

1955

school system, will do much to save our youth.

Then, thirdly, religion. The church and the synagogue—when correctly understood and used by the parents—can and do play a major role in the prevention of delinquency. The house of God and the religious school must, however, not be regarded by parents as good places to which to send their children, but in which they have no personal interest. How naive can parents become when they say: "I sent them to church, didn't I? I sent them to Sunday school, didn't I? What kind of a church are you running? You must have a pretty bad Sunday school if my children are turning out this way."

Now, religious institutions, although they can be exceedingly effective and are effective in the training of character, cannot perform miracles. Such institutions can imbue the child with the highest concepts of morality and unselfishness only when his parents participate with him. Only then will the child consider these institutions important.

Fourthly, the influence of the community upon the child's growth and development. Good housing, it has been shown time and again, prevents delinquency. And recreational facilities, playgrounds and social centers, operated by trained personnel, are all unquestioned deterrents to delinquency. The work of youth organizations like the Boy Scouts, Girl Scouts, YMCA's, YWCA's, etc., all should be widely expanded so that more and more of our youth will come under their influence. The policy of the infiltration of street gangs by trained youth leaders that is being pursued by our own New York Youth Board is, to my mind, an excellent method of dealing with this problem. Yes, when the community influences are favorable, the child has a better chance to be the kind of citizen that his parents and that the community at large would want him to be.

Finally, it is well known that the moral climate of a community has its effect upon the youth. Stories of corruption involving important Government officials, shady business practices, stories of easy money and of gangsters who are glorified and become heroes, the effect of unwholesome movies, comic books, TV programs are not without their influence upon the young. Dr. Fine tells of a young thief who remarked to him: "Yes, I stole \$150 from a gas station. So what? How much did Governor Hoffman steal from the people of New Jersey?" It is this attitude that is very easily developed in the minds of impressionable youth. "If they can do it, if they can get away with it, why can't I?"

I shall not go into the improvements that must be made in the various agencies dealing with our youth after they have become delinquent—the juvenile police officers, the juvenile courts, improved foster homes, detention homes, training schools, etc.—but desire merely to emphasize the need for improving those media which will prevent juvenile delinquency, namely, the home, the school, the church and synagogue, the community, the morale climate. To achieve this purpose, we must stop thinking in terms of delinquent youth, but rather in terms of our delinquent society. We know the causes. We also know the cure. Our problem is not that we demand that something be done by someone else, but that we express our willingness to accept whatever responsibility devolves upon us as members of society and to make whatever financial sacrifices that may be necessary in order to build a finer, healthier, and more worthy community life for the young people of our country. No task confronting us is more important, none more essential to the well-being of our society.

During the war a new expression, crash program, came into frequent use. It means

that if something of the utmost importance, something involving the very life and death of our country had to be accomplished, then the question of financial cost was not to be considered at all. Thus, when it was decided to create an atomic bomb—even though no one was certain that it could be achieved—we did not hesitate to spend what was then, and still is, the astronomical sum of \$2 billion. We said then, and we say now, that whatever the cost, it was worth it.

Something of the same spirit animated the National Foundation for Infantile Paralysis when it embarked upon its dramatic program to stamp out this horrible disease. Untold millions of dollars were spent and will continue to be spent until this scourge is completely eliminated from the world. Who will say that its wasn't—and isn't—worth it?

Some such crash program, it seems to me, is required if we are to win the war against juvenile delinquency, a disease which is even more dreadful and more destructive than polio or any other physical ailment. Let us have more family counselors than we think we need. Let us build more and better schools and playgrounds than we think are necessary. Let us hire better teachers, more teachers and provide them with a wage to which they are entitled. Let us engage more youth directors than we believe we are going to need. The cost will go up into the hundreds of millions and billions of dollars, but who will say that it isn't worth it?

At the present time juvenile delinquency is problem number one in America. It is infinitely more serious than any other problem which we are confronted. The very existence of our civilization depends upon its solution. It must be solved and it can be solved and it will be solved, when the citizens of our Nation become aware of the responsibilities devolving upon them. Yes, punishment is necessary when crimes are committed, whether by juveniles or by adults. But that doesn't solve the problem. It is the delinquent society which creates delinquency that requires our attention.

