GEORGIA

White L. Smith, Bartow, Ga., in place of O. S. Gabbert, resigned.

Marie E. Cox, Junction City, Ga., in place of C. W. Cox, deceased.

IOWA

Carson A. Ratliff, Garwin, Iowa, in place of I. M. Mauck, retired.

James D. Wilson, Oakland, Iowa, in place of C. I. White, deceased.

Nicholas D. Roach, Rock Rapids, Iowa, in place of E. G. Dieter, retired.

James F. Drew, Waukon, Iowa, in place of C. A. Palmer, retired.

KENTUCKY

Elsie B. Minor, Burdine, Ky., in place of L. H. Banks, retired.

MAINE

Beatrice G. Atwood, Seal Harbor, Maine, in place of L. B. Carter, retired.

MICHIGAN

Walter E. Marshall, Levering, Mich., in place of C. I. Cook, retired.

MISSISSIPPI

Orwin J. Scharr, Ocean Springs, Miss., in place of O. T. Davis, retired.

Ora B. Hudnall, Porterville, Miss., in place of S. B. Hudnall, deceased.

MISSOURI

Delbert S. Golden, Rutledge, Mo., in place of E. G. Allen, deceased.

NEVADA

Ronald F. Gandolfo, Austin, Nev., in place of B. J. Nurmi, resigned.

NORTH CAROLINA

W. Frank Beshears, Deep Gap, N.C., in place of W. S. Moretz, retired.

OHIO

John R. Thompson, Jamestown, Ohio, in place of R. W. Stitsworth, transferred.

Eber J. Boysel, West Mansfield, Ohio, in place of E. O. Welty, retired.

OKLAHOMA

P. Allen McDonald, Valliant, Okla., in place of J. T. Hughston, resigned.

PENNSYLVANIA

Jennie L. Goldstein, Wynnewood, Pa., in place of E. B. Maguire, retired.

SOUTH DAKOTA

Garfield C. Kraft, Wessington Springs, S. Dak., in place of J. A. DeLay, retired.

TEXAS

Wilson N. Munz, Brenham, Tex., in place of T. A. Low, Jr., deceased.

Delma L. Tyer, Mont Belvieu, Tex., in place of M. K. Fridel, retired.

VIRGINIA

Frances O. Ashworth, Bristow, Va., in place of M. E. Smith, retired.

WASHINGTON

Ralph W. Nicholls, Quincy, Wash, in place of T. W. Chamberlain, retired.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MONDAY, AUGUST 17, 1964

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

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

II Timothy 2: 15: *Study to show thyself approved unto God, a workman that needeth not to be ashamed.*

Almighty God, whose divine grace is inexhaustible in its fullness and invincible in its strength, may we enter upon the tasks and responsibilities of this new week with greater faith and fortitude.

Grant that we may be confident that Thou hast placed at our disposal resources and reserves of achievement and victory upon which we have heretofore failed to draw and springs of splendor in human nature which we have not explored.

Thou knowest how desperately men and nations need the redeeming and regenerating power, if our aspirations, and hopes of a nobler civilization are ever to become a blessed reality.

Inspire us with a lofty appreciation of the part that we may have in establishing peace and good will in a world that still seems to be blocked and barricaded by the forces of evil and the subtle devices of wickedness.

Hear us in the name of the Prince of Peace. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of Friday, August 14, 1964, was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Arrington, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment bills of the House of the following titles:

H.R. 946. An act to authorize the establishment of the Fort Bowie National Historic Site in the State of Arizona, and for other purposes;

H.R. 1172. An act for the relief of Rolando de la Torre Arceo and John Anthony Arceo;

H.R. 1262. An act for the relief of Mrs. Maisie Magdalene Lim Ketchens;

H.R. 2324. An act for the relief of Rosa Stefano Ratajczak;

H.R. 4223. An act to provide for audit of accounts of private corporations established under Federal law;

H.R. 5154. An act for the relief of Wilfredo Lacar de Leon;

H.R. 5155. An act for the relief of Mrs. Guiseppa D'Aquanno, Maria D'Aquanno, and Benedicto D'Aquanno;

