, is now under way. It should be possible to report orally to the committee on the early results as they come in over the radio.

Mr. Chairman, I do not believe anyone who is familiar with the Pacific and its problems, and particularly those of the Pacific islands, can fail to recognize the very great importance of this program. I recognize the need of economy, but I feel strongly that reckless curtailment of this activity is not only unsound but may very well result in the loss of the benefits of some of the fine work already accomplished. I strongly commend to the House, therefore, the point of view of those immediately engaged in this industry and trust appropriate steps can be taken at the proper time to restore this item to its original figure and that further curtailments in the appropriations for this purpose will not be allowed.

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the pending amendment and ask unanimous consent to proceed for 3 additional minutes.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Chairman, I am not alone surprised but I am very much disappointed at the action taken by the committee in cutting, I understand, $863,000 from fish and wildlife services. In fact, I cannot understand your thinking.

We have hundreds of thousands of people in this Nation who are interested in fish and wildlife and in our great outdoor recreational facilities. The gentleman from Massachusetts talked about not catching a mackerel for 5 years off the coast of Massachusetts. I can tell the gentleman that we have a thousand miles of fishable streams in the Allegheny Forest in which there are no fish whatever.

I cannot understand the attitude of some Members, particularly on my side of the aisle; however, when it comes to foreign aid or point 4 programs all over the world you willingly and heartily endorse the spending of billions and billions of dollars for that purpose.

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

Mr. GAVIN. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. JENSEN. When the gentleman says he cannot understand the Republicans who want to spend billions of dollars all over the world, may I ask him if he was looking at me when he made that remark?

Mr. GAVIN. No, I was not, but I can say to the gentleman that I have never voted for any foreign aid spending at any time anywhere except in the first UNRRA bill. I was not too informed about foreign spending at that time. So we are both in the same category.

But it is interesting, though, to hear some of my friends that expatiate in extenso about our foreign aid spending. I think they love the sound of their own voices and they glory in pitching billions all over the world at the expense of the American taxpayers. But when it comes to an appropriation in their own backyard, that is something else again. In my district where we have the Allegheny Forest, of some 750,000 acres, millions of people use this forest area. Did you ever watch a boy fishing for trout, the great happiness he gets in catching a fish. Certainly we should appropriate sufficient money to stock our streams and protect our wildlife.

You appear to be willing to deny to American youth the opportunities to go into these great wooded areas, out in the great outdoors, and enjoy fishing and hunting. What better way to spend the tax dollar? It is a wise investment for the youth of our Nation.

I glory in the greatness of America and our great outdoors. And, what do we do to try to rehabilitate these dried-out streams, these wornout, denuded forest areas, our wildlife and our recreational facilities? But little. You stand up with a cynical smile on your face and you seem to get a smug satisfaction on voting down an appropriation for fish and wildlife service and management of resources. Well, I just want to tell you that I do not agree with you. I think the Fish and Wildlife Service should be encouraged. They turn in a fine performance with the money they have available. We should encourage the youth of America to get out in the great outdoors. We should encourage them to hunt and fish, it builds them into fine Americans. But, no; you want to cut back the appropriations that makes these opportunities possible. I receive many applications for fish, hundreds of them, but the fish are not obtainable. When I see the papers from my district when they do get an allocation of fish, you see the sportsmen gather around and go out into the woods and dump fish into the creeks, the ponds, and the streams, and they get real satisfaction and happiness out of doing something worthwhile. So, I hope you get just as much satisfaction out of the attitude and the action taken here today in cutting back this appropriation $863,000 as they do in stocking our streams. I doubt if you will.

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

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I think when today's debate is over on this amendment that the gentleman from Pennsylvania will be very well pleased when he hears of the action of the committee and the action that will be taken by the committee on both sides of the aisle regarding this amendment.

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

Mr. JENSEN. I yield.

Mr. GAVIN. On this amendment?

Mr. JENSEN. Yes.

Mr. GAVIN. Oh, yes, it is quite evident there is a coalition here today and there is evidently groundwork laid because of the response that was made when the gentleman arose to speak everybody wanted to get on the bandwagon as being for the amendment, the gentleman from Massachusetts was unable to say a word to explain his amendment. But, I did not see anybody arise when you cut off $863,000 from appropriations for fish and wildlife services. Nobody got up to defend that position.

Mr. BATES. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, is the gentleman in favor of this amendment?

Mr. GAVIN. Yes, I am inclined to be in favor of it. Anything that would help the fishing industry along the East coast I would be for. If it helps your people and helps the East coast fishing industry, I would be for it.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, I want the gentleman to have all the time he wants, because I enjoy listening to him.

Mr. GAVIN. I might say to the gentleman that the feeling is mutual. I greatly admire my good friend from Iowa, he is one of the outstanding Members of the House.

Mr. JENSEN. I thank the gentleman. I do know, Mr. Chairman, that he is a very sincere gentleman and he means exactly what he says. He made a very fine statement. I do want to say, Mr. Chairman, that after the next gentleman speaks—and I think there is just one more who wants to talk—I have an announcement to make.

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Chairman, do I have any more time?

Mr. JENSEN. The gentleman was on my time.

Mr. GAVIN. I want to thank my very good and able friend for using his time.

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I had intended to offer an amendment to this section of the bill, but instead I will support the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts. I think the House should know that the amount involved here is spread very thinly over four different programs. I should like to enumerate those programs to the House. If the amendment of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. BATES] is carried it will restore the budget figure for this item of $4,027,000. That figure is spread very thinly over four different programs, all very important; $2,389,000 will go to fisheries biology; $1,108,000 goes to commercial fisheries; $380,000 will go to wildlife research; $150,000 will go to fish migration over dams.

All of these are very important programs, programs in which I think every American is interested. The committee this year reduced the appropriation from last year considerably. We are not asking for full restoration to the 1954 fiscal figure but we are, through the Bates amendment requesting the House to approve what the budget has allocated for these programs.

This bill provides, unless the Bates amendment is carried, for only $3,500,000 to carry out the Fish and Wildlife Service program for the year. This represents a cut of $960,000 below the amount available in the fiscal year 1954.

I was going to propose an amendment to increase it to the fiscal 1954 figure, but I think it would be the better part of wisdom to support the amendment of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. BATES] which would merely restore it to the budget figure, a figure which everyone could conscientiously support, since it comes from the Bureau of the Budget after close study, and certainly could be considered part of administration policy.

In the fiscal year 1954, the appropriation for the Fish and Wildlife Service for wildlife research was $481,000. That is just one item. That is a very important item. This is scarcely an improvement over the low of the war years when our very existence was at stake and all possible manpower and funds were of necessity diverted to war activity. Considering that wildlife science is in its beginning stages as a technology, this research effort is hardly adequate to meet even minimum Federal responsibilities. We can hardly do less than hold the program at this level, although I concede that we might accept a cut in view of the situation existing.

The Fish and Wildlife Service has responsibility for wildlife investigations needed in the management of all Federal lands.

This includes approximately 181 million acres of National Forests and 23 million acres of National Parks, in addition to the Service's own 18 million acres of wildlife refuges besides the other millions of areas of the public domain. These are important recreation lands for the public, on which wildlife for hunting and other purposes is a primary value. Economic and management problems involving wild birds and mammals are waiting for attention in every major area, yet the Service has only $70,000 to carry on this work. The program should be greatly expanded rather than curtailed.

DISEASE STUDIES

Wildlife diseases are a factor in nearly every major management problem yet one that is little understood. Epidemics of diseases strike all important wildlife species and cause heavy losses of high economic value. As one problem alone, it is estimated that in the Great Basin waterfowl mortality to western duck sickness frequently accounts for from half a million or more birds per year. In some years, fowl cholera in the Southwest accounts for 50,000 to 100,000 ducks. Based on an average cost of $8 to harvest a duck even at the lowest figure of half a million and 50,000 loss, respectively, would mean a monetary loss of $4 million and 400,000 respectively.

A few years ago, some 10,000 deer died within a short period throughout the Southeast. In stocking programs, it costs more than $100 per deer, and at this rate it would equal a capital loss of not less than $1 million.

Losses to fish and wildlife from disease, lead poisoning, and parasites costs this Nation millions of dollars annually.

The States commonly look to the Federal Government for cooperation on disease problems, yet the Fish and Wildlife Service has only one man from appropriated funds engaged in this work, and the budget for such studies is a pittance of only $10,000. We are hardly approaching this problem on a scientific basis.

INSECTICIDE STUDIES

The annual application of insecticidal chemicals on the Nation's forest, marsh, and agricultural lands now aggregates more than a billion pounds at a cost of $300 million. From month to month, new and more potent toxicants are available for such use. These chemicals should be tested for their effects on valuable fish and wildlife before they are given clearance for widespread application. The Fish and Wildlife Service is attempting to gather facts and consult as to the hazards involved with only one man and a budget of $9,000 for such work. Research, therefore, in this important field is practically at a standstill.

BIRD DAMAGE CONTROL RESEARCH

Depredations to grain, forest reseedings and other crops increase year by year as agriculture and other land uses are intensified. As an example of such problems, heavy blackbird damage to sweet corn, rice, and other crops is growing in many areas of the east coast from Florida to New Jersey. Demands increase yearly that this problem be studied and control methods developed. The Service is making an inadequate effort with one research man. Problems of this type need much more attention before such losses can be brought under practical control.

Mr. TOLLEFSON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. BATES]. I am confident the House will approve it and perhaps it is unnecessary to take any additional time, but I should like to bring some information to the House in support of the amendment. The amendment seeks to add something like $527,000 to this item in the bill.

Last week the House Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries held hearings on a measure which seeks to transfer approximately $3,500,000 annually from the funds under section 32 of the Agriculture Act to the Fish and Wildlife Service for just this type of program. I think every member of the committee was impressed with the testimony offered, to the point where I believe everybody on the committee feels definitely that the Fish and Wildlife Service needs those additional funds for research and rehabilitation programs. These programs are very much worthwhile and very much needed.

The testimony that was presented to our committee showed rather conclusively to me and I think everybody else on the committee that the Fish and Wildlife Service needs these funds quite desperately. These programs have proved very worthwhile. I should like to mention 2 or 3 of them to the committee for your information.

I think most of you are familiar with the research and rehabilitation program in connection with the seals on Pribiloff Island. At one time those seals were almost extinct, but because of just such a program as this we now have a large seal population controlled and governed by the Fish and Wildlife Service. That brings revenue to the United States every year.

Out in the North Pacific at one time the Pacific halibut almost reached extinction. They reached such a low ebb it was no longer worthwhile to make an effort to take them. However, because of just such a program as this the halibut industry has been restored, employing many men and bringing a great deal of money into the coffers.

The sockeyed salmon disappeared a few years ago almost completely, when at one point in our history they produced several million dollars worth of fish. Because of just such a program as this the sockeyed salmon have been in the process of being restored and now that industry employs a large number of men, and it is a profitable operation.

Mr. SEELY-BROWN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TOLLEFSON. I yield to the gentleman from Connecticut.

Mr. SEELY-BROWN. I congratulate the gentleman on the statement he is making. Not only do I support the Bates amendment, but I congratulate the gentleman on calling the attention of the committee to the fact that this affects not only those of us who represent fishing in New England but the fishing interests throughout the entire Nation.

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

Mr. TOLLEFSON. I yield.

Mr. ALLEN of California. I join the gentleman in hoping this amendment will be adopted. I think it is worthwhile to point out that at the hearings mentioned it was shown that the fishery industry produces a product worth about $1 billion per year as against $35 billion coming from our other source of food, agriculture. On the other side, it was shown that over the years Federal aid and assistance and promotion of products of agriculture has been slightly over $7 per ton per year while the amount that has been invested in the preservation of the fisheries has been something less than 75 cents a year. This is an industry which must be developed by the investigations on the high seas and only the Government can carry on those investigations.

Mr. TOLLEFSON. I thank the gentleman from California for his contribution. Let me repeat, Mr. Chairman, these programs are very much worthwhile. They pay dividends to the Government. It is not money thrown down

the drain or in a rat hole. They pay back dividends to the Federal Government in the employment of citizens who in turn, of course, pay income taxes. I am sure the committee will approve the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. KNOX. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. BATES].

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. KNOX to the amendment offered by Mr. BATES: At the end of the amendment offered by Mr. BATES, insert "of which not to exceed $320,000 shall be available for the lamprey eel program."

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, we have no objection on this side to either the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. BATES] or the amendment to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. KNOX].

Mr. KNOX. Mr. Chairman, this amendment is offered because of a condition which has arisen in the area of the Great Lakes. Although the Congress has appropriated some $2 million for the research survey and control program of eradicating the lamprey eel, this year is the first year that the Canadian Government has recognized the lamprey eel as a menace to the Great Lakes fishing industry. Therefore, this year the Canadian Government is appropriating $320,000, the same amount of money which I am asking that you earmark in this appropriation for the control of the lamprey eel. The budget request of the Fish and Wildlife Service for use by the Great Lakes fishery investigations during the fiscal year 1955 was cut by the Bureau of the Budget from $400,000 to $180,000. The Fish and Wildlife Service of the Department of the Interior approved the original request and has an item to meet the following commitments which embody the program organized for the fiscal year 1955. The first is the operation in the 1954 budget of lamprey control structures on Lake Superior and Michigan during the month of July 1954, of approximately 75 structures from April 1 through June 30, 1955.

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

Mr. KNOX. I yield.

Mr. TOLLEFSON. Is the gentleman's amendment a permissive amendment which permits the use of funds for this purpose or does your amendment direct the Fish and Wildlife Service to use the funds for this purpose.

Mr. KNOX. It directs the Fish and Wildlife Service to spend not exceeding $320,000.

Mr. TOLLEFSON. It is an absolute direction then?

Mr. KNOX. I would say it is a direction not to exceed $320,000. If the program costs less than that, they could spend less.

Mr. TOLLEFSON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that we may have the amendment reread.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The Clerk again read the amendment to the amendment.

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

Mr. KNOX. I yield.

Mr. NICHOLSON. This lamprey-eel proposition has been put through here on special bills or special appropriations in former years; is that not correct?

Mr. KNOX. It has been a part of the recommendations of the Fish and Wildlife Service, and has been recommended by the committee of the other body on two occasions, as I recall, they raised the appropriation that was made by the House. Last year we had, I believe, $140,000 in the budget. The Senate raised it to $400,000. This year they are still asking for $400,000 from the Fish and Wildlife Service. However, the Canadian Government has come into the picture and is appropriating $320,000. Therefore, I think there is justification for not asking in excess of $320,000 from the United States Government so that we may cooperate with the Canadian Government.