In the 21st chapter of the Book of Deuteronomy a very strange procedure is described in connection with what is to take place when a slain person is found in a field and his murderer is unknown. The elders and the judges of the city nearest the spot where the body has been found are required to offer a sacrifice, wash their hands over it and then say, "Our hands have not shed this blood, neither have our eyes seen it. Forgive, O Lord Thy people Israel, whom Thou had redeemed, and suffer not innocent blood to remain in the midst of Thy people Israel." In commenting on this unusual proceeding, one of the ancient rabbis asked: "Why is it that the good people, the respectable people, the elders and the judges are called upon to swear that their hands were guiltless of this crime? Why were not the cutthroats, the thieves, and the known criminals of the community made to swear that they did not perpetrate this crime?" To these rhetorical questions he provided the answer: "In order that we might always realize that not the bad people, but the good people are responsible for the evils of a community; the evils of life will disappear when the good folk assume the responsibilities which belong to them." Amen.

LOSS OF UNITED STATES TRADE IN LATIN AMERICA

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, to those of us who recognize the importance of the Latin American countries to the economic well-being of our Nation, the article which appeared in the July 1 issue of the Washington Post and Times Herald is indeed frightening. This article is entitled "United States Is

Losing Trade in Latin America." It goes on to state that Japan and Europe, including the Soviet bloc countries, are cutting into the trade of Latin America by offering lower prices and longer credit terms.

This assertion was contained in a United Nation's report which reviewed the economy of the Latin America countries for the year 1954.

Mr. President, the Department of Commerce reveals that our trade with Latin America has dropped by almost \$250 million in the past 2 years, and there is every indication that with our little attention to the affairs of the countries to the south of us, and increased attention on the part of the countries of Europe and the Soviet bloc countries that trade between Latin America and the United States will unfortunately continue to fall off.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point the above-described article.

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

UNITED STATES IS LOSING TRADE IN LATIN AMERICA

UNITED NATIONS, N. Y., June 30.—Japan and Europe, including Soviet bloc countries, are cutting into United States trade with Latin America by offering cheaper prices and easier credit terms, a U. N. report disclosed today. Soviet bloc trading was sharply on the upgrade, it said.

A review of Latin American economies for 1954 was made public here in advance of the meeting of the U. N. Economic Commission for Latin America starting August 29 in Bogota, Colombia.

Agriculture increases in Latin America as a whole kept up with a population increase and industry spurred 8.4 percent over 1953, but there were gloomy notes in the review. Investment in Latin America showed a declining trend. Balance of payments surplus was reduced by more than \$700 million.

During 1951 and 1953 imports of European rolling stock almost equaled those from the United States, the review noted. The United States also was losing ground in commercial vehicles, not only to Europe but also to Japan.

European exports to Latin America of machinery for the pulp, paper, and timber industries have more than doubled in 2 years, while those of the United States and Canada have fallen by 45 percent, the review said.

Japan was described as extremely active in textile-machinery sales.

Eastern Europe and Japan have provided strong competition in agricultural machinery, cutting considerably imports of United States tractors.

The United States still holds an edge in the sale of private automobiles and was showing recovery in agricultural machinery, oil drilling machinery and machine tools, the review said.

MULTIPLE USE OF SURFACE OF SAME TRACTS OF PUBLIC LANDS—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, I submit a report of the committee on conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 5891) to amend the act of July 31, 1947 (61 Stat. 681) and the mining laws to provide for multiple use of the surface of the same tracts of the public lands, and for other

MOR/CDF

purposes. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the report. The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BARKLEY in the chair). The report will be read for the information of the Senate.

The legislative clerk read the report, as follows:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 5891) to amend the act of July 31, 1947 (61 Stat. 681) and the mining laws to provide for multiple use of the surface of the same tracts of the public lands, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate and agree to the same with a further amendment as follows: On page 5, line 17, of the Senate engrossed amendment, after the words "United States" insert the words "subsequent to the location of the claim", and the Senate agree to the same.

CLINTON P. ANDERSON,
HENRY M. JACKSON,
JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY,
EUGENE D. MILLIKIN,
ARTHUR V. WATKINS,

Managers on the Part of the Senate.

CLAIR ENGLE,
WALTER ROGERS
LEE METCALF,
JOHN P. SAYLOR,
WILLIAM A. DAWSON,

Managers on the Part of the House.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the report?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the report.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The report was agreed to.

CONSTRUCTION OF CERTAIN MILITARY, NAVAL, AND AIR FORCE INSTALLATIONS — CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I submit a report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 6829) to authorize certain construction at military, naval, and Air Force installations, and for other purposes. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the report.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The report will be read for the information of the Senate.