H.R. 5543. An act to extend the provisions of the act of October 11, 1949 (63 Stat. 759, ch. 672; 32 D.C. Code 417), to authorize the commitment of persons of unsound mind found on Federal reservations in Loudoun County, Va., to St. Elizabeths Hospital in the District of Columbia;

H.R. 5728. An act for the relief of the county of Cuyahoga, Ohio;

H.R. 5964. An act to provide for the inclusion of Hopkins County, Tex., within the Paris Division of the Eastern District for the U.S. District Courts in Texas;

H.R. 6040. An act for the relief of Chrisoula Baker;

H.R. 7138. An act for the relief of Saint Francis Levee District, Arkansas;

H.R. 7219. An act to amend sections 3288 and 3289 of title 18, United States Code, relating to reindictment after dismissal of a defective indictment;

H.R. 7508. An act to amend title 28, United States Code, to establish jurisdiction and venue for appeals from orders of the Interstate Commerce Commission in judicial reference cases;

H.R. 7617. An act for the relief of Vula Roed;

H.R. 7662. An act to amend the Federal Employees' Compensation Act, as amended, to provide appeal rights to employees of the Canal Zone Government and the Panama Canal Company;

H.R. 8399. An act for the relief of Mrs. Edeltraud Englisch Franklin;

H.R. 9150. An act for the relief of Miss Leonor do Rozario de Medeiros (Lenor Medeiros);

H.R. 9290. An act for the relief of Danny Hiromi Ovama;

H.R. 9334. An act to amend the act of May 21, 1928, relating to standards of containers for fruits and vegetables, to permit the use of additional standard containers;

H.R. 9436. An act to amend the act of September 2, 1958, to establish a Commission and Advisory Committee on International Rules of Judicial Procedure, as amended;

H.R. 9519. An act for the relief of Young Soon Kim and Tai Ung Choi;

H.R. 9561. An act for the relief of Moni Parvanoff Floroff;

H.R. 10216. An act for the relief of Dr. Miguel de Socarraz;

H.R. 10446. An act to permit the use of statistical sampling procedures in the examination of vouchers;

H.R. 10705. An act to amend the Government Corporation Control Act to change the General Accounting Office audit to a calendar year basis in the case of the Federal home loan banks and the Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation;

H.R. 11211. An act to provide authority for the payment of certain amounts to offset certain expenses of Federal employees assigned to duty on the California offshore islands, and for other purposes;

H.R. 11520. An act to amend subsection (d) of section 1346 of title 28 of the United States Code relating to the jurisdiction of the United States district courts; and

H.R. 11652. An act to exempt from taxation certain property of the United Supreme Council, Thirty-third Degree, Ancient and Accepted Scottish Rite of Freemasonry, Southern Jurisdiction—Prince Hall Affiliation.

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. 5941. An act for the relief of Julian A. Erskine;

H.R. 6910. An act to provide for the settlement of claims against the United States by members of the uniformed services and civilian officers and employees of the United States for damage to, or loss of, personal property incident to their service, and for other purposes;

H.R. 8344. An act to amend the Railway Labor Act to provide that the terms of office of members of the National Mediation Board shall expire on July 1;

H.R. 8355. An act to amend the Life Insurance Company Act of the District of Columbia (48 Stat. 1145), approved June 19, 1934, as amended; and

H.R. 8451. An act to amend the District of Columbia Sales Tax Act, as amended, relating to certain sales to common carriers or sleeping-car companies.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed bills and a joint resolution of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 108. An act making Columbus Day a legal holiday;

S. 284. An act for the relief of Ethel R. Loop, the widow of Carl R. Loop;

S. 763. An act to amend the District of Columbia Public Assistance Act of 1962 so as to provide for the furnishing of medical assistance for the aged to eligible residents of the District of Columbia;

AUTHENTICATED U.S. GOVERNMENT INFORMATION GPO

S. 1717. An act for the relief of Marie Jane Lewis;

S. 1752. An act for the relief of Lt. Robert C. Gibson;

S. 2180. An act to amend title VII of the Public Health Service Act so as to extend to qualified schools of optometry and students of optometry those provisions thereof relating to student loan programs;