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

Mr. KNOX. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. LANE. Would the gentleman be willing to strike out the word "shall" in his amendment and insert the word "may," in order that the amendment in which you are interested may be of a permissive nature? Would the gentleman agree to that?

Mr. KNOX. Yes. I would accept the recommendation.

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

Mr. KNOX. I yield.

Mr. JENSEN. I think it should be explained that there is already $180,000 in this bill for the sea lamprey.

Mr. KNOX. There is $180,000.

Mr. JENSEN. This simply permits the Fish and Wildlife Service to expend, if they see fit, another $140,000, or enough more up to $140,000 for the eradication of the sea lamprey.

Mr. KNOX. There is nothing mandatory that they shall spend it all, but they cannot exceed that amount.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman desire to modify his amendment?

Mr. KNOX. No, Mr. Chairman. I will leave the amendment as it is.

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

(By unanimous consent, Mr. KNOX was granted 5 additional minutes.)

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

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

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the gentleman's amendment. I wish to call the attention of the Members of the House to the fact that there are two things that are practically destroying all the fish life in the Great Lakes. Fish is food. The question of the lamprey and the question of the pollution of the fresh waters of this country is practically making all of our streams, lakes, and rivers devoid of fish life. This past week my attention has been called to the fact that so many fish have been killed in the Niagara River that they are damming up the water supply at Buffalo. A bill has been introduced to continue the investigation into the pollution of streams. That is a subject that should be taken care of between the two Governments, just as this money which you propose be allocated to meet the Canadian effort to keep the fish life alive in the Great Lakes.

Mr. KNOX. I thank the gentleman.

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

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

Mr. MEADER. I would like to direct the attention of the Members to page 219 of the hearings before the committee indicating that the funds in the past have been used on this program to develop devices and methods to attack the lamprey eel, which has destroyed the trout in the Great Lakes. They are are now ready to implement those devices and those plans by actually carrying out a program of destruction or control of the lamprey eel. Without funds to carry forward that program, the money which has been spent on the research in the past will be wasted.

Mr. KNOX. The gentleman's remarks are exactly true.

Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KNOX. I yield to the gentlewoman from Ohio.

Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON. I want to thank the gentleman who has just spoken. He has said exactly what I had intended to say. However, I would like to remind the older Members of the keen interest of our onetime colleague, the Honorable John Rankin, in the lamprey eel and its depredations on the Great Lakes and in our water supply. He was very, very urgent that we do something about it, and I am sure he will be happy to know we are taking positive steps to preserve the fish of the Great Lakes. Certainly we on Lake Erie know how much this action is needed.

Mr. KNOX. I thank the gentlewoman from Ohio very much.

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

Mr. KNOX. I yield.

Mr. McCORMACK. I was very much interested in the observation of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DONDERO], the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MEADER], and the gentleman who has the floor, and I am very much impressed with the argument, but why did you not make a motion to add $300,000 rather than to take away from the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. BATES]? If you have such a just case, why did you not come in on your own feet? In case the Bates amendment is adopted, you are cutting $320,000 away from it for all practical purposes, or at least $140,000.

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

Mr. KNOX. I yield.

Mr. JENSEN. I always like to take the blame when the blame should be on my shoulders. In this case the blame is on my shoulders.

I asked the gentleman to offer the amendment, which he did. Had he offered an amendment to go above the

amount which is in the budget I would have been obliged to object. For that reason the gentleman offered it as he did. Certainly it is a fair amendment. Perhaps they will not spend all of the $140,000 and if they do not see fit to spend it, then it will not be spent. But certainly the lamprey eel has caused the most terrible destruction of fish in the Great Lakes that one can imagine. You just have to know and learn and see with your own eyes what the lamprey eel has done—and I have seen the destruction they have wreaked on the fish of the Great Lakes. Certainly it is a fair amendment and the committee accepts the amendment.

Mrs. CHURCH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KNOX. I yield.

Mrs. CHURCH. I would like to commend the gentleman on his amendment and bear witness to the fact that those of us in Illinois who share the western coast of Lake Michigan have fought for a long time the depredations of the lamprey eel. I have personally seen the seines put in the rivers and I know that the work is bearing fruit. This is therefore a very important appropriation. Before we began to control this depredation, our fishing industry out of Waukegan was well-nigh destroyed. This is a most substantial industry, and merits increased protection. I hope that the amendment will pass.

Mr. KNOX. Mr. Chairman, the appropriation item for this work is covered in H. R. 8680, page 26, line 8, under "Investigations of resources."

Accomplishments to date are summarized in the attached report which was prepared recently for the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee of the House of Representatives.

The budget request of the Fish and Wildlife Service for use of its Great Lakes fishery investigations during fiscal year 1955 was cut by the Bureau of the Budget from $400,000 to $180,000. The Fish and Wildlife Service and the Department of the Interior approved the original request as an item needed to meet the following commitments which embody the program organized for fiscal year 1955.

First. Operation of 54 sea lamprey control structures on Lakes Superior and Michigan during the month of July 1954, and approximately 75 structures from April 1 through June 30, 1955. Sea lamprey control devices are installed on all of the known major sea lamprey producing streams of Lake Superior—47—and on 7 major streams tributary to Northern Green Bay—Lake Michigan. Control on Lake Superior is critically urgent and must be continuous if lake trout stocks there are to be saved. These stocks are the only ones left which support a domestic lake trout fishery. They are our sole American source of eggs for artificial propagation, which seems necessary. Canada is moving rapidly to place control structures on spawning streams in her Lake Superior territory. It is likely that effective sea lamprey control on Lake Superior will be realized before the spawning runs of this parasite enter streams in the spring of 1955. Failure to operate the structures on United States waters would nullify the entire effort of both countries.

Second. Continuation of thorough investigations of lake trout life history as a basis for intelligent planning in the restoration of lake-trout stocks in Lakes Michigan and Huron and the maintenance of stocks in Lake Superior: Studies in progress of remnant lake-trout stocks in Lake Michigan strongly indicate little or no natural recruitment. Reestablishment of lake-trout populations there and in Lake Huron almost surely will require the efficient use of artificially reared fish. We must learn the most effective means of handling and using this expensive product. Since small lake trout are not especially sought out by sea lampreys, it seems reasonable to begin stocking Lakes Michigan and Huron as soon as effective control of sea lamprey spawning populations is in prospect. Reestablishment of lake-trout stocks simultaneously with the application of sea-lamprey control efforts will shorten materially the time required to rebuild the once profitable lake-trout fishery. Delay in gaining the knowledge necessary to do this work would be inefficient and would add greatly to the ultimate cost of reestablishing the fishery.

Third. Investigation of the problem of enormous increases in abundance of small, unmarketable chubs in Lakes Michigan and Huron as a result of destruction of the major predatory species—lake trout and burbot—by sea lampreys: Rapidly mounting evidence indicates that the release of various species of chubs, especially a variety known locally as the "bloater," from predation by lake trout and burbot has resulted in phenomenal increases in their populations. Bloaters were long kept in balance by the lake trout which consumed many millions of pounds of these small fish each year. Bloaters are too small and thin to be acceptable on the present market. They are now so abundant that they are threatening the fishery which has developed for other species of chubs in the past 10 years. They are caught in gill nets in such vast numbers that the cost of their removal reduces the margin of profit in the chub fishery to a point where the business is a definite risk. It is essential that their effect on the productive capacity of Lakes Michigan and Huron be ascertained. We must also attempt to devise some means whereby they can be utilized economically.

Fourth. Continued laboratory search for, and field testing of poisons specific in their action to lamprey larvae: The successful development of a larvacide specific to young sea lampreys in streams would provide direct and immediate means of controlling sea-lamprey predation. In contrast to control methods now in use—control of spawning adults after they have been parasitic on fishes—a procedure that can show benefits only after 4 or 5 years—all generations of larvae could be killed at once. No succeeding generations would remain to mature as parasites, especially if the adult population in the lake were blocked from spawning streams by the electrical barriers now in place or yet to be installed. The Service is now testing about 6,000 compounds to determine their effect on sea-lamprey larvae and associated fishes. Some promising leads have been uncovered. Termination of this work prior to completion would nullify the entire project and waste much or all of the funds already expended.

Fifth. Maintenance of adequate statistics on the Great Lakes fish catch, intensity of fishing, and abundance of stocks: The quality of statistics on the Great Lakes fishery is unquestionably the highest for any important fishery in the United States. This standard of excellence has been made possible by close cooperation between the Service and the eight Great Lakes States—all of which collect statistics along procedures developed by the Great Lakes staff. Six of the States annually turn their records over to the Service for analysis; two make their own analyses by methods recommended by the Service. The maintenance of this recordkeeping and the attendant analyses are indispensable to the intelligent management of the fishery resources. The eight States on the Great Lakes as well as the Service make greater use of these invaluable records each year.

Reduction of the funds available to Great Lakes fishery investigations to $180,000 would, first, reduce the sea-lamprey-control program to operation of most of the structures on Lake Superior; second, provide for no maintenance or upkeep of control devices; third, stop all plans for completion of the sea-lamprey-control program; fourth, disperse experienced personnel; fifth, eliminate the search for and development of a toxicant for sea-lamprey larvae; sixth, force the tying up of research vessels; seventh, stop all field work on lake trout and on the chub problem; eighth, reduce gravely the effectiveness of the United States effort in the presently excellent informal cooperation with Canadian Federal Government and the Province of Ontario in construction and operation of sea-lamprey-control structures—the Canadian budget for their next fiscal year is reported to be $320,000 their first full year of activity; and, ninth, endanger the continuity of valuable statistical records.

Mr. BENNETT of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I am glad to support the amendment of my colleague from Michigan [Mr. KNOX] to authorize $320,000 for the investigation and control of sea lampreys in the Great Lakes.

The Fish and Wildlife Service has done an excellent job on this program. I am advised that the program of research on fisheries and on sea lamprey control in the Great Lakes consisted of the following principal phases:

First. Complete studies on electrical and electromechanical barriers designed to stop migration and prevent spawning of adult sea lampreys.

Second. Install and operate a pilot-control project on Lake Superior. This project included the construction and operation of 23 electrical sea lamprey control structures on streams known or strongly believed to harbor established runs of sea lampreys.

Third. Survey additional streams tributary to Lake Superior to determine: (a) Their suitability as sea lamprey spawning areas; (b) their potential as sea lamprey producers; (c) their adaptability to control measures; and (d) their relative ranking or priority in a planned control operation.

Fourth. Investigate other phases of sea lamprey natural history and behavior.

Fifth. Continue investigations into the life history of the lake trout in the Great Lakes for the purpose of learning ways and means of effectively and efficiently restoring the greatly reduced populations concurrent with sea lamprey control: (a) Evaluating present procedures and developing possible new ones in artificial propagation to accomplish the best use of the hatchery product; (b) discovering the migratory and spawning habits, vertical and horizontal distribution, growth rate, recruitment rate, age composition of stocks and survival of lake trout; (c) learning the feeding habits of lake trout and their relation to other fish populations; and (d) establishing an abundance index, if possible, for the smaller lake trout in populations in Lakes Huron and Michigan.

Sixth. Intensify inquiries into the environment, life history, and habits of all Great Lakes fish species, especially those of direct economic importance to accumulate a sound background for management and for utilization on a maximum sustained yield basis.

A good start has been made and much has been accomplished, but all of the good work that has been done will go for naught unless an adequate sum is provided to carry out the work projects outlined for the next fiscal year.

The preservation and restoration of trout in the Great Lakes is of great national importance. It can only be done if adequate funds are given the Fish and Wildlife Service for that purpose. I sincerely hope that my colleague's amendment will be adopted.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I think we ought to clarify the situation because I think I see a little constructive conspiracy—notice I said "constructive"—that is operating, and I fear that a lot of Members little realize what it is.

The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. BATES], offered an amendment to raise the appropriation to the amount recommended in the budget message. I thought my friend from Iowa was going to accept it. Probably I was proceeding upon an erroneous premise, but I had an idea that the gentleman was going to accept it.

Then the gentleman from Michigan offered an amendment which in fact takes away from the amount that the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. BATES], had, at least the sum of $140,000. Is that correct? I will yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. BATES], to answer.

Mr. BATES. The figure is correct.

Mr. McCORMACK. The amount proprosed by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. BATES], is a benefit to New England, along the coast, the gulf; it benefits the other areas of the country and the country generally. This cuts in on it.

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

Mr. McCORMACK. Of course I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. JENSEN. May I say to the gentleman that I can assure him that the gentleman from Iowa did not know that the gentleman from Michigan was going to offer his amendment when I agreed to accept the Bates amendment.

Mr. McCORMACK. I thought the gentleman said he asked the gentleman from Michigan to offer the amendment.

Mr. JENSEN. After the Bates amendment had been accepted.

Mr. McCORMACK. After the Bates amendment? Now, you had better do some explaining.

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

Mr. McCORMACK. Certainly.

Mr. KNOX. I may say to the gentleman from Massachusetts that I did offer the amendment to raise the total amount. I discussed the question with the chairman and others here in the Congress. They thought that we should not raise the entire amount but that we should take the $320,000, earmark it out of the total amount that was arrived at through the Bates amendment. That is the reason I have operated as I have. That $320,000 will bring about control of the lamprey eel in the Great Lakes and the fresh waters of this Nation.

Mr. BATES. I would like to ask the gentleman from Michigan how much was in the budget for this particular item?

Mr. KNOX. The request was for $400,000 and the budget recommended $180,000.

Mr. BATES. How much did the committee trim it?

Mr. KNOX. To $180,000.

Mr. BATES. How much was in the budget?

Mr. KNOX. $400,000 was requested.

Mr. BATES. Mr. Chairman, the thing I fail to understand is why we should set aside any amount of money for a specific cause. Coming from New England, and with Gloucester in my district, I should be concerned primarily with ground fishing, but I do not think that would be fair to those along the Atlantic coast, in Alaska or on the Pacific coast; so I offered an amendment in a lump sum so everybody might get what they needed.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 5 additional minutes.

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

There was no objection.

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

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

Mr. JENSEN. Let me say that if this $140,000 is allocated to the eradication of the lamprey eel, it will take about 3 percent off of the amount that we are appropriating.

Mr. McCORMACK. We have not been allowed anything yet.