The legislative clerk read the report. (For conference report, see House proceedings of July 7, 1955, pp. 8661-8669, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.)

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the report?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the report.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD a letter which I received from residents of Langley, Va.

The subcommittee did not know of the objection of the people of Langley, Va., to the possible location of the new CIA headquarters in that community.

I am not sure whether it has been finally decided that the headquarters will go to Langley, Va. I think, however, that certainly the people of that community should have an opportunity to be heard before the Appropriations Committee before any final decision is reached. The committee was unaware of the protest at the time the matter was being considered.

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

JULY 8, 1955.

The Honorable HENRY M. JACKSON,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR JACKSON: We are residents and property owners of the Langley-Great Falls area of Fairfax County, Va., who are concerned over the possible construction of the Central Intelligence Agency headquarters in the neighborhood. On April 7 of this year CIA announced publicly that it was giving up any plan to locate in Langley. Then last week, without notice, language was written into a military construction bill which indicated that CIA was still very much interested in Langley as a possible site. We believe there are serious considerations against locating CIA in Langley that should be brought to the attention of the Congress.

Langley is a unique residential area of one-family homes on large lots, country places, and farms. There are no apartment buildings and virtually no commercial development. A large Government office building will bring great pressure for mass housing, commercial construction, used-car lots, and other changes which will destroy the character of the area.

Fairfax County is already hard-pressed to provide water, sewerage, schools, roads, police, and other facilities for a rapidly growing population. Water and sewerage may be arranged for an office building itself, but the great population increase which will follow will throw an intolerable burden on the community. For example, the water table is already falling in the county, and new mass housing in an area of individual wells will lower the table disastrously and dry up many existing wells.

To erect a large office building on this river front property and to build a super highway to it in the name of the George Washington Memorial Parkway is directly contrary to the purposes of the Capper-Crampton Act. The Congress in 1930 authorized the acquisition of the river front property, including the entire Virginia shore of the Potomac from below Chain Bridge to a point above Great Falls, for a memorial to George Washington and for "the protection and preservation of the natural scenery of the Gorge and the Great Falls of the Potomac" (46 Stat. 482).

The Public Roads tract at Langley with 1½ miles of riverfront is the only substantial piece of United States property on the

Virginia shore above Chain Bridge available for park purposes. Other such property is increasingly difficult to acquire. As with the more highly publicized Maryland shore of the Potomac, the interest of protecting the wilderness of the river and carrying out the statutory purposes of the Capper-Crampton Act must be balanced against the interest of providing access for the motorist. Neither consideration, however, suggests that large Government office buildings should be located on potential park land.

The McLean Citizens Association, drawing its members from the entire area, considered the problem at a special meeting and voted to oppose location of a CIA building in Langley. At a subsequent meeting the association recommended that park and recreation areas be designated for the area, including if possible the bulk of the Public Roads property at Langley. Of several sites now being considered by CIA, Langley is the only one in which the local citizens association has objected. In fact, other areas have pleaded with CIA to locate there and have offered free land and facilities.

No affirmative reason has been offered for location of a huge Government office building on potential park land, in the midst of an entirely residential area, against the wishes of the community and in the face of strongly pressed invitations to locate elsewhere. CIA has no need to have its employees work in rural residential surroundings. To locate in Langley would damage a unique community with no offsetting gain to CIA.

We are presenting our views in this letter to make clear that residents of the Langley area have not changed their opposition to a CIA building here. After the April 7 statement we assumed that the matter was closed. If Langley is again to be considered by CIA, we wish to be heard. Surely such a controversial proposal, with its serious effects on long-established Federal park policy and on the orderly development of a community, should receive full and careful study including an opportunity for all viewpoints to be presented.