S. 2208. An act granting the consent of Congress to a compact relating to taxation of motor fuels consumed by interstate buses and to an agreement relating to bus taxation proration and reciprocity;

S. 2392. An act to provide an additional place for holding court in the district of North Dakota;

S. 2588. An act for the relief of Luther D. Stull;

S. 2628. An act to protect the public health by amending the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to regulate the manufacture, compounding, processing, distribution, delivery, and possession of habit-forming barbiturate drugs, amphetamine, and other habit-forming central nervous system stimulant drugs, and other drugs that have a potential for abuse resulting in psychotoxic effects or antisocial behavior;

S. 2649. An act to designate as the Graham Burke Pumping Plant the pumping plant being constructed in the State of Arkansas as a part of the White River backwater unit of the lower Mississippi River flood control project;

S. 2654. An act to change the name of the canal known as the Bay Head-Manasquan Canal and as the Manasquan River-Barnegat Bay Canal to Point Pleasant Canal;

S. 2856. An act for the relief of Teresa Marangon;

S. 3027. An act to incorporate the American Academy of Actuaries;

S. 3068. An act to amend the Federal Firearms Act, as amended, to authorize the Secretary of the Treasury to relieve manufacturers from certain provisions of the act if he determines that enforcement would impair the national security; and

S.J. Res. 162. Joint resolution extending recognition to the International Exposition for Southern California in the year 1968 and authorizing the President to issue a proclamation calling upon the several States of the Union and foreign countries to take part in the exposition.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the amendments of the House to bills of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 16. An act to provide for the establishment of the Ozark National Rivers in the State of Missouri, and for other purposes; and

S. 502. An act to preserve the jurisdiction of the Congress over construction of hydroelectric projects on the Colorado River below Glen Canyon Dam.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 2215) entitled "An Act for the relief of E. A. Rolfe, Jr."

DEPARTMENTS OF STATE, JUSTICE, AND COMMERCE, THE JUDICIARY, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATION BILL, 1965

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H.R. 11134) making appropriations for the Departments of State, Justice, Commerce, the judiciary and related agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1965, and for other purposes, and ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers on the part of the House be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

There was no objection.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

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

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Missouri makes the point of order that a quorum is not present. Evidently, a quorum is not present.

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

A call of the House was ordered.

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

[Roll No. 230]

Adair	Harvey, Mich.	Pucinski
Alger	Healey	Rains
Ashley	Hoeven	Randall
Avery	Hoffman	Reid, N.Y.
Baring	Horton	Roudebush
Barry	Jarman	Roybal
Bass	Johnson, Pa.	Ryan, Mich.
Blatnik	Jones, Ala.	St. George
Bolton, Frances P.	Jones, Mo.	St Germain
	Kee	Scott
Bromwell	Kluczynski	Sheppard
Brown, Calif.	Kornegay	Shipley
Buckley	Kyl	Sibal
Burkhalter	Landrum	Sickles
Cameron	Lankford	Smith, Calif.
Celler	Lesinski	Snyder
Daddario	McClory	Staebler
Davis, Tenn.	McDowell	Stafford
Dawson	McMillan	Stephens
Denton	Macdonald	Stratton
Derwinski	MacGregor	Thompson, La.
Diggs	Michel	Toll
Dingell	Miller, Calif.	Tollefson
Elliott	Miller, N.Y.	Tupper
Farbstein	Milliken	Wallhauser
Fraser	Montoya	Watson
Frelinghuysen	Morrison	Whalley
Fulton, Tenn.	Moss	Williams
Fuqua	Murray	Wilson, Bob
Giaimo	Nedzi	Wilson, Charles H.
Goodell	Olsen, Mont.	
Grabowski	Osmers	Winstead
Gurney	Pepper	Wyman
Hanna	Pilcher	
Hardy	Pirnie	

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall 327 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

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

DEPARTMENTS OF STATE, JUSTICE, AND COMMERCE, THE JUDICIARY, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATION BILL, 1965