Mr. JENSEN. Yes. $140,000 is about 3 percent of $4,700,000. So you are just crying over a little thing here.

Mr. McCORMACK. No. Now just a minute. You are crying over a little thing because the gentleman says he agreed to accept the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. BATES]. Is that correct?

Mr. JENSEN. Yes.

Mr. McCORMACK. Later the gentleman suggested to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. KNOX], that he offer his amendment, which is inconsistent somewhat with the promise he made to the gentleman from Massachusetts, it seems to me.

Mr. JENSEN. I have done a little figuring myself.

Mr. McCORMACK. I know the gentleman's intent is absolutely honorable. We will have no question on anything like that.

Mr. JENSEN. This $140,000, if the gentleman's amendment is agreed to, is taken out of the full amount. Your $140,000 does not come out of the $527,000, which is included in the Bates amendment. It comes out of the $4,027,000.

Mr. McCORMACK. The gentleman still has not got himself out of his uncomfortable position.

Mr. JENSEN. I am not uncomfortable at all.

Mr. McCORMACK. I am trying to help the gentleman get out of it. I know he has promised to accept the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts. But this amendment here is somewhat inconsistent.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, a point of order. No one seems to be addressing the Chair and you cannot tell who has the floor.

The CHAIRMAN. It has gotten to be the custom here not to address the Chair. The gentleman from Massachusetts has the floor.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I would like to inquire how the gentleman from Iowa got into it?

The CHAIRMAN. He yielded to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I understood the Chairman to say he yielded to a gentleman over there.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, I differ with my friend from Iowa, but I always respect him.

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

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

Mr. PRICE. Every Member of the House is familiar with the lamprey eel problem. Everyone is interested in it. We voted to appropriate funds to do something about it, and I think we are sympathetic with the problem of those Members in the Great Lakes area. We would like to help them, many to the extent we would vote for a separate appropriation, but, as I pointed out in the remarks I made earlier, this $4,027,000 is spread very, very thin now, and if you allocate another

$140,000 of it to this particular purpose, there would be that much less left. We have got to remember there is only about $381,000 in this bill for study and investigatory work of the diseases of fish in the whole system of streams in the country. There are millions of fish and millions of dollars being lost to our economy this year because of the insecticides and herbicides that have been poisoning our streams and destroying our wildlife. We are spreading this $427,000 too thin already, and if we have $427,000 for a specific purpose, we are spreading it that much further.

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

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield.

Mr. JENSEN. When I made the statement that this side of the House accepted the amendment of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. BATES]——

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. My point of order is that the Chair is not being recognized in debate.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, I yielded to the gentleman from Iowa. Mr. Chairman, to avoid any other points of order which we know should not be made, I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. JENSEN. All right. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Iowa made a statement to the effect that he would accept the Bates amendment and also the Knox amendment.

Mr. McCORMACK. Did the gentleman state that to the gentleman from Massachusetts?

Mr. JENSEN. Oh, yes. I state that publicly here now.

Mr. McCORMACK. No, no. I mean when the gentleman said he would accept the Bates amendment, did he tell the gentleman from Massachusetts that included in that would be the Knox amendment at the time?

Mr. JENSEN. No. Did I have to do that?

Mr. McCORMACK. I do not know. The gentleman may not have had to.

Mr. JENSEN. All right. Mr. Chairman, now does the gentleman want me to retract, to take back, the statement I made and just say, "I am sorry I made the statement? I retract my statement and do not accept the amendment," either one of them? Is that what the gentleman wants me to do?

Mr. McCORMACK. I simply wanted to establish the facts that I think are well established. Let me ask my friend from Iowa this——

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

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman be allowed to proceed for 5 additional minutes.

Mr. McCORMACK. No, 2 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the granting of 2 additional minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, I am wondering if we cannot get an agreement to end debate on this amendment. We have been at it over an hour, and if we are ever going to get through, we ought to get at it and kind of calm ourselves down and work it out. Let us see what we can do. Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate on this paragraph and all amendments thereto close in 10 minutes.

The motion was agreed to.

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

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield.

Mr. JENSEN. I wish at this time to retract the statement I made that I accepted the amendment.

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

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

Mr. BOLLING. I wonder if the burden of the colloquy going on would give the gentleman from Massachusetts the impression that I have had, that until this last moment when the chairman of the subcommittee retracted his statement one might have had the impression that there was an attempt to get as much political mileage out of this small amount of money as possible.

Mr. McCORMACK. I will not go into that. I am sorry to hear the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. JENSEN] say that he retracts his promise. We have gotten into an uncomfortable situation here. Where do I find myself? I want to help the Members from Michigan and from the Great Lakes. I realize their plight. The Bates amendment was going to bring some help to them.

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

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield.

Mr TOLLEFSON. In the report that the committee made there were no exceptions made beyond the $180,000.

Mr. McCORMACK. I will accept the gentleman's statement on that but, in any event, the gentleman's amendment will take away at least $140,000 of the effect of the Bates amendment. Is that correct?

Mr. TOLLEFSON. I do not believe that is correct.

Mr. McCORMACK. I will ask the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. BATES].

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman from Massachusetts yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield.

Mr. JENSEN. The gentleman just heard me explain a minute ago that the $140,000 comes out of the full amount.

Mr. McCORMACK. I understand that. But it diminishes the full effect of the Bates amendment; is that correct?

Mr. JENSEN. To the extent of 3 percent, yes.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has expired. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Montana [Mr. METCALF] for 2 minutes.

Mr. METCALF. Mr. Chairman, I want to associate myself with the Bates amendment. I had planned to associate myself with the amendment for $4,460,000, offered by the gentleman from Illinois, [Mr. PRICE].

I want to remind the committee that this is not an amendment such as I previously introduced that would provide for waterfowl refuges that would benefit sportsmen. This amendment benefits everyone. It benefits the small businessman who has to rely on the tourist traffic and the sportsmen who come in and buy guns and fishing rods and so forth. It benefits all walks of life. It benefits not only the people who are interested in a study of the diseases of fish and wildlife, but it benefits the farmers who are interested in control of bird damage through the research that will be done. This amendment would benefit the livestock operator whose cattle are grazing on the public lands and the public ranges, because there are diseases that are transmitted to domestic animals and proper research would control the transmission of such diseases.

I should like to have the committee support the Bates amendment wholeheartedly, and I am sure that they will.

I assure you, Mr. Chairman, that the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. BATES] will return manyfold to the people of the United States the amount that they are going to spend for research and experiment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. O'NEILL] for 1 minute.

(By unanimous consent, at the request of Mr. O'NEILL, the Bates amendment and the Knox amendment were again reported.)

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Chairman, I agree that there is great reason for the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. KNOX], and perhaps it does not scuttle the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. BATES]; but what it actually does, in effect, is earmark a certain proportion of the money in this paragraph. The fishing industry in New England, and, in fact, all the Coastal States, is in a great economic plight. In view of the fact that the gentleman from Michigan has earmarked $150,000 for a specific issue, I think perhaps the gentleman from Massachusetts ought to earmark his amendment so that we would provide that a scientific and economic study be made.

Mr. BATES. Does the gentleman put that as a question?

Mr. O'NEILL. I am making a suggestion.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. NICHOLSON].

Mr. NICHOLSON. Mr. Chairman, I think this is an unfair way to go about making up this budget. All the Bates amendment did was to put back what the Budget Bureau allowed. We from Massachusetts provide a certain amount of money, annually, thousands of dollars, for elimination of starfish. Why do we not talk about the borers that go into the oysters and the quahaugs, and have something done about that? We should look into these things.

Our shores have been depleted of softshell clams. Twenty-five years ago we were getting hundreds of thousands of barrels at $3 a barrel. Now we have to go into the State of Maine, and I think

some of them are bootlegged down to us for $18 to $20 a barrel.

Mr. Chairman, this lamprey business came in here when the gentleman from Michigan was here who now has gone to the Senate. He brought his eels in here and showed them to us. We appropriated money to take care of that problem, and we are willing to do it again, but let us do it in a proper way. If he wants $140,000 more, or $240,000, put it in there, and let us do it for lamprey eels or anything else. Let us conserve the natural resources we have. But it looks to me as though our problems will have to hang fire until they have spent $240,000 on the lampreys in Lake Michigan or Lake Superior, or wherever they are.

We are not asking for an increase in the appropriation. All we are asking for is the appropriation that was submitted and approved by everybody, and then they cut a half a million dollars out of it. All we want to do is have it restored.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GAVIN].

Mr. GAVIN. I have listened with a great deal of interest to this discussion. I know all of us approach legislation unselfishly. We are just interested in the welfare of this great Nation of ours. But I have listened to the talk about the mackerel on the Northeast coast, and then we heard about the salmon on the Northwest coast. Then we hear about this scourge, this menace, the lamprey eel in the Great Lakes, which must be eradicated.

I wonder if any of you ever thought about brook trout in the streams throughout the Nation? When the sportsmen throughout the Nation hear the action that has been taken of cutting off $863,000 from Fish and Wildlife Service and management of resources, you fellows are going to hear something about brook trout and wildlife. I think it is about time we gave some attention to the great outdoors and to the great recreational facilities afforded to the American people and to the stocking up of streams protecting our game and wildlife to permit the youth of America to do some hunting and fishing once in a while. I know you are all interested in the problems concerning your respective districts, but look at it in a big, broad way and start to give a little attention to our national forests, our streams, the stocking of the streams and the preservation and protection of our wildlife for the benefit of the American people.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER].

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I want to see if we can get this matter settled somehow. May I suggest to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. KNOX], if he would change his amendment which now provides that $320,000 shall be available for the lamprey eel program, and to cut that down so that it would provide a couple of hundred thousand dollars or something like that.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, there is $180,000 already provided.

Mr. TABER. Then, suppose you make it $250,000. That would give you $70,000 more, and in a way would be splitting the difference between you, and it would get this matter fixed up on this figure that the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. BATES] has provided. Why do you not do that?

Mr. KNOX. I would be very happy to cooperate in every way, but I would like to point out that the Canadian Government is involved in this lamprey eel control this year, and they are appropriating a certain amount.

Mr. TABER. Yes; but we are in a mess, and we only have a minute to get out of it. If you do not do business while we are up against it, we will have to oppose all of it.

Mr. KNOX. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that my amendment to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. BATES] may be withdrawn so that I may offer another amendment.

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

There was no objection.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. KNOX: On page 26, line 15, strike out "$4,027,000" and insert "$4,167,000 of which not to exceed $320,000 shall be available for the lamprey eel."

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, would the gentleman change that to $250,000?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, may I at this time ask the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. BATES] if he will accept the amendment to his amendment, which will be corrected in the amount of $250,000?

Mr. BATES. I will accept that.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Michigan desire to ask unanimous consent to modify his amendment in accordance with the statement made by the gentleman from Iowa?

Mr. KNOX. Yes, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. Will the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. KNOX] offer his amendment as modified?

The Clerk will report the modified amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. KNOX to the amendment offered by Mr. BATES: At the end of Mr. BATES' amendment insert the following: "of which not to exceed $250,000 shall be available for the lamprey eel program."

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. DONDERO. How much money does that provide for the lamprey eel investigation or procedure to try to do away with it?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman does not state a parliamentary inquiry.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentlewoman will state it.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Is there any way that I can get time at the present time?

The CHAIRMAN. All time has expired.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I want to express my great interest in the fishing industry and the Bates amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. All time has expired.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, the Knox amendment has been accepted by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. BATES] and apparently by everyone else who is interested in this bill.

I now make the statement that this side of the House is not opposed to the Bates amendment or to the amendment to the Bates amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question occurs on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. KNOX] to the amendment proposed by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. BATES].

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The question occurs on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. BATES] as amended.

Mr. NICHOLSON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment as amended be read.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BATES, as amended: On page 26, line 15, strike out "$3,500,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$4,027,000, of which not to exceed $250,000 shall be available for the lamprey eel program."

The CHAIRMAN. The question occurs on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. BATES] as amended by the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. KNOX].

The amendment as amended was agreed to.

Mr. BENNETT of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks immediately following the remarks of my colleague from Michigan [Mr. KNOX].

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

ALASKA PUBLIC WORKS

For an additional amount for expenses necessary for carrying out the provisions of the act of August 24, 1949 (Public Law 264), to remain available until June 30, 1955, $5,000,000, of which not to exceed $570,000 shall be available for administrative expenses.

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, it had been my intention to offer several amendments to this bill which in its Alaska provisions is so important to the Territory; but after considerable reflection and perhaps—this is merely conjecture—for the same reason that might have actuated the gentleman from Montana a while ago I have decided to substitute talk for any attempt at direct action. If, however, the chairman of the committee should want to acquiesce in any amendment I

might propose, I would be glad to save the time of the committee and not proceed further. I can tell now I had better go ahead.

Actually, the amounts at stake in the reduction of the budget estimates regarding Alaska are more important than those which were involved in the matter which consumed so much time in the debate which has just concluded.

It was mentioned here yesterday in general debate that the overall cut from the Budget recommendation had been something in the order of 12½ percent.

The reduction in respect to those programs administered in Alaska by the Office of Territories of the Interior Department is much greater in degree. The House allowance of $23,421,000 represents a reduction of 35½ percent under the amount appropriated for these activities in the current fiscal year, and a reduction of 41.6 percent in the amount requested by the Department of the Interior for 1955. Needless to say, a cut of this size cannot help but have an effect on our programs in the Territory as well as having an adverse impact on the economy of the Territory.

It is impossible, Mr. Chairman, to determine what the extent of the cuts are in the important appropriations for Alaska having to do with the Fish and Wildlife Service, the Bureau of Indian Affairs, and the Geological Survey, Bureau of Land Management, and other activities, because the Alaska items are included in the whole, and not until final action has been had on this bill and it has been signed into law will an administrative determination be made as to allotments for Alaska.

I was terribly concerned to learn that the Bureau of Indian Affairs is not going to provide any financing at all for the cooperative salmon canneries in southeastern Alaska which have been operated by the Indian people there for the last several years. New regulations are in effect this year relating to the taking of salmon from Alaska waters, and there will be a considerable curtailment and a combining of cannery operations. I think it should not have proceeded to the point where every last one of these cooperative canneries upon which the Indian people depend to such a very considerable extent should have been closed down as the Bureau of Indian Affairs informs me today is now contemplated.

The canneries at Angoon, Hydaburg, Kiawock, and Kake will not operate this year.

