

waiting list pursuant to section 203(c) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1153) under priority date earlier than March 31, 1954, and (2) is eligible for a quota immigrant status under the provisions of section 203(a)(4) of the said Act (8 U.S.C. 1153) on a basis of a petition filed with the Attorney General prior to January 1, 1962, and the spouse and children of such alien, shall be held to be nonquota immigrants and if otherwise admissible under the provisions of the Immigration and Nationality Act, shall be issued nonquota immigrant visas: *Provided*, That, upon his application for an immigrant visa and for his admission into the United States, the alien is found to have retained his relationship to the petitioner and status as established in the approved petition.

Sec. 2. Any alien eligible for a quota immigrant status under the provisions of section 203(a)(1) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1153) on the basis of a petition filed with the Attorney General prior to April 1, 1962, shall be held to be a nonquota immigrant and may be issued a nonquota immigrant visa: *Provided*, That, upon his application for an immigrant visa and for admission to the United States or for adjustment of his immigrant status in the United States pursuant to section 245 of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1255) the alien is found to have retained his status as established in the approved petition. This section shall be applicable only to aliens admissible to the United States except for the fact that an immigrant visa is not promptly available for issuance to them because the first 50 per centum of the quota of the quota area to which they are chargeable is oversubscribed by beneficiaries of petitions approved by the Attorney General pursuant to sections 203(a)(1) and 204 of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1153, 1154) prior to the date of enactment of this Act.

Sec. 3. Section 204(c) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1154) is hereby amended by adding the following at the end thereof: "The Attorney General shall forward to the Congress a report on each approved petition for immigrant status under section 203(a)(1) stating the basis for his approval and such facts as were by him deemed to be pertinent in establishing the beneficiary's qualifications for the preferential status and for the petitioner's urgent need for his services. Such reports shall be submitted to the Congress on the first and fifteenth day of each calendar month in which the Congress is in session."

Sec. 4. Section 249 of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1259) is hereby amended by substituting the date "December 24, 1952;" for the date "June 28, 1940;".

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

The SPEAKER. The Chair has recognized the gentleman from Pennsylvania. Is the gentleman from Pennsylvania going to accept the amendment?

Mr. WALTER. Yes. This is a good amendment.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. MOORE: On page 3, strike out lines 14, 15, and 16.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. WALTER: Add section 4 to read as follows:

"Sec. 4. The first sentence of section 104(b) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1104) is hereby amended to read:

"(b) There is hereby established in the Department of State a Bureau of Consular Affairs, to be headed by an administrator (with the title of Assistant Secretary of State), with rank and compensation equal to that of an Assistant Secretary of State."

(Mr. MOORE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.)

[Mr. MOORE addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

The SPEAKER. The question is on the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 days in which to extend their remarks on the bill just passed.

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

There was no objection.

BREAKTHROUGH IN DESTROYER DESIGN BY BETHLEHEM STEEL CO.

(Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD, and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, the Speaker of the House, the Honorable JOHN W. MCCORMACK and Congressman THOMAS P. O'NEILL, JR., of Massachusetts, join me in this statement.

Bethlehem Steel Co. has developed a breakthrough in destroyer design that offers such improvements in cost and performance as to constitute a quantum jump in the art.

Compared to present ships, the new design features the following:

First, 20 to 25 percent higher speed—40 knots top speed.

Second, 50 to 60 percent greater cruising range without refueling—8,000 miles.

Third, comparable armament but increased military effectiveness because of 1 and 2.

Fourth, reduction in complement to about one-half.

Fifth, better sea-keeping ability.

Sixth, improved reliability.

Seventh, lower first costs when produced in numbers.

Eighth, substantially lower operating costs.

One feature of the design is the integration of standard aircraft jet engines as prime movers to drive marine propellers. Cold start to 40 knots in about 4 minutes. Steam destroyers require hours for buildup to full power.

This ship has all-around mission capability but could be especially suited to antisubmarine warfare.

Bethlehem Steel Co., Quincy, Mass., has proposed under date of August 2, 1962, to build one ship on a research-and-development basis and is prepared to deliver in 24 months.

The necessity of retaining highly trained personnel possessing unusual skills becomes of prime importance with the delivery of the USS *Bainbridge*. An immediate start of work would accomplish this end.

I am bringing this matter to the attention of the Members and hope that those who are responsible for appropriating funds will recognize this great advance made in the new construction of this new type of antisubmarine warfare which will prove to be so helpful to the Nation in time of war.

I express the hope that the Navy will take advantage of this new breakthrough by Bethlehem Steel Co.'s shipbuilding division.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. TEAGUE of California. Mr. Speaker, at the time the vote was taken on the bill H.R. 7927 I was called from the floor to answer a long distance telephone call from a service wife in California. I missed the vote. Had I been here I would have voted "yea."

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may extend my remarks in the RECORD immediately following the vote on the conference report on the bill H.R. 7927.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California [Mr. TEAGUE]?

There was no objection.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. MACK. Mr. Speaker, last evening I missed the rollcall No. 276. This is only the second rollcall I have missed in this Congress. I was here until quite a late hour last evening and when I left I was under the impression the House had completed its legislative business.

Had I been present I would have voted "yea."

SECTION 362(b) OF THE COMMUNICATIONS ACT OF 1934

Mr. MACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (S. 1288) to amend section 362(b) of the Communications Act of 1934.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the following language be added to section 362(b) of the Communications Act of 1934 (47 U.S.C.A. 360):

"The Commission may, upon a finding that the public interest would be served thereby, waive the annual inspection required under this section from the time of first arrival at a United States port from a foreign port, for the sole purpose of enabling the vessel to

proceed coastwise to another port in the United States where an inspection can be held: *Provided*, That such waiver may not exceed a period of thirty days."