The Clerk read the statement.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT. No. 1817)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 11134) "making appropriations for the Departments of State, Justice, and Commerce, the judiciary, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1965, 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 Senate recede from its amendments numbered 2, 12, 15, 17, 22, 30, 31, and 32.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 3, 6, 13, 14, 16, 18, 19, 27, 28, 29, 33, 34, 36, and 37; and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 1: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 1, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$164,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 4: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 4, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by said amendment insert: purchase not to exceed two passenger motor vehicles; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 5: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 5, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$3,165,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 8: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 8, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$2,025,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 9: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 9, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$45,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 10: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 10, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$19,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 11: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 11, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$2,275,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 20: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 20, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$1,130,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 21: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 21, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$65,100,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 23: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 23, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$187,500,000"; and the Senate agree to the same

Amendment numbered 24: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 24, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$47,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same

Amendment numbered 25: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 25, and agree

to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$3,648,250,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 26: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 26, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$2,225,413,315"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 35: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 35, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$137,800,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

The committee of conference report in disagreement amendment numbered 7.

JOHN J. ROONEY
(except as to amendment No. 34),
GEORGE MAHON,
FRANK T. BOW,
GLENARD P. LIPSCOMB,
Managers on the Part of the House.

JOHN L. MCCLELLAN,
ALLEN J. ELLENDER,
WARREN G. MAGNUSON,
SPESSARD L. HOLLAND,
JOHN O. PASTORE,
J. W. FULBRIGHT,
MARGARET CHASE SMITH,
LEVERETT SALTONSTALL,
KARL E. MUNDT,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 11134) making appropriations for the Departments of State, Justice, and Commerce, the judiciary, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1965, and for other purposes, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon and recommended in the accompanying conference report as to each of such amendments, namely:

TITLE I—DEPARTMENT OF STATE

Administration of foreign affairs

Amendment No. 1: Appropriates $164,000,000 for salaries and expenses instead of $163,000,000 as proposed by the House and $165,600,000 as proposed by the Senate. Of the increase allowed in conference $500,000 is specifically earmarked for communications equipment and $500,000 for improvement of security facilities.

Amendment No. 2: Appropriates $18,125,000 for acquisition, operation, and maintenance of buildings abroad as proposed by the House instead of $18,821,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 3: Appropriates $5,000,000 for acquisition, operation, and maintenance of buildings abroad (special foreign currency program) as proposed by the Senate instead of $4,000,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 4: Provides for the purchase of not to exceed two passenger motor vehicles instead of three as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 5: Appropriates $3,165,000 for missions to international organizations instead of $3,100,000 as proposed by the House and $3,234,000 as proposed by the Senate.

International commissions

Amendment No. 6: Appropriates $785,000 for salaries and expenses, International Boundary and Water Commission, United States and Mexico, as proposed by the Senate instead of $760,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 7: Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to concur in the Senate amendment appropriating $30,000,000 for Chamizal settlement.

Amendment No. 8: Appropriates $2,025,000 for international fisheries commissions instead of $2,000,000 as proposed by the House and $2,100,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Educational exchange

Amendment No. 9: Appropriates $45,000,000 for mutual educational and cultural exchange activities instead of $44,125,000 as proposed by the House and $48,729,000 as proposed by the Senate. The funds for dependents' travel are disallowed.

Amendment No. 10: Provides that not less than $19,000,000 shall be used for payments in foreign currencies or credits owed to or owned by the Treasury of the United States instead of $18,500,000 as proposed by the House and $20,250,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 11: Provides that not to exceed $2,275,000 may be used for administrative expenses instead of $2,250,000 as proposed by the House and $2,310,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 12: Appropriates $5,300,000 for the center for cultural and technical interchange between East and West as proposed by the House instead of $5,600,000 as proposed by the Senate.

TITLE II—DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

Amendment No. 13: Inserts $30,000 as proposed by the Senate instead of $22,000 as proposed by the House as the salary of the Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation in accordance with the new pay act.

TITLE III—DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

Area Redevelopment Administration

Amendment No. 14: Appropriates $13,700,000 for operations as proposed by the Senate instead of $14,000,000 as proposed by the House.