Mr. Chairman, the committee allowed the budget request of $5 million for Alaska public works. We were hopeful that the Department of the Interior presentation for an appropriation of $10 million would be allowed. This $5 million figure represents a 58-percent reduction from fiscal 1954 and is going to have a very hard and harsh impact upon the whole public works undertaking in Alaska.

During the House hearings on the Alaska public works items the committee was advised of the projects which had been deleted from our original request as a result of the $5 million reduction made by the Bureau of the Budget in that request. These projects were:

Applicant-location	Type	Estimated cost
Territory of Alaska, Anvik.	School	$134,416
Petersburg, city of	Water, streets, sewer.	460,959
Juneau Independent School District.	High school	1,843,836
Nenana, city of	School	368,767
Territory of Alaska, Sitka.	Pioneers' home addition.	800,000
Valdez, city of	Hospital	460,000
Anchorage, city of	Water system rehabilitation and extensions.	500,000
Do	Street improvements.	340,000
Seldovia, city of	School general purpose room.	400,000
		5,307,978

The present budget contains the following items:

Applicant-location	Type	Estimated cost
Territory of Alaska, Fort Yukon.	School	$416,250
Juneau, city of	Streets	376,450
Territory of Alaska, College.	Utilities	532,000
Skagway, city of	School addition	239,200
Anchorage Independent School District.	School addition	347,200
Anchorage, city of	Sewer extension	290,800
Nome, city of	School	585,000
Fairbanks, city of	Sewer extension	469,300
Kake, city of	School	250,900
Anchorage, city of	Sewer extension	452,600
Haines Independent School District.	School	470,300
		4,430,000
Administration		570,000
Total		5,000,000

It was my hope that the House would take action to reinstate some of the projects which had been deleted by reason of the Bureau of the Budget actions. None of these projects were reinstated.

Since the inception of the Alaska public-works program, $41,208,200 has been appropriated of the $70 million authorized by the Public Works Act, leaving approximately $29 million yet to be appropriated of which $5 million is being requested in 1955. At the present time, all of the $41,208,200 has been allocated. Of these allocations, contracts have been awarded against 58 projects, the status of which is as follows:

Thirty-three have been completed.

Ten are substantially complete.

Fifteen are under construction.

An additional 19 projects are currently being processed so that contracts can be awarded this spring and summer. Nine allotments have been made for advance planning.

At the present time, there is approximately $12 million available for awarding contracts against the 19 allocations now being processed. When these awards are made, the present funds on hand will be fully committed.

If $5 million is appropriated for 1955, 11 additional projects will be undertaken during the fiscal year 1955.

Presently the Alaska Public Works has on hand unprocessed applications covering 54 projects which are estimated at $34 million and are divided into the following categories:

Schools	22
Other public buildings	8
Water, streets, sewer, and other facilities	24

It would appear that if $5 million is appropriated for 1955, there will be about $24 million remaining of the $70 million originally authorized against which there are now $34 million in applications not yet acted upon.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words.

Mr. Chairman, I deeply regretted I could not secure time previously in order to speak on behalf of the Bates amendment providing more money for the conservation and investigation and promotion of the fishing industry.

The fishing industry is very vital to us in Massachusetts. And the situation in the industry is very critical. It would be a calamity to have it curtailed.

I am firmly of the conviction, Mr. Chairman, that the Senate will increase the amount the committee has just appropriated for this purpose, so I do not feel very anxious now about the amendment that would limit the provisions of the Bates amendment.

I do not believe anyone can dispute the fact that we have in Massachusetts delicious fish that is second to none in the entire country.

There is a bill in the Senate by Senator SALTONSTALL and Senator KENNEDY, the passage of which would help our industry.

The Clerk read as follows:

Operation and maintenance of roads, Alaska

For operation and maintenance of roads, tramways, buildings, ferries, bridges, and trails, $3 million.

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to confirm what the Delegate from Alaska has stated about the cuts which have been made in the appropriations this year for the Territory of Alaska. This is a reduction of 32½ percent over the amount which was appropriated for the fiscal year 1954 and it is a reduction of 41.6 percent of the amount requested by the Interior Department from the Bureau of the Budget.

It seems strange that just a few days ago the House unanimously authorized a continuance of public works in Alaska and now the Appropriations Committee turns around and cuts the amount which is requested for public works.

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

Mr. SAYLOR. I yield to the gentleman from Alaska.

Mr. BARTLETT. I appreciate what the gentleman is saying and I want to add to it the fact that these communities which were expecting an appropriation went ahead and spent their own money for advance planning and made all the arrangements they could, having had substantial assurances that if they

did so that money would be allotted to them. Half of the money they will pay back to the Federal Treasury.

Mr. SAYLOR. That is correct. In the public works program in Alaska, which this Congress authorized, there were 58 projects, of which 33 have already been completed, 10 of them have been substantially completed and 15 are under construction. The money requested this year would have been sufficient to complete this work.

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

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

Mr. FENTON. I may say that the committee did not cut the amount the Budget requested. The exact amount the Budget recommended was $5 million.

Mr. SAYLOR. That is correct, that is the amount the Bureau of the Budget recommended, but the department requested $10 million to complete the work this year, which is $2 million less than was appropriated by the Congress for fiscal 1954. I am very frank to say that I sincerely believe this tremendous cut will place an undue hardship upon the Director of Territories in his administration of the great Territory of Alaska.

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, the reduction for road construction by the Alaska Road Commission, which builds all the roads on the public domain in the Territory, is much more drastic and much deeper than the program to which the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SAYLOR], and I previously referred. The amount in the bill for construction purposes represents a cut of 61 percent from the money appropriated for this fiscal year. I submit, Mr. Chairman, that that cut is too drastic and will do grave injury to the road-building program in Alaska. For example, we had a budget request of $11,994,000 for road construction by the ARC—that is the Alaska Road Commission—in Alaska for this fiscal year, and that represented a substantial reduction, I might add, from the preceding year. The amount which had been approved by the Bureau of the Budget was $11,994,000. This was reduced by the committee to $7,494,000. The reduction by the Bureau of the Budget in the Department's request for the construction of roads resulted in the elimination of the $3 million requested for continuation of work on the Copper River Highway—that was even before it got to the Congress—and a reduction of $1,250,000 originally requested for road improvements and a bridge replacement to $800,000; also the amount of $400,000 requested for continuation of construction on the Denali Highway was reduced to $200,000, and $100,000 asked for the beginning of construction of the Fairbanks-Meana Road was eliminated entirely. I think that was a great mistake, Mr. Chairman, because this was an appropriate time to start construction of the highway which had been approved by the Alaska Road Commission to extend from Fairbanks to Meana.

I submit here the history of some of our important appropriation items:

	Appropriated 1954	Departmental request 1955	Budget Bureau allowance	House allowance
Territory of Alaska:				
Governor's Office	$112,500	$98,500	$97,400	$97,400
Legislative expenses		48,000	48,000	45,000
Care and custody of Alaskan insane	798,600	784,600	784,600	784,600
Alaska public works	12,000,000	10,000,000	5,000,000	5,000,000
Construction of roads, Alaska	14,600,000	13,690,000	9,940,000	7,000,000
Operation and maintenance of roads, Alaska	3,000,000	3,500,000	3,500,000	3,000,000
Construction, Alaska Railroad	4,215,000	11,994,000	11,994,000	7,494,000
Grand total	34,726,100	40,115,100	31,364,000	23,421,000

CONSTRUCTION OF ROADS, ALASKA

The reduction by the Bureau of the Budget in the Department's request for the construction of roads, Alaska, resulted in the elimination of the $3 million requested for continuation of work on the Copper River highway, and a reduction of $1,250,000 originally requested for road improvements and bridge replacements to $800,000. Also, the amount of $400,000 requested for continuation of construction on the Denali Highway was reduced to $200,000, and the $100,000 asked for the beginning of construction on the Fairbanks-Nenana road was eliminated.

The House Appropriations Committee further reduced the amount requested for construction of roads in the amount of $2,940,000 and stated that of the amount recommended, $700,000 should be used for construction on the Copper River road. This necessitates a reduction of $3,640,000 in the work program as submitted to the House committee. The application of the $2,940,000 reduction and the provision for $700,000 for the Copper River road results in the following changes:

	Budget Bureau allowance	Revision based on House allowances
Richardson Highway, asphalt surfacing	$4,000,000	$2,000,000
Alaska Highway, asphalt surfacing	2,390,000	1,000,000
Denali Highway	1,500,000	1,250,000
Copper River Highway		700,000

The Department is requesting restoration of the $2,940,000 reduction made by the House committee. If the request is approved, the funds will be added to the foregoing revisions as follows:

Richardson Highway	$1,650,000
Alaska Highway	1,040,000
Denali Highway	250,000

The Clerk read as follows:

Construction, Alaska Railroad

For the authorized work of the Alaska Railroad, including improvements and new construction, to remain available until expended, $7,494,000: *Provided,* That funds appropriated under this head may be transferred to the Alaska Railroad revolving fund for purposes of accounting and administration.

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, we are requesting restoration of the $4,500,000 reduction by the House committee. Without the $4,500,000, the bridge, trestle, culvert, and tunnel replacement and repair programs will be greatly slowed down; much needed road improvement and the laying of new rail and placement of ties will be impossible on 52 of the 62 miles of road involved; the section buildings and the Seward shop and enginehouse facilities will not be built, and the railroad will not be able to provide the track scale, and the jitney repair and storage shop, nor will it be able to rebuild the communications line.

The Clerk read as follows:

Alaska Railroad revolving fund

The Alaska Railroad revolving fund shall continue available until expended for the work authorized by law, including operation and maintenance of oceangoing or coastwise vessels by ownership, charter, or arrangement with other branches of the Government service, for the purpose of providing additional facilities for transportation of freight, passengers, or mail, when deemed necessary for the benefit and development of industries or travel in the area served; and payment of compensation and expenses as authorized by section 42 of the act of September 7, 1916 (5 U. S. C. 793), to be reimbursed as therein provided: *Provided,* That no one other than the general manager of said railroad, and one assistant general manager at not to exceed $13,000 per annum, shall be paid an annual salary out of said fund of more than $11,000.

TITLE IV—GENERAL PROVISIONS

SEC. 401. No part of any appropriation contained in this act, or of the funds available for expenditure by any corporation included in this act, shall be used to pay the salary or wages of any person who engages in a strike against the Government of the United States or who is a member of an organization of Government employees that asserts the right to strike against the Government of the United States, or who advocates, or is a member of an organization that advocates, the overthrow of the Government of the United States by force or violence: *Provided,* That for the purposes hereof an affidavit shall be considered prima facie evidence that the person making the affidavit has not contrary to the provisions of this section engaged in a strike against the Government of the United States, is not a member of an organization of Government employees that asserts the right to strike against the Government of the United States, or that such person does not advocate, and is not a member of an organization that advocates, the overthrow of the Government of the United States by force or violence: *Provided further,* That any person who engages in a strike against the Government of the United States or who is a member of an organization of Government employees that asserts the right to strike against the Government of the United

States, or who advocates, or who is a member of an organization that advocates, the overthrow of the Government of the United States by force or violence, and accepts employment the salary or wages for which are paid from any appropriation or fund contained in this act shall be guilty of a felony and, upon conviction, shall be fined not more than $1,000 or imprisoned for not more than 1 year or both: *Provided further,* That the above penalty clause shall be in addition to, and not in substitution for, any other provisions of existing law: *Provided further,* That in cases of emergency, caused by fire, flood, storm, act of God, or sabotage, persons may be employed for period of not more than 30 days and be paid salaries and wages without the necessity of inquiring into their membership in any organization.

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

The Clerk read the amendment, as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. Bow: On page 37, after line 17, insert:

"SEC. 402. None of the funds appropriated or made available by this act shall be used to purchase articles, materials, or supplies manufactured outside the United States, its Territories or possessions, whenever the monthly report on labor force issued by the Department of Commerce indicates total unemployment in the United States to be in excess of 2 million."

Mr. BOW. Mr. Chairman, this amendment provides that none of the funds appropriated by this bill shall be used for the purchase of articles, materials, or supplies manufactured outside of the United States, its Territories or possessions, when through the Bureau of the Census it is determined that we have more than 2 million unemployed in this country.

If the Committee will read the hearings held by the subcommittee they will find large amounts of the sums heretofore appropriated have been spent for the purchase of materials outside of the United States that could have been purchased in the United States in areas now where unemployment is very large, in some of the class 4 areas of labor surplus.

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

Mr. BOW. I yield.

Mr. JENSEN. I may say that I am in complete harmony with the amendment offered by the gentleman. The facts and figures presented to the committee in the hearings will show on page 756 that 56 percent of all the generators and related equipment purchased by the Bureau of Reclamation in the fiscal year 1953 was purchased abroad. Even though we have a 25 percent differential in favor of American contractors, the fact still remains that they were underbid more than 25 percent, so that 56 percent of those items to which I have just referred, purchased by the Bureau of Reclamation, in the fiscal year 1953, were purchased abroad.

Mr. BOW. I thank the gentleman, and I should like to say this. These projects are generally for the benefit of particular areas of our country. It has been brought out time and time again that they are reimbursable and that eventually the Treasury is paid off. Nevertheless, the people of all the country contribute the taxes that build up the Treasury that finances these projects, and certainly those taxpayers in Ohio and West Virginia and the other States of the Union who are contributing have a right to have their districts considered in the purchase of articles used in the building of these large projects.

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

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

Mr. BAILEY. I want to compliment the gentleman from Ohio on the intent of his amendment. I could support the amendment on general principles without any data from the testimony before the committee.

Mr. BOW. It seemed to me that if 56 percent of our appropriation is being used for the purposes the gentleman from Iowa suggested, it certainly is time for the House to begin to protect the American workingman.

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

Mr. BOW. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. VORYS. Has the gentleman made an estimate as to how much more this might cost the American taxpayers in appropriations?

Mr. BOW. I said that these are paid back to the Treasury through the reimbursable projects, and therefore, eventually do not cost us any more.

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

Mr. BOW. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. GOLDEN. I wish to express my sympathy and wholehearted support of this amendment. I would like to see it in a lot of our bills as long as we have extensive unemployment in the United States.

Mr. BOW. I thank the gentleman.

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

Mr. Chairman, I do not think this amendment has any place in this bill. We have a State Department, and I think they are doing a pretty fair job, a good job. But when it comes to permitting the Committee on Appropriations to come in and tell the State Department what to do, in the crisis that is going on in the world today, I think we had better stop, look and listen.