Respectfully yours,

BENJAMIN LEE BIRD,
G. BOWDOIN CRAIGHILL, Jr.,
ROGER F. FISHER,
MANNING GASCH,
ANTHONY LEWIS,
SAMUEL E. NEEL,
CYNTHIA ZIMMERMAN.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I have a short statement which is a summary of the conference report, and I ask unanimous consent that the statement may be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

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

STATEMENT BY SENATOR STENNIS ON CONFERENCE REPORT ON H. R. 6829, MILITARY CONSTRUCTION AUTHORIZATION BILL

A tabulation showing a comparison of the authorization contained in this bill as it passed the House, as it passed the Senate, and as has been agreed to in conference is as follows:

Comparative summary of military construction authorization bill (H. R. 6829)

	House	Senate	Conference
Army.....	\$551,105,000	\$527,027,000	\$533,904,000
Navy.....	596,140,900	571,620,300	564,224,300
Air Force.....	1,165,453,000	1,205,170,000	1,207,902,000
Chairman, Joint Chiefs of Staff.....	300,000		
CIA.....	66,000,000	63,500,000	64,500,000
Total.....	2,368,998,900	2,357,317,300	2,360,530,300

1955

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

8715

The total authorization agreed to in conference is \$3,213,000 more than had been approved by the Senate and \$8,468,600 less than had been approved by the House.

Under the conference agreement the Army would receive \$533,904,000 or \$6,877,000 more than had been contained in the bill as it passed the Senate. This difference represents Senate agreement to add \$5 million for hospital facilities at Fort Jackson, S. C. and to add \$1,877,000 for cold storage facilities at Schofield Barracks in Hawaii.

The Navy would receive authorization in the amount of \$564,224,300, which figure is \$7,396,000 less than the Senate had approved. This net reduction derives from the Senate's agreeing to the addition of \$81,000 for providing Navy family quarters in the District of Columbia and to the addition of \$432,000 for a dispensary at Quantico, Va., with these additions being more than offset by reductions of \$6,098,000 at Camp Pendleton in California; \$123,000 at the Naval Powder Factory, Indian Head, Md.; and \$1,688,000 for land acquisition at Port Chicago, Calif. The decision to reduce the authorization at Camp Pendleton results from a reluctance to provide additional facilities there until an adequate water supply for the base is assured. The land acquisition at Port Chicago was deleted, pending an on-the-site study by a subcommittee of the House Armed Services Committee to determine whether this land requirement can be coordinated with a similar requirement of the Army in the same area. The relatively small reduction at the Naval Powder Factory, Indian Head, Md. was made after the Department of the Navy advised that it no longer required this small item.

The Air Force portion of the authorization is \$1,207,902,000, an increase of \$2,732,000 over the authorization contained in the bill as it passed the Senate. The addition of \$2,732,000 is to provide additional facilities at the Charleston Air Force Base, S. C. These facilities were originally scheduled for authorization next year, but were included in this bill in order to enhance the effectiveness of this important base at an early date.

The Senate had provided authorization for the headquarters installation for the Central Intelligence Agency in a maximum amount of \$53,500,000; \$45 million of this sum as intended for the construction of buildings. If the headquarters installation were placed at Langley, Va., \$8,500,000 would have been available for the extension of the George Washington Memorial Parkway. If a site other than Langley were chosen, \$1 million would have been available for the purchase of the necessary land. The House had provided \$50 million for the building, and the Conferees agreed to add \$1 million to the Senate allowance of \$45 million for this purpose. Thus, the CIA is provided a maximum authorization of \$54,500,000, of which \$46 million is earmarked for the construction of a headquarters installation. If the Langley site is finally selected, an additional \$8,500,000 is available for extension of the George Washington Memorial Parkway. If the Langley site is not selected, this \$8,500,000 is not available for authorization, but \$1 million would be available for the purchase of land.

The House had provided an authorization of \$300,000 for the construction of quarters and related communication facilities for the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff and his assistants. The conferees recognized the desirability of providing suitable quarters for the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs, but no detailed justification for this construction had been presented in the Senate, and it was agreed that an authorization of this type should be separately considered. Only this morning a subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Armed Services took testimony on an authorization for this purpose, and it is

possible that a separate bill to authorize housing for the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff will be reported in time for consideration and action at this session of the Congress.

There were two changes from the Senate version of the general provisions contained in title V. The Senate conferees agreed to accept a House provision authorizing the secretaries of the military departments to acquire housing units insured by the Federal Housing Commissioner pursuant to title VI or title IX of the National Housing Act, in those cases where the housing units are adequate and suitable for housing military personnel and their dependents. This provision, as it was originally inserted by the House, was intended to be complementary to a somewhat similar provision authorizing the secretaries of the military departments to assume, on application by the sponsor, mortgage obligations on the so-called Wherry housing units that had been insured under the provisions of title VIII of the National Housing Act. The Senate bill did not contain the provision affecting the Wherry housing units. The House receded from its language authorizing the acquisition of Wherry housing units and the Senate accepted the House language authorizing the acquisition of title VI and title IX units.