International activities

Amendment No. 15: Appropriates $9,425,000 for salaries and expenses as proposed by the House instead of $10,145,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 16: Appropriates $4,575,000 for export control as proposed by the Senate instead of $4,500,000 as proposed by the House.

Coast and Geodetic Survey

Amendment No. 17: Appropriates $27,000,000 for salaries and expenses as proposed by the House instead of $27,624,000 as proposed by the Senate. The seismograph program should continue to be funded through the Advanced Research Project Agency of the Department of Defense.

National Bureau of Standards

Amendment No. 18: Inserts language proposed by the Senate relative to a standard frequency broadcasting station.

Amendment No. 19: Appropriates $3,770,000 for plant and facilities as proposed by the Senate instead of $2,800,000 as proposed by the House.

Office of Technical Services

Amendment No. 20: Appropriates $1,130,000 for salaries and expenses instead of $1,060,000 as proposed by the House and $1,200,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Weather Bureau

Amendment No. 21: Appropriates $65,100,000 for salaries and expenses instead of $65,000,000 as proposed by the House and $67,266,900 as proposed by the Senate. The increase of $100,000 allowed is for fire weather service expansion.

No funds are included herein for weather services previously funded by the Department of Defense. The conferees reiterate the position taken last year in the statement of the managers accompanying the conference report in the 1964 bill.

Amendment No. 22: Appropriates $10,400,000 for research and development as proposed by the House instead of $11,300,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Despite a specific directive in the statement of the managers accompanying the conference report in this bill last year to the effect that hereafter funds for certain aviation weather research were to be funded by the Federal Aviation Agency, the Bureau of the Budget included the request for funds in this appropriation item. If the research is deemed necessary, it should be funded by the Federal Aviation Agency.

Maritime Administration

Amendment No. 23: Appropriates $187,500,000 for operating—differential subsidies (liquidation of contract authorization) instead of $190,000,000 as proposed by the House and $185,000,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Bureau of Public Roads

Amendment No. 24: Provides a limitation of $47,000,000 on general administrative expenses instead of $46,750,000 as proposed by the House and $47,250,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendments Nos. 25 and 26: Appropriate $3,648,250,000 for Federal-aid highways (trust fund) instead of $3,648,000,000 as proposed by the House and $3,648,500,000 as proposed by the Senate and adjust the amount of the 1964 fiscal year authorization being appropriated.

Amendments Nos. 27 and 28: Appropriate $7,000,000 for public lands highways (liquidation of contract authorization) as proposed by the Senate instead of $8,000,000 as proposed by the House and adjust the amount of the 1964 fiscal year authorization being appropriated as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 29: Appropriates $2,000,000 for the Inter-American highway as proposed by the Senate instead of $4,000,000 as proposed by the House.

TITLE IV—THE JUDICIARY

Amendment No. 30: Appropriates $2,670,000 for salaries of referees as proposed by the House instead of $2,750,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 31: Appropriates $5,750,000 for expenses of referees as proposed by the House instead of $5,784,000 as proposed by the Senate.

TITLE V—RELATED AGENCIES

Federal Maritime Commission

Amendment No. 32: Appropriates $2,763,000 for salaries and expenses as proposed by the House instead of $2,938,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Special representative for trade negotiations

Amendment No. 33: Appropriates $525,000 for salaries and expenses as proposed by the Senate instead of $500,000 as proposed by the House.

U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency

Amendment No. 34: Appropriates $9,000,000 for arms control and disarmament activities as proposed by the Senate instead of $11,000,000 as proposed by the House.

U.S. Information Agency

Amendment No. 35: Appropriates $137,800,000 for salaries and expenses instead of $137,550,000 as proposed by the House and $142,789,000 as proposed by the Senate. The increase allowed is for television.

Amendment No. 36: Appropriates $2,000,000 for the acquisition and construction of radio facilities as proposed by the Senate instead of $13,400,000 as proposed by the House. Of the $2,000,000 allowed, $600,000 is for project "Bamboo."

Amendment No. 37: Deletes the appropriation for informational media guarantee fund

as proposed by the Senate instead of an appropriation of $750,000 as proposed by the House.