Let us look at the record. If you attempted to buy 1 ton of steel a year ago in this country it would cost you 5 times what it was worth. Everybody was working overtime. I am not saying this as politics. I am telling you this was the situation in America 1 year ago. And back of that time you could not get the steel in this country. It was a gray, blue, black, every kind of market you could think of. I represent a steel town, and there are thousands idle there today. Do not think I am talking politics. I am not. Business caught up with itself last November. Politics had nothing to do with that. If they did not buy the steel abroad when they started those dams a year ago or 2 years ago, what was the use of our spending American dollars over there to start the dams? Now there are people idle all over America, yet Members come down in the well of this House and, without consulting the State Department or anybody at all who knows what is going on abroad, and say, "Let us put language in an act here that we will not buy anything abroad under certain circumstances."

Just think, this is an appropriation bill, yet we are certainly reaching out and taking in a lot of territory when we want to take on the functions and duties of the State Department. They talk here about taking over the legislative end of it, but we are going pretty far afield. Mr. Dulles is down there in the State Department, and I do not think we want to take over his duties. This committee or the Congress has no right at all to do that.

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word and rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, Congress has had some advice about the subject of this amendment which has been proposed by the gentleman from Ohio, and we got it from a very distinguished authority only last week, the President of the United States. He submitted legislation to the Congress asking that present provisions in the law be so amended as to eliminate some of the present barriers, referring to these 25 percent differentials which were mentioned, in order to lower the cost to the American taxpayer, both directly and indirectly, and to bolster the position of the United States in the effort we are now making to continue our position of leadership in the free world at the least possible cost to the American taxpayers. The President endorsed some of the recommendations made by the Randall Commission, of which the distinguished gentleman from Ohio [Mr. VORYS] was a member, and which recommendations if they go into effect in even a limited way will decide to a great extent the success or failure of our foreign policy in the next few years to come.

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

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. I yield.

Mr. VORYS. The President's recommendation following the recommendation of the Randall Commission was this: That we have no impediments to purchases abroad as to countries that do not have such impediments to our purchases, the idea being that we would get a little reciprocity in this, and that any country that does not bar our imports, we will not automatically bar theirs. The purpose behind the amendment for the proper protection of our industry is a very sound one, but my feeling is that this is not the way to go at it. The thing to do is to take a look at this Buy American idea within its four corners. I think the President's recommendation, if carried out, would protect American industries from imports that might hurt here, but it will also help American exporters abroad.

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. The adoption of this amendment, Mr. Chairman, would be a direct slap in the face to the President of the United States so far as his recommendation of last week is concerned because it is directly and completely contrary to the suggestion made by the President to the Congress.

I hope the Congress will not in this ill-conceived and hasty fashion and without any real consideration adopt this proposal which would be directly opposite to the policy suggested by the President. I regret that it is necessary for those of us on the Democratic side of the Congress to rise in defense of the policy of the President, but somebody has to do that, if we are to maintain the position of world leadership of our country today. This is not a matter of politics. This is a matter of urgent necessity, as it relates to the position of the United States in the world today. I regret to see such an effort being made to destroy the program that has been submitted to the Congress for its consideration by the President even before the Congress has hardly had the chance to read the message from the President.

Mr. Chairman, the necessity for doing something about the alleviation of unemployment in any area of our country is something that should be fully considered, but not through the action on an appropriation bill, except to furnish funds for studies and things of that sort.

We certainly have the opportunity through the various legislative committees of the House such as the Committee on Banking and Currency and the Committee on Ways and Means and the Committee on Foreign Affairs and the Committee on Public Works to which a bill, which I have introduced relative to the idea of "buy American" was referred, to consider in detail these policies in regard to purchases. I think this amendment would be an unwise legislative attempt to change the policy of our Government in an appropriation bill, and I hope the amendment will be soundly defeated.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on the pending amendment do now close.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Bow].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. SMITH of Mississippi) there were—ayes 38, noes 44.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. DONOVAN. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that when the vote was taken a quorum was not present.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will count.

Mr. DONOVAN. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw the point of order.

The Clerk concluded the reading of the bill.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, before I move that the Committee rise, I wish to say that I appreciate the fact that my colleague from Iowa [Mr. HOEVEN] has presided over the Committee of the Whole during the consideration of the bill of which I am chairman. He has presided in a most excellent, able, and patient manner, and I think he should be complimented.

Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise and report the bill back to the House with sundry amendments, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and the bill as amended do pass.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. HOEVEN, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 8680) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1955, and for other purposes, had directed him to report the same back to the House with sundry amendments adopted in Committee of the Whole, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to, and the bill as amended do pass.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the bill and all amendments to final passage.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the amendments. Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment? If not, the Chair will put them en bloc.

The amendments were agreed to.

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

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

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

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

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND REMARKS

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks on the bill just passed.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. Chairman, it would require the adoption of at least a score of amendments to make the Department of Interior appropriations bill adequate to the needs of the Pacific Northwest.

One tragic effect of this bill is to freeze development of our great Bonneville Power Administration, to prevent it from extending service to any area that the private power companies want to take over sometime in the future, and to advance the ultimate liquidation of all Federal power facilities.

This bill will increase power shortages in the Northwest, and the end result, if these policies are continued, will be to deliver domination of electricity supply to private power companies in our area and several others in the Nation.

It is completely clear, in view of the Republican determination to block needed generating and transmission appropriations, that it would be futile to offer the needed amendments.

The administration cut the Bonneville appropriations request below our area's needs. Now the subcommittee has eliminated—in the Northwest area—a considerable portion of the items which the Budget Bureau cleared, including the McNary-Walla Walla transmission facility, the McNary-LaGrande transmission line, the Dalles area service, the Bellingham substation, and the main stem transmission facility. This latter was delayed to put it on the same schedule as the completion of dams which were delayed last year. And it has been done in spite of the fact that McNary generators are installed and there is need already for a transmission facility there.

Mr. Chairman, the inadequate civil functions bill, which was passed some time ago without needed power starts, was cut from the same pattern as this bill—a pattern which Herbert Hoover prescribed a year ago at Cleveland, Ohio.

Mr. Hoover gave a step-by-step plan, in a nationwide broadcast, for halting power-facility construction and preparing to turn existing facilities over to the private power companies. To be completely clear, he said:

> The objective of the whole proceeding should be to get the Federal Government out of the business of generating and distributing power as soon as possible.

The Interior appropriation bill, drafted in accordance with Mr. Hoover's plan and his objective, ought to be returned to the committee with instructions to change its objective completely.

The new objectives should be abundant power for the economic development of the Northwest and every other region of this Nation.

The new objective should include all the facilities recommended by President Eisenhower, Hells Canyon Dam and several others in the jurisdiction of the Bureau of Reclamation. It should include enough dams so, if a defense emergency arises, there will be abundant power for necessary electrochemical plants, another Hanford and Oak Ridge and similar projects if those are necessary.

In the present situation in this House, it is useless to talk of such realistic objectives. We can only hope that the Senate will restore the most essential of these appropriations—and that the people will restore to a majority next November the party which does not sell America short and deliberately plan for shortages and scarcity.

I probably should not close without expressing gratitude for the $3 million added in this bill to the appropriation for the Columbia Basin reclamation project. It is at least $1 million less than needed, but after a diet of crumbs, a piece of crust is received gratefully. Even so, I sincerely hope the Senate will see fit to increase the Columbia Basin project appropriation to a more adequate total.

HOSPITALIZATION OF CERTAIN VETERANS IN THE PHILIPPINES

Mr. BROWN of Ohio, from the Committee on Rules, reported the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 503, Rept. No. 1489), which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

> *Resolved*, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the

Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 8044) to extend the authorization for funds for the hospitalization of certain veterans in the Philippines. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and shall continue not to exceed 1 hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

PAN-AMERICAN DAY APRIL 14

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of a resolution (H. Res. 504) which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That the House of Representatives hereby designates Wednesday, April 14, 1954, for the celebration of Pan-American Day, on which day remarks appropriate to such occasion may occur.

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

SPECIAL MEETING OF COMMITTEE ON VETERANS' AFFAIRS APRIL 7

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

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

There was objection.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I have called a meeting of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs tomorrow at 10:30 a. m. to witness demonstrations of progress that has been made in the artificial limb research and development program sponsored by the Veterans' Administration and the Department of Defense and coordinated by the National Research Council's Advisory Committee on Artificial Limbs. Brig. Gen. F. S. Strong, Jr., executive director of the advisory committee, will be on hand to present several orthopedic clinic teams who have taken advantage of the results of the research program and who will demonstrate before the committee what can be done for both arm and leg amputees at the present time. I have brought to the floor with me today several products of the research program that are now commercially available and which represent a significant advance over those available to amputees before the inauguration of this project in 1945. These items, which are only a few of the many that have been introduced during the past few years, will be available for your inspection at the close of this session. Many more will be shown tomorrow.

Written invitations have been sent to each of you, but I would like to take this opportunity to extend at this time a more personal invitation to attend this most interesting and informative meeting of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs tomorrow morning at 10:30 in the caucus room of the Old House Office Building.

STRENGTHENING ESPIONAGE LEGISLATION

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. Speaker, I should like to call the attention of the House to the fact that in his annual report to the Congress, the Attorney General, Hon. Herbert Brownell, Jr., has urged that legislation dealing with espionage be strengthened to allow the courts to impose the death penalty on persons convicted of espionage even in peacetime.

In his report to Congress, Mr. Brownell noted that the present laws draw a distinction between wartime and peacetime espionage. Mr. Brownell is quoted as saying:

I fail to perceive any justification for any such distinction inasmuch as the essence of this crime is the intent to breach the national security, which security is of paramount importance whether in war or peace.

The Attorney General has also pointed out that, by making peacetime spying a capital offense, it would remove the present statute of limitations under which the Government must institute prosecution within 10 years or lose the chance to move against spies.

I would like to call to your attention also the fact that the House Committee on Un-American Activities, through its investigations and hearings, has remained vigilant in its directed duties to insure against subversion. In its annual report for the year 1951, the House Committee on Un-American Activities made the following recommendation for legislation:

A single comprehensive espionage statute applicable to both peacetime and wartime: This should incorporate the present provisions of wartime espionage statutes, carrying a capital punishment sentence. The statute of limitations would not then apply in espionage any more than it applies to other crimes carrying a capital punishment.

During this, the 83d Congress, the Attorney General has asked for legislation in three matters which the House Committee on Un-American Activities has recommended over a period of years. In addition to the recommendation I have just referred to, the Attorney General has recommended, as has the House committee, the admissibility of wiretapping evidence and the granting of immunity to witnesses.

It is my hope that the House will give early attention to the requests of the Attorney General in order that our security statutes will be strengthened.

ALASKA STATEHOOD

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, I am deeply puzzled to learn that at this late date after the Senate had passed an Alaska statehood bill which he had endorsed, that the Governor of Alaska within the last few days has proposed that part of Alaska be made into a State and part remain as a Territory.

Friends of Alaska statehood are bound to view this as a diversionary move intended to delay consideration of the combined Alaska-Hawaii bill now pending in this body. I am reliably informed that there is no substantial backing in Alaska for any such partitioning and that this has been considered on several occasions, only to be rejected. The proposal made by the Governor of Alaska would deny to the new State some areas rich in resources. Of course, the Governor is such a recent convert to immediate statehood that his expressions on this subject can scarcely be said to reflect the thinking of those in Alaska who have for years espoused the cause of statehood. Nevertheless, the fact that he appeared before the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs only recently and made no mention then of separating Alaska into a State and a Territory naturally gives rise to conjecture as to what motives may have led him to interject this last-minute suggestion.

The devoted efforts of everyone truly in favor of statehood are surely needed now so that the combined bill for Alaska and Hawaii before us may be passed. Diversionary attempts such as this can only do damage to the cause of statehood for Alaska—and Hawaii as well.

NAVY SHIPBUILDING AND REPAIR POLICY

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. SHELLEY. Mr. Speaker, at this moment I feel like a vaudeville actor playing a return engagement at the same old stand. I am not here to try and entertain you and the Members of the House, however. In fact, the subject of my remarks is as far from being a laughing matter as anything I can think of. I intend to place before the House a problem of the greatest importance to national security, involving as it does the maintenance of one of the most important aspects of our mobilization base. I want to call the attention of Congress again to the shipbuilding and repair industry which, with few exceptions, is completely unprepared to meet the demands which would be made of it if rapid mobilization were required to meet a war situation. The exceptions I speak of are a few eastern shipyards and areas which have through the years been the favored children of the Navy Department. My particular concern is with

the stepchildren of the industry—the shipyards on the Pacific coast, both Navy and private.

We have a situation where everybody agrees that we must have a going maritime industry in peacetime if we don't want to lose any future war before it gets well under way. Everybody also agrees that our peacetime military organization should not within itself be expected or allowed to build up and maintain the large numbers of commercial type vessels we will have to have to meet emergencies which may develop. The only solution lies in a private maritime industry with every segment active enough to permit the rapid buildup war would require. The military view on the need for cargo ships in wartime was well stated by Admiral Denebrink, Commander of our Military Sea Transportation Service, in a recent hearing before a subcommittee of the House Merchant Marine Committee when he said:

I know that ocean transportation is one of the most vital areas of logistics. * * * In war, without logistics, courage just isn't enough, so we must have ocean transportation.

I only wish that Admiral Denebrink's department, the Navy Department, would show by concrete evidence that they also realize that courage isn't enough to put ships in the water with the moment's notice that war would give. That requires initiative, experience, long-time planning, and a going nucleus of active shipyards on every coast of the United States. Our stepchild shipbuilding industry has no fairy godmother to wave a magic wand and turn pumpkins into modern oceangoing ships.

House Report No. 1681, submitted by the Committee on Armed Services during the 82d Congress, stated congressional policy on geographic disperson of shipbuilding capacity in unmistakable terms. I quote from the report:

A healthy shipbuilding industry, that is, one ready for expansion and full-scale production, requires that naval ship construction be distributed throughout the United States. * * * With the need enunciated above in mind, the Committee on Armed Services emphasized most strongly during the hearings and now repeats in this report its considered belief that the dispersal of ship-construction facilities in the various coastal areas in the United States * * * is an essential element of our national security and that any construction contracts awarded pursuant to this authorization should be distributed throughout these various coastal areas in such manner as to encourage the dispersal of vital shipbuilding facilities and to prevent undue and dangerous concentration in any particular area or areas of the United States.