The second change in the general provisions as they had passed the Senate relates to the provision requiring the secretaries of the military departments to come into agreement with the Armed Services Committees on the utilization of certain classified and overseas construction authorization. This section represented a continuation of committee policy adopted originally in 1952. However, the construction requirements, cost estimates, and base agreements are much more firm and definite today than was true in 1952, and the Senate agreed to eliminate this provision.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, the conference report substantially follows the bill as passed by the Senate.

With reference to the matter at Langley, Va., we did not locate the CIA building at Langley. There was no testimony taken on that point.

I ask unanimous consent that a letter from the county executive of the county of Fairfax, Va., be printed in the RECORD at this point.

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

COMMONWEALTH OF VIRGINIA,
COUNTY OF FAIRFAX,
Fairfax, Va., July 7, 1955.

Hon. JOHN C. STENNIS,
United States Senator,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR STENNIS: It occurs to me that it would be appropriate to advise you of the position taken by the Board of County Supervisors of Fairfax County, Va., relative to possible location of the Central Intelligence Agency's Office building near Langley in Fairfax County.

Our board has consistently welcomed the CIA to this location and has expressed a willingness to cooperate in every way possible in providing the facilities which this installation would require in order to make it possible for the Langley site to be chosen.

The board has officially agreed to provide sewage disposal for the installation and has cooperated with the city of Falls Church and the Virginia Department of Highways relative to supplying water and providing adequate highway facilities for same.

It is my understanding that a decision in connection with this location will soon be forthcoming and I am pleased to advise you

of the position taken by the Fairfax County Board of County Supervisors.

With best wishes,

Sincerely yours,

CARLTON C. MASSEY,
County Executive.

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I should like to congratulate the members of the conference committee upon the action on the bill which the distinguished senior Senator from Mississippi has presented. The able and distinguished Senator from Mississippi and his committee composed of the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE], the Senator from Washington [Mr. JACKSON], and the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL], performed a very fine service, and I wish to commend them for the excellent manner in which they handled the bill.

On behalf of the people of South Carolina I should like to say that we are very appreciative of the consideration given to the hospital at Fort Jackson. Fort Jackson is one of the finest installations for training troops, and the hospital will provide facilities which are very badly needed there. We are very grateful to the conference committee for their action in the matter.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The report was agreed to.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina subsequently said:

Mr. President, I should like to commend the three Senate conferees on the military construction bill for their success in retaining certain items in the bill. I wish to say something in behalf of the Charleston transportation depot; and I notice that there is \$5 million allowed for Camp Jackson, S. C., for medical facilities. I should like to invite the attention of the Senate to the fact that it is not Camp Jackson. It is Fort Jackson. It was made a fort several years ago.

Also, I notice that \$427,000 has been included for the naval industrial reserve shipyard, Charleston, S. C.; \$1,650,000 for the Marine Corps record depot, Parris Island, S. C.; \$4,649,000 for the Marine Corps auxiliary air station, Beaufort, S. C.; and \$553,000 for community facilities at the Naval Receiving Station, Charleston, S. C.

There are several other items pertaining to South Carolina, but I shall not go into them in detail now.

I thank the committee of conference for having included these items for South Carolina. I think they are much needed and can well be used in the defense of our Nation at this time.

MRS. LORENZA O'MALLEY (DE
AMUSATEGUI) ET AL.

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives announcing its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 1003) for the relief of Mrs. Lorenza O'Malley (de Amusatogui), Jose Maria de Amusatogui O'Malley, and the legal guardian of Ramon de Amusatogui O'Malley, and re-

questing a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon.

Mr. KILGORE. I move that the Senate insist upon its amendment, agree to the request of the House for a conference, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Presiding Officer appointed Mr. KILGORE, Mr. McCLELLAN, Mr. DANIEL, Mr. WELKER, and Mr. BUTLER conferees on the part of the Senate.

THOMAS F. HARNEY

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives announcing its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 2907) for the relief of Thomas F. Harney, Jr., doing business as the Harney Engineering Co., and requesting a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon.

Mr. KILGORE. I move that the Senate insist upon its amendment, agree to the request of the House for a conference, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Presiding Officer appointed Mr. KILGORE, Mr. McCLELLAN, Mr. DANIEL, Mr. WELKER, and Mr. BUTLER conferees on the part of the Senate.