JOHN J. ROONEY
(except as to amendment No. 34),
GEORGE MAHON,
FRANK T. BOW,
GLENARD P. LIPSCOMB,
Managers on the Part of the House.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, this bill making appropriations for the Departments of State, Justice, and Commerce, the judiciary, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1965, and for other purposes, contains a total of $1,717,157,800 in direct appropriations.

The total amount agreed upon in conference is $14,530,000 above the bill as it passed the House. However, the Senate bill included a supplemental item for the Chamizal settlement between the United States and Mexico which was submitted after the House committee had completed its hearings on the bill. The request for that item was in the amount of $41,400,000 and $30 million agreed upon in conference is included in the total. Excluding that item, the bill is now $15,470,000 below the amount of the bill as it passed the House in April.

It is $13,727,900 below the total in the bill as it passed the Senate.

It is also $123,076,100 below the total 1964 appropriations carried in this bill.

Finally, this bill as it stands is $282,006,900 below the total of the budget estimates presented to the House and Senate.

I should say that the bill also includes a total of $3,648,250,000 for the Bureau of Public Roads, which is derived from the highway trust fund and not from direct appropriations.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert at this point in the RECORD a table showing the action of the House-Senate conferees with regard to the various items contained in the bill.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

The table referred to follows:

Departments of State, Justice, Commerce, the judiciary and related agencies

Item	1964 appropriation	1965 budget estimate	Passed House	Passed Senate	Conference action	Conference action compared with—			
						1964 appropriation	Budget estimate	House	Senate
Department of State	$341,070,000	$443,112,000	$343,837,000	$383,296,000	$376,827,000	+$35,757,000	−$66,285,000	+$32,990,000	−$6,469,000
Department of Justice	344,539,000	367,887,000	364,036,000	364,036,000	364,036,000	+19,497,000	−3,851,000		
Department of Commerce	805,620,100	911,969,000	730,086,000	727,481,900	725,501,000	−80,119,100	−186,468,000	−4,585,000	−1,980,900
Bureau of Public Roads (Highway Trust Fund)	(3,249,650,000)	(3,650,000,000)	(3,648,000,000)	(3,648,500,000)	(3,648,250,000)	(+398,600,000)	(−1,750,000)	(+250,000)	(−250,000)
The judiciary	65,934,800	70,762,700	68,830,800	68,944,800	68,830,800	+2,896,000	−1,931,900		−114,000
American Battle Monuments Commission	1,800,000	1,800,000	1,800,000	1,800,000	1,800,000				
Commission on Civil Rights	985,000	985,000	985,000	985,000	985,000				
Federal Maritime Commission	2,575,000	3,300,000	2,763,000	2,938,000	2,763,000	+188,000	−537,000		−175,000
Foreign Claims Settlement Commission	1,455,000	1,689,000	1,650,000	1,650,000	1,650,000	+195,000	−39,000		
Small Business Administration	98,500,000	7,438,000	7,150,000	7,150,000	7,150,000	−91,350,000	−288,000		
Special representative for trade negotiations	465,000	533,000	500,000	525,000	525,000	+60,000	−8,000	+25,000	
Subversive Activities Control Board	425,000	475,000	440,000	440,000	440,000	+15,000	−35,000		
Tariff Commission	3,145,000	3,324,000	3,250,000	3,250,000	3,250,000	+105,000	−74,000		
U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency	7,500,000	11,000,000	11,000,000	9,000,000	9,000,000	+1,500,000	−2,000,000	−2,000,000	
U.S. Information Agency	166,220,000	174,890,000	166,300,000	159,389,000	154,400,000	−11,820,000	−20,490,000	−11,900,000	−4,989,000
Total	1,840,233,900	1,999,164,700	1,702,627,800	1,730,885,700	1,717,157,800	−123,076,100	−282,006,900	+14,530,000	−13,727,900

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROONEY of New York. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. I would like to see a cut in some of these appropriation bills below the spending of last year. However, I do wish to commend the gentleman and his subcommittee for having sustained the position of the House and I guess a little more, in the conference.