I submit, Mr. Speaker, that those plain words do not mean that every time a captain's dinghy is built on the Pacific coast the east coast should be awarded a supercarrier contract. Yet that is approximately the policy the Navy has been following.

Mr. Speaker, I and other Members of Congress from the west coast have been beating our heads against a stone wall of Navy resistance to equal treatment for our shipyards for years. I do not want to repeat what is now the ancient history of these efforts, since I have taken the floor of the House on a number of occasions and told the story. However, I do want to outline some of the most recent developments in this regard.

In March of last year a delegation of Congressmen from California, Washington, and Oregon met with Secretary of the Navy Anderson and the then Under Secretary Thomas, soon to be Secretary. Our purpose was to discuss specifically certain awards of contracts for conversion of troopships in which we felt the west coast was suffering discrimination, the then pending award of a contract for construction of a third supercarrier of the *Forrestal* class, and in general the establishment of an administration policy for equitable geographic distribution of Navy ship construction in the interest of national security. We reminded the Secretary that ample legislative authority existed for establishing such a policy. However, the result of our conferences and later representations to the White House was a flat turndown. The Secretary stated that ship-construction contracts must be governed by broad administration policy laid down in a directive from Director of the Budget Dodge, which stated that all Government contracting must be done on a dollars-and-cents basis regardless of other considerations. The Secretary's statement was confirmed in a later letter from General Persons, special assistant to the President, in which he stated with reference to the Navy's policy that—

This practice is consistent with the established policies of the administration to secure performance of Government work at the lowest possible cost and to balance the budget as soon as practicable.

The only way in which I can interpret that statement is that it says that the national security can go hang as long as the budget is balanced. I took issue with that policy at the time it was pronounced and I take issue with it now.

However, in recent months a rather curious sequence of statements and actions by the Navy have occurred. On September 16, 1953, the Navy announced its 1954 shipbuilding and conversion program. Secretary Anderson was quoted as making several interesting statements. Firstly he stated "that a healthy private shipbuilding industry is essential to the national security." This was coupled with an expression of concern "with the present low-level of activity in American private yards." Further, and I quote from the announcement:

The Secretary stated that, in awarding this work, the Navy would be governed as in the past, not only by cost, but also by the necessity for obtaining timely and satisfactory completion, by the need for geographic dispersal of naval work and by other considerations important to the national welfare. He added that special care would be taken to award construction of the new aircraft carrier in such a way as to best serve the public interest.

These are admirable statements and expressions of policy. I cannot quarrel with any of them since they say exactly what I have been saying in public and in private year after year. When I read them, however, I was somewhat amazed, since they seemed to exactly contradict what the Secretary had told the congressional delegation a few short months before. The "past" to which he referred, I thought, was a very recent past indeed, but I let that pass and looked for a reason for this sharp reversal of policy. It did not take long to find it. The very next paragraph of the announcement read like this:

As no private yard on the Pacific coast has the necessary facilities to build the new carrier, this ship will be constructed in a qualified east coast private shipyard.

This pleasant tribute to the private shipbuilding industry and to the need for geographic dispersal of shipbuilding facilities had proved to be only another camouflage for the same old Army game as played by the Navy. When it served the purpose of eastern shipbuilding interests, one policy was in effect. When an excuse was needed to keep this third supercarrier from being built on the west coast, another turned up. Bear in mind that this was the third of this class of supercarriers to be built. Two had already been awarded to eastern private yards. Not one has yet been scheduled for the west coast despite the fact that naval shipyards in my own city of San Francisco and at Bremerton, Wash., are completely capable of doing the job, and employment in the shipbuilding industry on the Pacific coast has been and continues at alarmingly low levels.

On February 2, 1954, the Secretary of the Navy announced the award of contracts for construction of this supercarrier and of three destroyers. The Secretary again expressed "concern at the low level of activity in the private shipbuilding industry and stated that one of the paramount considerations of the Navy Department in awarding the new construction included in its 1954 program was to preserve the mobilization readiness of these yards."

This announcement was also vastly interesting. The supercarrier was awarded to the Newport News Shipbuilding & Dry Dock Co. This company, entrenched in the affections of the Navy, is already building one supercarrier which will take several months to complete. The announcement dealt with three other private eastern shipyards. One was the New York Shipbuilding Co., the second was the Quincy, Mass., shipyard of the Bethlehem Steel Co., and the third was the Bath Iron Works, Bath, Maine.

The Bethlehem Quincy yard was awarded the contract for construction of three destroyers. Their bid amounted to $53,022,000. That is exactly $6,545,000 more than the bid of Bath Iron Works on the same vessels. The announcement piously stated that:

The Secretary of the Navy feels it is necessary to make an exception in this case to the Navy's policy of awarding to the lowest qualified bidder and to pay a higher price for these destroyers to keep available the great mobilization potential of the Quincy yard.

Here we have $6,545,000 worth of concern for the "great mobilization potential" of a Bethlehem Steel Co. subsidiary, while not a nickel's worth of concern has ever been shown for the vastly greater mobilization potential of the Pacific coast shipbuilding industry except when

the chips were down in World War II and we built 40 percent of the ships which won the war, despite the head start of the Navy's favored eastern yards.

The Secretary's announcement proceeded to give a tender analysis of the present and future workload for these four eastern yards, making it clear that his concern was no transitory thing and that he intended to take proper care of them in the future.

Since that time, on March 5, the Bureau of Ships announced award of a contract for escort vessels to a Great Lakes shipyard, and on March 16 awarded contracts for two dock landing ships to the Ingalls Shipbuilding Co. on the Gulf coast. On each of those awards the announcement repeated the Navy's concern over geographic dispersal of shipbuilding and the low level of employment in private shipyards, but I noted carefully that in each case the contract went to the lowest bidder.

It seems evident that the Navy is paying only lipservice to the geographic dispersal principle and the need for maintaining the mobilization potential of all qualified private shipyards. It has failed in any single instance to take any practical action to build west coast private yards, now rusting away, back to a condition where they could serve the Nation adequately in time of war. Despite the soft soap in its March 5 and March 16 announcements it has not taken concrete action favoring Great Lakes or Gulf yards. On a geographic basis alone it has continued its refusal to give the great navy yards in San Francisco and Bremerton the capital ship construction they should have to keep west coast skilled workers and technical personnel up to the numerical and qualifications levels that should be maintained for effective mobilization purposes. It reserves its real concern for the industry in the East alone.

To lend emphasis to the critical situation facing the west coast industry as far as our private yards are concerned, I want to point out that during 1943, at the height of World War II, west coast private shipyard employment totaled 497,000 workers. As of the end of February 1954, the relatively few yards remaining active at all had only 13,800 employees—less than 3 percent of the wartime total. Can your imagination stretch that into a wartime mobilization potential? In 1943 Atlantic coast yards employed 513,000 blue collar workers, approximately the same total as the west coast. As of February 1954, those same yards have 70,500 employees, over five times the total working on the Pacific coast. Does that sound as if the Navy has efficiently discharged its responsibility for maintaining the mobilization potential of the industry on a sound geographic dispersal basis?

The fiscal 1955 budget recommendation for the Navy asks for $1,042,400,000 for naval vessel construction and conversion. The program calls for 1 new supercarrier, the fourth of this class; 5 destroyers; 3 submarines; 10 amphibious vessels; and a number of smaller craft. It also calls for the conversion of two large attack aircraft carriers of the *Midway* class and for conversion of some smaller vessels. To restore the necessary balance between east and west coast shipyard activity, a major portion of this construction should be assigned to Pacific-coast shipyards, either private or Navy. The supercarrier must be awarded to one of the two Navy yards on the coast capable of building it—either at San Francisco or at Bremerton. Aside from the mobilization level problems, we find now the spectacle of all of these carriers which must and will be used in the Pacific; must and will be serviced in west coast yards; and are too large to transit the Panama Canal—being built in east coast yards and creating there a monopoly on the know-how necessary to build, repair, and maintain them. That fantastic situation must be corrected. If the Navy does not have common sense enough to take the necessary action, it is the responsibility of Congress to see to it that they do. As a matter of fact, I am even inclined at this time to fight and vote against the ship-construction provisions in the Navy appropriation unless agreement is reached that the fourth supercarrier is definitely to be built on the Pacific coast.

The Navy, in view of its recent series of announcements, can no longer hide behind the excuse that they must award such construction on a strict dollars-and-cents basis. As a matter of fact, they now have and have had ample legislative authority, amounting to a directive, to go beyond that basis in the interests of national defense. The Armed Services Procurement Act of 1947 which governs this contracting states in section 2 (c) (16) that the military agency may negotiate such contracts without advertising if, and I quote, "the agency head determines that it is in the interest of the national defense that any plant, mine, or facility of any producer, manufacturer, or other supplier be made or kept available for furnishing supplies or services in the event of a national emergency, or that the interest either of industrial mobilization in case of such an emergency, or of the national defense in maintaining active engineering, research and development, are otherwise subserved."

Mr. Speaker, this act certainly not only authorizes but requires that the Navy and every other military agency survey and make determinations as to our needs for industrial mobilization potential in various types of industry. The shipbuilding industry is one of our most vital wartime suppliers. The record is clear that the Navy, by implicit admission on many occasions, including its discussions with west coast Congressmen, has failed to follow through on this matter, for what reasons I am not prepared to say. The record is also clear that its acts in deciding where combat vessels shall be built the Navy has completely ignored the need for maintaining either plants or facilities, or active engineering, research, and development, in the shipbuilding industry on the west coast. Indeed, one of the excuses they have used for not constructing a supercarrier there is the lack of the very engineering and design facilities they are bound by law to keep available. There is a paradox if I ever heard of one.

I trust that the Appropriations Committee will act on this urgent matter in reporting the Navy ship construction items for the coming fiscal year, and I have urged them to do so. However, I believe it equally important that an appropriate committee of Congress conduct a thorough investigation of the manner in which the Navy has administered its responsibilities in maintaining shipbuilding mobilization potential, with particular reference to the geographic dispersal of the industry. The investigation would not be complete unless it included an inquiry into the reasons why certain large eastern shipyards have been favored in the award of major ship contracts at the expense of the rest of the country. Finally, such an investigation would be pointless if it did not include firm recommendations for legislative action laying down national policy as to the Navy's responsibility for maintaining an active shipbuilding potential on all coasts and in the Great Lakes area.

Although I realize that since this matter involves the Navy Department, the Committee on Armed Services has a vital interest in the problem. In view of the fact that the survival of our private shipbuilding industry is the essential point involved, I suggest that the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee should properly have jurisdiction over such an investigation. I urge that the committee undertake this task without delay. As a member of the committee I shall do everything I can to assure that national security and not local interest governs our conclusions.

SENATE BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS REFERRED

Bills and joint resolutions of the Senate of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 53. An act for the relief of Lewis Roland Edwards; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 95. An act for the relief of Mrs. Donka Kourteva Dikova (Dikoff) and her son Nicola Marin Dikoff; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 110. An act for the relief of Christopher F. Jako; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 203. An act for the relief of Yvonne Linnea Colcord; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 246. An act for the relief of Gerrit Been; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 347. An act for the relief of George Taipale; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 366. An act for the relief of Sister Concepta (Ida Riegel); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 435. An act for the relief of Setsuko Kinoshita; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 447. An act for the relief of Vasiliki Tountas (nee Vasiliki Georgion Karoumbali; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 483. An act for the relief of Miss Elvira Bortolin; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 496. An act for the relief of Dr. Samson Sol Flores and his wife, the former Cecilia T. Tolentino; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 507. An act for the relief of Mrs. Eleanor Emilie Nell; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 587. An act for the relief of Carlos Fortich, Jr.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 614. An act for the relief of Eero and Tina and Karina Waskinen; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 628. An act for the relief of Aloisia Schlotter; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 653. An act for the relief of Metorima Shizuko; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 661. An act for the relief of Nino Sabino Di Michele; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 769. An act for the relief of Mrs. Robert M. Roskos (formerly Maria E. Laedel); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 803. An act for the relief of Donald R. Dyson and Kenneth M. Dyson; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 804. An act for the relief of Antonios Vasillos Zarkadis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 809. An act for the relief of Vittoria Sperti; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 860. An act for the relief of Juanita Lach and Leticia Androda Lach; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 891. An act for the relief of Albina Sicas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 917. An act for the relief of Stefan Burda, Anna Burda, and Nikolai Burda; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1063. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to review the records of commissioned naval officers who failed of advancement during the war, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

S. 1073. An act for the relief of Mary Shizue Hirano; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1126. An act for the relief of Sandy Michael John Philp; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1135. An act for the relief of Stamatios James Bratsanos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1141. An act for the relief of Hildegard Noble; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1155. An act for the relief of Giuseppe Bentivegna; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1225. An act for the relief of Brunhilde Walburga Golomb, Ralph Robert Golomb, and Patricia Ann Golomb; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1290. An act for the relief of Ruth Sonin; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1296. An act for the relief of Elfriede Hall; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1313. An act for the relief of Olga Balabanov and Nicola Balabanov; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1321. An act for the relief of Michajlo Dzieczko; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1352. An act for the relief of Siegfried Rosenzweig; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1362. An act for the relief of Rev. Ishai Ben Asher; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1395. An act for the relief of Manasseh Moses Manoukian, Elize Manoukian, nee Kardzair, and Socrat Manoukian, also known as Socrates Manoukian; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1477. An act for the relief of Gerhard Nicklaus; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1600. An act for the relief of Esther Saporta; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1808. An act for the relief of Hildegard Monti; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1850. An act for the relief of Dr. John D. MacLennan; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 2070. An act for the relief of the estate of Givens Christian; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 2198. An act for the relief of (Sister) Jane Stanislaus Riederer; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 2243. An act for the relief of Seiko Nagai and her minor child; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 2307. An act for the relief of Harold George Wetzlmair; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 2308. An act to authorize and direct the investigation by the Attorney General of certain offenses, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 2340. An act for the relief of Alphonsus Devlin; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 2360. An act for the relief of Jacob Vandenbergh; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 2411. An act for the relief of Ruth Berndt; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 2438. An act for the relief of Maria Teresa Rossi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 2469. An act for the relief of Francisco Vasques-Dopazo (Frank Vasquez); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 2596. An act for the relief of Lucy Mao Mei-Yee Li; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 2777. An act to provide transportation on Canadian vessels between Skagway, Alaska, and other points in Alaska, between Haines, Alaska, and other points in Alaska, and between Hyder, Alaska, and other points in Alaska or the continental United States, either directly or via a foreign port, or for any part of the transportation; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

S. 3096. An act to further amend section 4 of the act of September 9, 1950, in relation to the utilization in an enlisted grade or rank in the Armed Forces of physicians, dentists, or those in an allied specialist category; to the Committee on Armed Services.