ORRIN J. BISHOP

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives announcing its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 4249) for the relief of Orrin J. Bishop and requesting a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon.

Mr. KILGORE. I move that the Senate insist upon its amendment, agree to the request of the House for a conference, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Presiding Officer appointed Mr. KILGORE, Mr. McCLELLAN, Mr. DANIEL, Mr. WELKER, and Mr. BUTLER conferees on the part of the Senate.

ESTATE OF VICTOR HELFENBEIN

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives announcing its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 5078) for the relief of the estate of Victor Helfenbein, and requesting a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon.

Mr. KILGORE. I move that the Senate insist upon its amendment, agree to the request of the House for a conference, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Presiding Officer appointed Mr. KILGORE, Mr. McCLELLAN, Mr. DANIEL, Mr. WELKER, and Mr. BUTLER conferees on the part of the Senate.

DONALD HECTOR TAYLOR

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the amendment of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 26) for the relief of Donald Hector Taylor, which was, in line 7, after "fee" 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."

Mr. KILGORE. The bill has been amended by the House to provide for the posting of a bond, as a guaranty that the beneficiary will not become a public charge.

I move that the Senate concur in the amendment of the House.

The motion was agreed to.

LUPE M. GONZALEZ

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the amendment of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 36) for the relief of Lupe M. Gonzalez, which was, to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That the Attorney General is authorized and directed to discontinue any deportation proceeding and to cancel any outstanding order and warrant of deportation, any warrant of arrest and bond which may have been issued in the case of Lupe M. Gonzalez, and the said Lupe M. Gonzalez shall not again be subject to deportation by reason of the same facts upon which any such deportation proceedings were commenced or any such warrants of arrest have issued.

Mr. KILGORE. The amendment of the House is to merely cancel outstanding deportation proceedings rather than granting the status of permanent residence to the beneficiary.

I move that the Senate concur in the amendment of the House.

The motion was agreed to.

ANNA C. GIESE

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the amendment of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 244) for the relief of Anna C. Giese, which was in line 7, after "fee" insert "under such conditions and controls which the Attorney General, after consultation with the Surgeon General of the United States Public Health Service, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, may deem necessary to impose."

Mr. KILGORE. The House amendment provides that the Surgeon General may impose such conditions as he may deem necessary, inasmuch as the beneficiary has been afflicted with tuberculosis.

I move that the Senate concur in the amendment of the House.

The motion was agreed to.

RELIEF OF CERTAIN ALIEN SHEEP-HERDERS

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the amendment of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 633) for the relief of certain alien sheepherders, which was, on page 1, line 5, strike out "Panagiatis Demitrios Zeras,"

Mr. KILGORE. The bill has been amended by the House to delete the name of one of the beneficiaries inasmuch as he has departed from the United States.

I move that the Senate concur in the amendment of the House.

The motion was agreed to.

MARION S. QUIRK

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the amendment of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 758) for the relief of Marion S. Quirk, which was, on page 1, line 7, after "fee" insert ", under such conditions and controls which the Attorney General, after consultation with the Surgeon General of the United States Public Health Service, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, may deem necessary to impose."

Mr. KILGORE. The bill has been amended by the House to provide that the Surgeon General may impose such conditions as he may deem necessary, inasmuch as the beneficiary has been afflicted with tuberculosis.

I move that the Senate concur in the amendment of the House.

The motion was agreed to.

ELISEU JOAQUIM BOA

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the amendment of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 1654) for the relief of Eliseu Joaquim Boa, which was, to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That, notwithstanding the provisions of section 212 (a) (9) and (19) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Eliseu Joaquim Boa 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 these exemptions shall apply only to grounds for exclusion of which the Department of State or the Department of Justice had knowledge prior to the enactment of this act.

Mr. KILGORE. The bill has been amended by the House to grant a waiver to the beneficiary of the bill, rather than granting the status of permanent residence. This waiver will enable the beneficiary to qualify for a visa as the husband of a lawfully resident alien.

I move that the Senate concur in the amendment of the House.

The motion was agreed to.

DR. LUCIANO A. LEGIARDI-LAURA

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the amendment of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 467) for the relief of Dr. Luciano A. Legiardi-Laura, which was, to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Dr. Luciano A. Legiardi-Laura 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 appro-