I would like to ask the gentleman one question—If there is any increase as between the House and the other body on the item known as tools of the trade?

Mr. ROONEY of New York. I assume the gentleman refers to representation allowances and entertainment funds. I am pleased to be able to say to him that there is not $1 additional included in this bill as we bring it back to the House.

Mr. GROSS. Again I commend the gentleman and the other members of his committee. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. The managers on the part of the House have agreed with the action of the other body in providing $30 million as a payment toward expenses necessary to enable the United States to meet its obligations under the convention between the United States and Mexico, signed August 29, 1963, for settlement of the Chamizal dispute, and to carry out the American-Mexican Chamizal Convention Act of 1964 approved April 29, 1964. The convention settles a boundary dispute with Mexico at El Paso, Tex., and Ciudad Juarez, Chihuahua, which began nearly 100 years ago. President Johnson is entitled to commendation and credit for the settlement of this longtime dispute with our friends and neighbors to the south and was assisted therein by another Texan, the Honorable Thomas C. Mann, Assistant Secretary of State for Inter-American Affairs.

Mr. LONG of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. GONZALEZ] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, the appropriation of $30 million, as provided for in amendment No. 7 to H.R. 11134, is the amount deemed to be necessary to implement the Chamizal Treaty signed by the United States and Mexico August 29, 1963, and subsequently ratified by the President and approved by the Senate. The Treaty itself settled a problem which served as an irritant to U.S.-Mexican relations for 99 years.

It will be recalled that S. 2394, known as the American-Mexican Chamizal Convention Act, was introduced last December to authorize the Secretary of State to conduct technical and other investigations relating to the new boundary; flood control; water resources; sanitation and prevention of pollution; channel relocation, and other matters relating to the new river channel; to acquire all lands necessary to carry out these purposes; and to perform the work involved in the relocation of railroads, schools, and new port-of-entry facilities; and to enter into contracts with property owners for the acquisition of properties; and to transfer or exchange properties acquired or improved by the United States.

The bill authorized an appropriation to the Department of State of an amount not to exceed $44.9 million to carry out the provisions of the treaty and the proposed bill, S. 2394. The present conference report on H.R. 11134, which we will shortly vote on, and which I heartily endorse, contains the appropriation authorized by the American-Mexican Chamizal Convention Act, S. 2394, Public Law 88-300.

There are a few brief points I would like to make about the authorization act and this appropriation bill.

First, perhaps the most significant portion of the Chamizal Convention Act is contained in section 3. This section provides that the U.S. Government shall reimburse the owners and tenants displaced as a result of the settlement for expenses and other losses and damages incurred by them in the process and as a direct result of such moving; and that the Government will also compensate the owners and tenants for proved costs

and losses for nonconforming abodes and minimum forms of shelter for which there are no comparable properties on the market in the city of El Paso and concerning which fair market value would be inadequate to find minimum housing of equal utility; for commercial properties for which there are no comparable properties on the El Paso market; for business losses such as loss of profits directly resulting from relocation, and for penalty costs to owners for prepayment of mortgages incident to the acquisition of the properties by the United States.

I could not overemphasize the importance of this section to the people who live in the El Paso area who could otherwise be greatly damaged by the carrying out of this treaty. Section 3 has its origin in the late President Kennedy's instructions to Ambassador Thomas C. Mann at the outset of the negotiations for the convention, that the people who live in El Paso today should not be injured by any settlement. This section was drawn with the view that the acquisition of private properties for transfer to Mexico not cause loss or injury to the U.S. property owners affected. In the course of the negotiations over the treaty, Ambassador Mann and Joseph F. Friedkin, the U.S. Commissioner for the International Boundary and Water Commission, held an extensive series of meetings with the community leaders and with the people who resided in the affected area. Those people were assured that the problems of adequate compensation to enable them to relocate and reestablish their homes and businesses without loss would be presented to Congress. These problems have been presented to Congress in the form of section 3. This section is well worded and well designed to take care of those special problems.