S. J. Res. 69. Joint resolution requiring the preparation of an estimate of the cost of reconstructing Ford's Theater in Washington, D. C.; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

S. J. Res. 119. Joint resolution to validate conveyance of a 40-acre tract in Oskaloosa County, Fla.; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

S. J. Res. 130. Joint resolution requesting the President to proclaim the week May 2 to May 8, inclusive, as National Mental Health Week; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

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

H. R. 962. An act for the relief of Gabrielle Marie Smith (nee Staub);

H. R. 1148. An act for the relief of Antonino Cangialosi (or Anthony Consola);

H. R. 1529. An act to facilitate the development of building materials in Alaska through the removal of volcanic ash from portions of Katmai National Monument, Alaska, and for other purposes;

H. R. 1568. An act to amend section 6 of chapter 786 of the act of June 6, 1900, entitled "An act making further provision for a civil government for Alaska, and for other purposes" (31 Stat. 323; title 48, sec. 108, U. S. C.);

H. R. 2351. An act for the relief of Sam Rosenblat;

H. R. 2441. An act for the relief of Husnu Ataullah Berker;

H. R. 2747. An act to amend title 17 of the United States Code entitled "Copyrights" with respect to the day for taking action when the last day for taking such action falls on Saturday, Sunday, or a holiday;

H. R. 3045. An act for the relief of Nickolas K. Ioannides;

H. R. 3306. An act to provide for the relief of certain reclamation homestead entrymen;

H. R. 3961. An act for the relief of Margherita Di Meo;

H. R. 4024. An act to change the name of the Appomattox Court House National Historical Monument to the "Appomattox Court House National Historical Park";

H. R. 4056. An act for the relief of Manfred Singer;

H. R. 4707. An act for the relief of Lee Yim Quon;

H. R. 4738. An act for the relief of Gabriel Hittrich;

H. R. 4886. An act for the relief of Ingrid Birgitta Maria Colwell (nee Friberg);

H. R. 4984. An act to remove certain limitations upon the sale or conveyance of land heretofore conveyed to the city of Miles City, Mont., by the United States;

H. R. 5085. An act for the relief of Mrs. Marie Tcherepnin;

H. R. 5529. An act to preserve within Manassas National Battlefield Park, Va., the most important historic properties relating to the battles of Manassas, and for other purposes;

H. R. 6434. An act to amend sections 401 and 701 of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act so as to simplify the procedures governing the establishment of food standards; and

H. J. Res. 238. Joint resolution granting the status of permanent residence to certain aliens.

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

S. 1456. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to authorize a permanent annual appropriation for the maintenance and operation of the Gorgas Memorial Laboratory," approved May 7, 1928, as amended; and

S. 2405. An act to authorize the exchange, upon terms fully protecting the public interest, of the United States Public Health quarantine station at Marcus Hook, Pa., for a new quarantine station.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted as follows:

Mr. HOEVEN.

Mr. ANGELL to revise and extend his remarks made in Committee and include extraneous matter.

Mr. FERNANDEZ, the remarks which he shall make in the Committee of the Whole today in connection with the Carlsbad Caverns National Park appropriation, and to include a tabulation showing actual appropriations and expenditures to date and the number of visitors served per year.

Mr. JAVITS and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. METCALF.

Mr. DODD.

ADJOURNMENT

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

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 2 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, April 7, 1954, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

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

1416. A letter from the Chairman, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting a report on backlog of pending applications and hearing cases in the Federal Communications Commission as of February 28, 1954, pursuant to section 5 (e) of the Communications Act as amended July 16, 1952, by Public Law 544; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1417. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to amend the act entitled 'An act to assist in the internal development of the Virgin Islands by the undertaking of useful projects therein, and for other purposes,'" approved December 20, 1944; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

1418. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, transmitting copies of orders granting the applications for permanent residence filed by the subjects, pursuant to section 4 of the Displaced Persons Act of 1948, as amended; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1419. A letter from the Secretary, Smithsonian Institution, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to authorize the construction of a building for the Smithsonian Institution and to authorize an appropriation therefor"; to the Committee on Public Works.

1420. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of Defense, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to authorize certain construction at military and naval installations and for the Alaska Communications System, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1421. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a report on the Colorado River storage project and participating projects, providing for the development and utilization of the water and related resources of the Upper Colorado River Basin, pursuant to the Federal reclamation laws (H. Doc. No. 364); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs and ordered to be printed with illustrations.

1422. A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to further amend section 20 of the Trading With the Enemy Act, relating to fees of agents, attorneys, and representatives"; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

Mr. LECOMPTE: Committee on House Administration. H. Res. 490. Resolution for the relief of Mrs. Rosa O. Shannon, widow of Henry C. Shannon, late an employee of the House of Representatives; without amendment (Rept. No. 1470). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. LECOMPTE: Committee on House Administration. H. Res. 433. Resolution to authorize the expenditure of certain funds for the expenses of the Special Committee To Investigate Tax-exempt Foundations; with amendment (Rept. No. 1471). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. BEAMER: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. Progress report of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce; pursuant to H. Res. 127; without amendment (Rept. No. 1487). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. BURDICK: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 2098. A bill to provide for the compensation of certain persons whose lands have been flooded and damaged by reason of fluctuations in the water level of the Lake of the Woods; without amendment (Rept. No. 1488). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio: Committee on Rules. H. Res. 503. Resolution for consideration of H. R. 8044, a bill to extend the authorization for funds for the hospitalization of certain veterans in the Philippines; without amendment (Rept. No. 1489). Referred to the House Calendar.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

Mr. JONAS of Illinois: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 364. An act for the relief of the Advanced Seed Co., of Phoenix, Ariz.; without amendment (Rept. No. 1472). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. JONAS of Illinois: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 893. An act for the relief of David T. Wright; without amendment (Rept. No. 1473). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. BURDICK: Committee on the Judiciary. House Resolution 475. Resolution providing for sending to the United States Court of Claims the bill (H. R. 8404) for the relief of B Amusement Co. (Robert H., J. C. Kenneth, and Mrs. J. R. Bowers) and others; without amendment (Rept. No. 1474). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. LANE: Committee on the Judiciary. House Resolution 491. Resolution for the relief of Tom R. Hickman and Nannie Conley; without amendment (Rept. No. 1475). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. BURDICK: Committee on the Judiciary. House Resolution 493. Resolution providing for sending to the United States Court of Claims the bill (H. R. 3965) for the relief of Lauren F. Teutsch; without amendment (Rept. No. 1476). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. LANE: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1370. A bill for the relief of Guy H. Davant; with amendment (Rept. No. 1477). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. FORRESTER: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1665. A bill for the relief of Carl Piowaty and W. J. Piowaty; with amendment (Rept. No. 1478). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. LANE: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 2024. A bill for the relief of Frank L. Peyton; without amendment (Rept. No. 1479). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. BURDICK: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 3951. A bill for the relief of Frank G. Koch; without amendment (Rept. No. 1480). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. BURDICK: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 4259. A bill conferring jurisdiction upon the United States Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of Spencer C. Clark for extra compensation for Sunday, holiday, and overtime services performed between 1929 and 1942; with amendment (Rept. No. 1481). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. JONAS of Illinois: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 4474. A bill for the relief of Frederick Joseph Buttaccio and others; without amendment (Rept. No. 1482). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. LANE: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 4638. A bill for the relief of David W. Wallace; without amendment (Rept. No. 1483). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. LANE: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 5185. A bill for the relief of Klyce Motors, Inc.; with amendment (Rept. No. 1484). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. BURDICK: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 5986. A bill for the relief of Harold E. Wahlberg; without amendment (Rept. No. 1485). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. LANE: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 7140. A bill for the relief of Robert A. Duval; with amendment (Rept. No. 1486). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. DAWSON of Utah:

H. R. 8720. A bill to protect the essential security interests of the United States by stimulating the domestic production of lead and zinc, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MACK of Washington:

H. R. 8721. A bill providing that on and after the date of enactment of this act, for pension purposes, any person who served under contract with the War Department as acting assistant or contract surgeon between April 21, 1898, and February 2, 1901, shall be considered to have been in the active military service of the United States for the period of such contract service between those dates; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 8722. A bill to liberalize procedures relating to furnishing medical and hospital care to persons retired from the Armed Forces of the United States; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. McDONOUGH:

H. R. 8723. A bill to amend the Social Security Act to provide for the payment of benefits thereunder to certain gold star mothers; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PELLY:

H. R. 8724. A bill to amend the Federal Credit Union Act; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. PILLION:

H. R. 8725. A bill to abate the pollution of the waters comprising the eastern end of Lake Erie, the Niagara River, and their tributaries; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. SHORT:

H. R. 8726. A bill to authorize certain construction at military and naval installations and for the Alaska Communications System, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. HILLINGS:

H. R. 8727. A bill to provide for the creation of an 11th judicial circuit to be comprised of Alaska, Idaho, Montana, Oregon and Washington, and for the circuit judges constituting the 9th and 11th circuits; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TEAGUE (by request):

H. R. 8728. A bill to provide that the time and date of distribution shall be printed on the containers in which milk or cream is sold or offered for sale in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. WOLCOTT:

H. R. 8729. A bill to amend section 14 (b) of the Federal Reserve Act, as amended; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. TOLLEFSON:

H. Res. 494. Resolution relating to study of the problem of maintaining private ship construction and repair yards in the United States; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. ALLEN of California:

H. Res. 495. Resolution relating to study of the problem of maintaining private ship construction and repair yards in the United States; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. DORN of New York:

H. Res. 496. Resolution relating to study of the problem of maintaining private ship construction and repair yards in the United States; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. GARMATZ:

H. Res. 497. Resolution relating to study of the problem of maintaining private ship construction and repair yards in the United States; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. MAGNUSON:

H. Res. 498. Resolution relating to study of the problem of maintaining private ship construction and repair yards in the United States; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. MAILLIARD:

H. Res. 499. Resolution relating to study of the problem of maintaining private ship construction and repair yards in the United States; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. NORBLAD:

H. Res. 500. Resolution relating to study of the problem of maintaining private ship construction and repair yards in the United States; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. RAY:

H. Res. 501. Resolution relating to study of the problem of maintaining private ship construction and repair yards in the United States; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. SHELLEY:

H. Res. 502. Resolution relating to study of the problem of maintaining private ship construction and repair yards in the United States; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Memorial, of the Legislature of the State of California, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to compensation of postal employees; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Pennsylvania, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States that adequate safeguards be provided in tariff and trade legislation against the destruction or lowering of our American standard of living, the labor standard of our workmen, and the stability of our economy by unfair import competition and that the existing trade agreements legislation be amended accordingly; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. ABERNETHY:

H. R. 8730. A bill for the relief of Lt. Col. Thomas E. Rhodes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. BLATNIK:

H. R. 8731. A bill for the relief of Peter Penovic; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BONIN:

H. R. 8732. A bill for the relief of Rabbi Moshe Rosenblatt; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CONDON:

H. R. 8733. A bill for the relief of Toyoji (Suzuki) Whipple; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DONDERO:

H. R. 8734. A bill for the relief of Shizuko Fujita; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DORN of New York:

H. R. 8735. A bill authorizing the President to present a gold medal to Irving Berlin; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. FARRINGTON:

H. R. 8736. A bill to authorize the issuance of a land patent to certain public lands, situate in the County of Kauai, T. H., for school purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN:

H. R. 8737. A bill for the relief of Joseph Di Pasquale; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HARRISON of Virginia (by request):

H. R. 8738. A bill for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Derfery William Wright; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JOHNSON of California:

H. R. 8739. A bill for the relief of Pedro Fermin Bade; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LECOMPTE:

H. R. 8740. A bill for the relief of Kimiko Sueta Thompson; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MAHON:

H. R. 8741. A bill to provide for the conveyance of certain mineral rights to Mrs. Pearl O. Marr, of Crossroads, N. Mex.; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. McDONOUGH:

H. R. 8742. A bill for the relief of Robert H. Merritt; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 8743. A bill for the relief of Yvonne Dee Burnaman; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

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

623. By Mr. GROSS: Petition of Mrs. Pauline Williams, Marshalltown, Iowa, and others, favoring H. R. 1227, the Bryson bill, to prohibit the transportation in interstate commerce of alcoholic-beverage advertising in newspapers, periodicals, etc., and its broadcasting over radio and television; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

624. By Mr. KELLEY of Pennsylvania: Petition of the city of Arnold, Pa., calling upon the Randall Commission to reconsider its recommendation to the President, which advocates a reduction of existing tariffs on foreign-made goods and which severely cripples several industries in the 21st Congressional District (Westmoreland County) of Pennsylvania; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

625. By Mr. NORBLAD: Petition signed by Mrs. Martha Schroeder and 23 other citizens of Tillamook County, Oreg., urging the enactment of H. R. 1227, to prohibit all liquor advertising through interstate commerce and over the radio and TV; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Iowa Foremost in Nation in Livestock Production

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES B. HOEVEN
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 6, 1954

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Speaker, the eminence of Iowa as the breadbasket of the Nation and the agricultural center of the world has been further substantiated by a study of livestock production researched by Bernard F. Nowack, assistant director of the Iowa Development Commission.

The State of Iowa leads the Nation in the production of meat animals, slaughter of meat animals by packers, livestock on farms, meat animals marketed, and farm income from sale of meat animals, the commission reports.

In farm income from the sale of meat animals in 1950, Iowa led the Nation with $1,423,800,000, with Illinois second, having $785,557,000. Texas ranked third, Indiana fourth, and California fifth.

In 1952, cash receipts from livestock sales in Iowa totaled $1,513,635,000, followed by Illinois, with $880,272,000; Nebraska, Texas, and Kansas ranking in that order.

Iowa led the Nation in both number and liveweight of livestock slaughtered in 1950, with 13.8 million head constituting 4.3 billion pounds. Illinois was second, with 11 million head, and 3 billion pounds, followed by California and Texas which placed third and fourth respectively.

In the total of livestock on farms during 1950, Iowa was foremost throughout the country, with 19,460,000 cattle and calves, hogs, sheep and lambs, followed by Texas with 18,165,000; Illinois was third, and California placed fourth.