Mr. MACK. Mr. Speaker, section 362 (b) of the Communications Act of 1934 requires that every U.S.-flag vessel must have its communications equipment prescribed by the act inspected at least once each year by the Federal Communications Commission. This bill would authorize the FCC, upon a finding that the public interest would be served thereby, to waive for a period of not to exceed 30 days the required inspection and to permit the vessel to proceed coastwise to another port in the United States where the inspection will then be held.

Enactment of the legislation has been recommended by the Federal Communications Commission and has been urged by the shipping industry because the present inflexible inspection requirement frequently causes vessel operators to suffer costly delays due to the unavailability of inspection personnel at the original port at which the vessel docked.

The 30-day waiver authorized by this legislation would make it possible for such vessels to proceed to another port where the inspection would then be conducted.

The committee knows of no opposition to this legislation which passed the other body during the 86th Congress and again during the present Congress.

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

LOANS FOR MASS TRANSPORTATION

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the joint resolution (S.J. Res. 235) to extend the time during which loans for mass transportation facilities may be made under title II of the Housing Amendments of 1955.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

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

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I understand this is a \$50 million fund that is being carried over or would be carried over, if the extension is granted.

Mr. MULTER. If this resolution is adopted it will extend the life of the existing statute until June 1963, continuing to make available moneys authorized and appropriated to the extent of \$32.5 million.

Mr. GROSS. Did I understand the gentleman to say \$32.5 million?

Mr. MULTER. Yes.

Mr. GROSS. I was under the impression that it was \$50 million.

Mr. MULTER. The original amount authorized and appropriated was \$50 million, but as of this date \$32.5 million remains unexpended.

Mr. GROSS. So there has been spent \$17.5 million?

Mr. MULTER. Spent and lent, yes.

Mr. GROSS. This merely continues the remainder of the fund until next June?

Mr. MULTER. That is correct.

Mr. GROSS. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. BECKER. Mr. Speaker, further reserving the right to object, I would like to ask a further question of my good friend from New York. What was the \$17.5 million used for since 1955 and what will the remaining \$32.5 million be used for? Did the money go to cities that applied for it?

Mr. MULTER. Most of it was in loans; a small part of it was in grants.

This provision was enacted last year as an amendment to the act of 1955. It was the first time we provided for mass transportation loans and grants. There has been expended for that purpose loans of \$10,500,000, and there are loan applications on hand presently for about \$300,000. The balance of the funds was expended for grants to municipalities that sought to improve their mass transportation facilities.

Mr. BECKER. That is what I wanted to get at. Where did it go principally? The gentleman said what it was, but where did it go?

Mr. MULTER. Philadelphia and Chicago had their loan application processed and granted.

Mr. BECKER. In what amount?

Mr. MULTER. The total was \$10,500,000. There is pending a \$500,000 application by the city of Fresno for a loan.

Mr. BECKER. So what the gentleman is requesting now is an extension of the use of this money to June 1963, \$32,500,000 that can be applied for transportation loans and grants?

Mr. MULTER. For loans and grants. The maximum amount is \$32,500,000 for both loans and grants.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the joint resolution as follows:

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 202(d) of the Housing Amendments of 1955 is amended by striking out "December 31, 1962" and inserting in lieu thereof "June 30, 1963".

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

LOANS TO INDIAN TRIBES FOR PUBLIC WORKS OR FACILITIES

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (S. 2454) to amend the Housing Amendments of 1955 to make Indian tribes eligible for Federal loans to finance public works or facilities, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

Mr. BECKER. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, may I ask just for

information, in what way is this going to help our Indians, because they have been sadly neglected. We have Indians in New York. We have some in upstate New York.

Mr. MULTER. This merely clarifies an omission in this particular title of the Housing Act. The 1955 act was intended to include all public agencies. Unfortunately, due to what I believe is a misinterpretation of the law, Indian tribes even though recognized by law as public agencies are held not to be eligible for such loans. This will make no change in the law except to make clear that they can qualify on the basis of the same standards as apply to any other applicant.

Mr. BECKER. Will this in any way aid the Labre Mission on the Sioux Reservation in the Dakotas?

Mr. MULTER. I know nothing about that particular situation. This concerns public works and community facilities in connection with housing developments.

Mr. BECKER. Even if they live in tents, is not that a housing development? Would not the gentleman call tents out there a housing development?

Mr. MULTER. I am not familiar with the situation to which the gentleman refers.

Mr. BECKER. I hope my colleague will look into it.

Mr. GROSS. Reserving the right to object. Mr. Speaker, would this permit the Indians to use funds to accelerate public works?

Mr. MULTER. This would merely say that an Indian tribe is a qualified applicant and may file an application, but they have to meet all the other requirements. They must show they have a good project which meets all the qualifications all others must meet. They have to show they are financially responsible and competent to undertake the work, that the project is a good one, and that there is reasonable assurance that they will repay the loan. Then the application will be processed.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 201 of the Housing Amendments of 1955 is amended by—

(a) striking out in the first paragraph "subdivisions" and inserting in lieu thereof "subdivisions, and Indian tribes";

(b) striking out in the second paragraph "States," and inserting in lieu thereof "States, and Indian tribes,," and

(c) striking out in the third paragraph "of States," and inserting in lieu thereof "of States, and Indian tribes,,"

Sec. 2. Section 202 of such Act is amended by—

(a) striking out in clause (1) of subsection (a) "same State)," and inserting in lieu thereof "same State), and Indian tribes";

(b) inserting ", or an Indian tribe" before the period at the end of the second sentence in subsection (c).

Sec. 3. Section 207 of such Act is amended by striking out in the first sentence "instrumentalities" and inserting in lieu thereof "instrumentalities, and Indian tribes".