The liveweight and number of livestock marketed in 1950 shows Iowa first again, with 20.6 million head and 6.9 billion pounds. Illinois ranked second, with 10.6 million head and 3.7 billion pounds; Indiana was third, Texas placed fourth, and California, fifth.

In 1952, total livestock marketings disclosed Iowa's continued supremacy, with 7.2 billion pounds, followed by Illinois with 4 billion pounds. Texas, Nebraska, and Kansas followed Iowa's leadership in that order.

In 1950, the Hawkeye State ranked first among States in meat-animal production with 6.4 billion pounds recorded

by the Bureau of Agricultural Economics of the United States Department of Agriculture. Illinois ranked second, with 3.3 billion pounds, followed by Texas and California.

In 1952, Iowa maintained its leadership in production of meat animals, with 6.4 billion pounds, with Illinois second, having 3.6 billion pounds; Nebraska, third; Texas, fourth, and Kansas, fifth.

Robert E. Peary and the Discovery of the North Pole

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FREDERICK G. PAYNE
OF MAINE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, April 6, 1954

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. President, today is the 45th anniversary of the discovery of the North Pole by Adm. Robert E. Peary. I ask unanimous consent that a brief statement concerning that historic event be printed in the RECORD.

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

STATEMENT BY SENATOR PAYNE

A brief 45 years ago today one of the longest continued adventure stories of the human race culminated in success. For several generations the bravest of our world's explorers had attempted to reach the North Pole. We need only mention the names Frobisher, Hudson, Franklin, Nordenskiold, Nansen, and Amundsen, among others, to indicate the valor of those who tried. The forces of Nature, Nature at its rawest and coldest and cruelest, had long held them all at bay, destroying wholly the most luckless.

Then on April 6, 1909, there was glorious victory. An indomitable spirit, an American and an adopted son of Maine, reached the North Pole. Robert Edwin Peary, together with Matt Henson and 4 Eskimos, reached the pole, where they remained for 30 hours, taking observations, and then returned safely to civilization. What an honor, after all the long decades of failure—honor to Peary, to the United States, and to Maine.

Though Admiral Peary was born at Cresson, Pa. (on May 6, 1856), his widowed mother returned to her native New England when he was 3 years of age, settling at Cape Elizabeth, not far from Portland. He graduated from Bowdoin College in 1877, became a surveyor, then worked for the Coast and Geodetic Survey at Washington, D. C., later joined the Corps of Civil Engineers of the Navy.

Admiral Peary's widow, who is now 90 years old, and who accompanied him on several of his expeditions, still lives in Maine with her family. His daughter, Marie Peary Stafford, known as the "Snowbaby" because she was born in Greenland during one of her family's Arctic expeditions, is a well known author and lecturer on the North.

One of the men who accompanied Peary on the 1909 expedition, Comdr. Donald B. MacMillan, who is a famed Arctic explorer in his own right and a holder of the Congressional Medal of Honor, is being honored today at a special convocation at Bowdoin College which both Peary and he attended.

Oddly enough, Peary's first major work for the United States Navy was in the Tropics, including the directorship of the Nicaragua ship canal survey. But by 1886, at age 30, he was studying and exploring parts of Greenland, reporting the results to geographers in 1887. In 1891 the Philadelphia Academy of Natural Sciences put him in charge of a polar expedition. Other expeditions, some with limited objectives followed. In 1899 both feet were badly frozen and he lost 8 toes to the cruel cold.

Not until he was 52 years of age did this veteran of the Arctic wastes attempt his final and most successful exploration. By September 1908, his ship, the *Roosevelt*, had pushed to a record latitude of 82° 30′ N. Supplies were moved by sled to Cape Columbia, 90 miles to the northwestward. From that cape, on March 1, 1909, the party of 6 white men, 1 Negro, 17 Eskimos, 188 dogs, and 19 sledges set out over sea ice for the Pole. From time to time the more worn-out sections were turned back leaving the best dogs and extra supplies for the leader. Near the 88th parallel Capt. Robert Bartlett turned back and Peary proceeded on to victory.

His return journey to Cape Columbia, utilizing forced marches and the igloos built during the northward journey, required 16 days. On September 5, 1909, the *Roosevelt* steamed into Indian Harbor, Labrador, and by cable the world learned that Robert E. Peary had succeeded where so many had failed. Rightly enough he received many honors, including the thanks of Congress; he lectured widely and wrote several books before his death in 1920.

On this anniversary, there may well be a lesson for us all in the fact that the high courage and adventure of exploration of a remote area of a brief 45 years ago has so soon become a commonplace occurrence for our aviators guarding our northern frontiers. This is of major interest in terms of global strategy, of the geopolitics of survival.

Bipartisanship in Foreign Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. DODD
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 6, 1954

Mr. DODD. Mr. Speaker, I have read several times recently in news stories and in some of the columnists' reports that Secretary of State John Foster Dulles failed to consult any of us on the Democratic side on the important policy declaration contained in his speech a week ago last night in New York on the Indochina situation.

I have no idea who planted that story or why it was planted. But fairness and a regard for the necessary continuation of bipartisanship in our foreign policy impels me to say it is not a true report.

Mr. Dulles not only consulted Democrats—that is, those of us on the House Foreign Affairs Committee at least—in advance of his New York speech, but asked us for suggestions as to what he should say. He appeared in closed session with our committee and went over with the members his plans for this particular speech. Under those circumstances, I would certainly say that we were consulted and more than that, as I said, he asked us for suggestions as well.

Believe me, Mr. Speaker, I feel so deeply about the need for true bipartisanship in foreign policy that if I felt in this particular instance there was any basis for criticism of the Secretary for failure to consult the minority party and its representatives here on a matter of such far-reaching importance, I would certainly join in such criticism. But none is warranted in this case and I think it only fair for me to call that to the attention of the House and to correct the misstatements which have appeared in some of the newspapers.

Division of Waters of Waterton and Belly Rivers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEE METCALF
OF MONTANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 6, 1954

Mr. METCALF. Mr. Speaker, the Waterton and Belly Rivers rise in Glacier National Park and flow north into the Canadian Province of Alberta.

Division of the waters of these streams among the United States, Montana, and Canada is now before the International Joint Commission, set up by a 1909 treaty to handle international boundary water disputes.

The question came before the Commission on January 12, 1948. Canada submitted a proposal for dividing the waters in April 1952. The first United States proposal was submitted in October of that year.

In October of 1953 a special engineering committee was appointed to study the Canadian proposal. This committee reported to the Commission at a meeting here last week.

At that same meeting, Montana's attorney general, Mr. Arnold H. Olsen, representing the State water conservation board, objected to the Canadian proposal as wholly unacceptable to Montana in the light of the engineering report. He then resubmitted the United States proposal.

Mr. Olsen said the Canadian proposal would permit irrigation of a maximum of 40,000 acres in Montana with no firm flow, whereas under the United States proposal a firm flow of water would be guaranteed, irrigating a minimum of 84,000 acres.

The Canadians have been delaying solution of this problem for years by insisting on discussing first, the water requirements arising out of existing projects—all existing projects are in Canada—and, second, their claim that the only practical use for this water is in Canada.

Thus, they never get around to talking about apportionment of the water because discussions bog down on the first two points.

When we propose an apportionment, they say we cannot discuss apportionment until we have disposed of the first two points. When we insist, they say the answer to the first two points is: No water for Montana.

While they are holding us at arm's length on this question, they apparently

are getting everything they want in the St. Lawrence seaway.

There are many examples of our willingness to cooperate with our Canadian neighbors. The other body has passed and sent to the House a bill to provide for joint development of the St. Lawrence seaway. The people of Montana are willing to work with Canada in an attempt to solve mutual problems. But cooperation should not stop at the headwaters of the St. Lawrence. A good neighbor is one who assumes his just obligations as well as his privileges. Canada should indicate its realization of this fact.

Analysis of Bill Amending Immigration and Nationality Act, McCarran-Walter Immigration Act, Public Law 414, 82d Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JACOB K. JAVITS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 6, 1954

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, appended is an analysis of a bill to be introduced in the House by six Republican Members of this body, Representatives CRETELLA, FINO, FRELINGHUYSEN, MORANO, SCOTT, and myself:

Short title: "Immigration and Nationality Act Amendments of 1954."

TITLE I

This title follows recommendations of President Eisenhower as contained in his April 6, 1953, letter to Senator ARTHUR V. WATKINS proposing a Senate inquiry into the operations of the McCarran-Walter Act.

Section 101: Amends sections 212 (a) (15) and 241 (a) (8) of Public Law 414 with respect to standards for determining whether aliens are or are likely to become public charges. The provision which gives controlling effect to the opinion of the consul or of immigration officials, without adequate supporting evidence, is eliminated.

Section 102: Amends subsections (27) and (29) of section 212 (a) of Public Law 414 with respect to standards for determining whether immigrants would engage in subversive activities. The consul and immigration officials would no longer be vested with the authority, without restraint, to determine by their own mental processes the probability of future proscribed conduct.

Section 103: Amends section 287 (a) (1) of Public Law 414 with respect to power of officers and employees of the Immigration and Naturalization Service to interrogate without warrant persons believed to be aliens as to their right to be or remain in this country. Strengthens the term "believed" by requiring "with probable cause," thus preventing improper interrogation of citizens.

Section 104: Repeals sections 352, 353 and 354 of Public Law 414, which provide for loss of nationality by naturalized citizens because of residence abroad. This amendment thus eliminates the stigma of "second class citizenship." Section 104 of the bill also repeals sections 350 and 355 of Public Law 414 which provide for loss of citizenship by native-born citizens because of residence abroad. The principle that native-born citizens will lose their American nationality by residence abroad was introduced to our nationality laws for the first time by Public Law 414. To permit that principle to remain in our law, while repealing the corresponding provision as to naturalized citizens, would discriminate against the native-born citizen.

Section 105: Amends sections 101 (2) (37), 212 (a) (28) (D), 241 (a) (6) (D) and 313 (a) (3) of Public Law 414 by broadening restrictions contained in that act with respect to persons who have advocated a totalitarian dictatorship or have belonged to totalitarian organizations. Nazis and Fascists would, as a result, be barred from the United States without the necessity of proving, as Public Law 414 now requires, that they have advocated, or belonged to organizations which advocated, the establishment of a totalitarian dictatorship in the United States. This closes the loophole in Public Law 414 that now permits Nazis and Fascists to enter the United States and to become naturalized.

Section 106: By amending section 244 (a) (1) (2) (3) (4) and (5) of Public Law 414 eliminates the standards of "exceptional and extremely unusual hardship" in granting suspension of deportation, substituting the term "serious hardship."

Sections 107 and 108: By repealing section 3 (c) of the Displaced Persons Act and amending section 201 (e) of Public Law 414 eliminates provision requiring future mortgaging of quotas.

Section 109: By amending sections 202 (a) (5) and 202 (e) and repealing section 202 (b), (c) and (d) of Public Law 414, eliminates quota provisions in the present act which discriminate against Asiatic and colonial peoples. The amendment will restore the law as it existed prior to Public Law 414, by which colonial peoples came under the quota of their mother country. Public Law 414 establishes a quota determined by race for Asiatic peoples no matter in what country of the world they are born, while the quota for non-Asiatics is determined simply by birth within quota area. The amendment extends the latter provision to persons of an Asiatic race and thus removes the stigma of racial discrimination.

TITLE II

This title corrects certain administrative deficiencies that have become generally apparent since the beginning of enforcement of Public Law 414.

Section 201: By amending section 101 (a) (6) of Public Law 414, restored preexamination (an administrative procedure adopted in 1935 which permitted an alien in the United States to become a permanent resident by obtaining his immigration visa in Canada instead of being required to make the long and expensive journey to his country of origin for that purpose).

Section 202: By amending section 212 (9) and (10) permits entry of an alien who has received a pardon for a crime.

Section 203: Amends section 212 (c) of Public Law 414 to restore the law as it existed, and operated satisfactorily, from 1917 to 1952. The result would be to give the Attorney General discretionary power to admit an alien who is returning to an unrelinquished American residence of at least 7 years, with no requirement that the alien was originally admitted to this country for permanent residence.

Section 204: Repeals section 235 (c) of Public Law 414 which permits exclusion without a hearing.

Section 205: Repeals section 241 (d) of Public Law 414, the retroactive provision which makes an alien deportable for conduct prior to December 24, 1952, even though that conduct was not a ground of deportation before Public Law 414 came into effect.

Section 206: Amends section 245 of Public Law 414 which permits the Attorney General to adjust the status of an alien temporarily here to that of an alien admitted for permanent residence. The amendment softens the unnecessarily rigorous requirements which an alien must now meet.

Section 207: (a) Permits judicial review in exclusion and deportation cases. (b) Establishes a statute of limitations whereby no alien may be deported by reason of conduct occurring more than 10 years prior to the institution of deportation proceedings.

Section 208: Repeals section 360 (a) of Public Law 414 and substitutes a provision granting judicial review for a person claiming American citizenship who has been denied such right.

Section 209: Amends section 360 (c) of Public Law 414 by broadening provision for judicial review of final determination by Attorney General in refusing entry to persons issued certificate of identity as claimants of American citizenship under section 360 (b).

Section 210: Establishes a Board of Visa Appeals in State Department to review questions involving the denying of visas and the application or meaning of State Department regulations applying to immigration.

TITLE III

Section 301: Provides for the pooling of unused quotas and their allocation the next succeeding fiscal year to those on waiting lists of quotas 7,000 and under (includes Italian, Greek, Dutch, Austrian, and Eastern European quotas). Quotas are to be determined on the basis of the 1950 census instead of the 1920 census as is now the practice.

SENATE

WEDNESDAY, APRIL 7, 1954

(Legislative day of Monday, April 5, 1954)

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

Rev. George A. Taylor, rector of St. David's Church, Baltimore, Md., offered the following prayer:

Most gracious God, we humbly beseech Thee, as for the people of these United States in general, so especially for their Senate and Representatives in Congress assembled, that Thou wouldst be pleased to direct and prosper all their consultations, to the advancement of Thy glory, the good of Thy Church, the safety, honor, and welfare of Thy people; that all things may be so ordered and settled by their endeavors, upon the best and surest foundations, that peace and happiness, truth and justice, religion and piety, may be established among us for all generations. These and all other necessaries, for them, for us, and Thy whole Church, we humbly beg in the Name and mediation of Jesus Christ, our most blessed Lord and Saviour. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. KNOWLAND, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Tuesday, April 6, 1954, was dispensed with.