I have long advocated such fair and just treatment of the individuals affected by international agreements. Unfortunately, we have not always provided so well for our own people. When the Falcon Dam was constructed on the Rio Grande, downstream from El Paso, in Zapata County, many complaints were voiced by American citizens of injuries and damages which they sustained as a direct result of the construction of the dam. Those injustices could have and should have been avoided by careful planning and by the close scrutiny of Congress. Section 3 will avoid and preclude such injustices.

For a similar reason I recently introduced an amendment to the housing bill of 1964, which I am happy to say was adopted by the Housing Subcommittee and approved by the Members of this House when the bill was passed last week. This amendment is now section 315 of the housing bill, S. 3049, and is entitled "Planning Problems Resulting From Treaties or Other International Agreements." It carries one step further the principle of fair and just treatment embodied in section 3 of the Chamizal Convention Act. It enables cities, such as El Paso, with urban planning problems that have resulted or are expected to result from the implementation of a Federal treaty, to be entitled to urban planning assistance under section 701 of the housing law. Under the present law cities in federally impacted areas or disaster areas are entitled to such assistance, but not cities affected by Federal treaties. My amendment will close this gap. The effect of the amendment will be to permit El Paso to do the necessary planning for the people who will be relocated as a result of the Chamizal Treaty and for the entire community to the extent that it too is affected.

Finally, it should be noted that the appropriation calls for $30 million. This amount is almost $15 million less than the amount which has been authorized. It is the amount considered necessary at this time to carry out the settlement, and is demonstrative of the care and caution with which we have proceeded.

I urge the adoption of the conference report and the passage of H.R. 11134.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The conference report was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 7: Page 9, line 20, insert:

"CHAMIZAL SETTLEMENT

"For expenses necessary to enable the United States to meet its obligations under the Convention between the United States and Mexico, signed August 29, 1963, and to carry out the American-Mexican Chamizal Convention Act of 1964, including purchase of four passenger motor vehicles, $30,000,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That this appropriation shall not be available for expenses of operation and maintenance of works provided for in said Convention and Act."

Mr. ROONEY of New York Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as folows:

Mr. ROONEY of New York moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 7 and concur therein.

The motion was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider the votes by which action was taken on the conference report and the motion to recede and concur was laid on the table.

CONSENT CALENDAR

The SPEAKER. This is the day for the call of the Consent Calender. The Clerk will call the first bill on the calendar.

PROVIDING FOR ACQUISITION OF CERTAIN PROPERTY IN SQUARE 758 IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, AS AN ADDITION TO THE GROUNDS OF THE U.S. SUPREME COURT BUILDING

The Clerk called the bill (S. 254) to provide for the acquisition of certain property in square 758 in the District of Columbia, as an addition to the grounds of the U.S. Supreme Court Building.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, since this measure has been given a rule for its consideration, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

PROVIDING FOR ADDITIONAL COMMISSIONERS OF THE U.S. COURT OF CLAIMS

The Clerk called the bill (S. 102) to provide for additional commissioners of the U.S. Court of Claims.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BOGGS). Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

APPLICATION OF EVACUATION AND ALLOTMENT PAY LAW TO GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 8827) to extend the act of September 26, 1961, relating to allotment and assignment of pay, to cover the Government Printing Office, and for other purposes.

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

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

There was no objection.

ANNUITIES OF WIDOWS OF SUPREME COURT JUSTICES

The Clerk called the bill (S. 1686) to amend section 375 of title 28 of the United States Code, relating to the annuities of widows of Supreme Court Justices.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, since a rule has been granted for the consideration of this bill, I ask unanimous consent that it be passed over without prejudice.

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

There was no objection.

AUTHORIZING THE WAIVER OF COLLECTION OF CERTAIN ERRONEOUS PAYMENTS MADE BY THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT TO CERTAIN CIVILIAN AND MILITARY PERSONNEL

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 3800) to authorize the waiver of collection of certain erroneous payments made by the Federal Government to certain civilian and military personnel.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I think we ought to have some explanation of the purposes of this bill.

Mr. ASHMORE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I am glad to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. ASHMORE. Mr. Speaker, the purpose of this bill is to authorize the Comptroller General in meritorious cases to waive indebtedness of employees or military personnel based upon erroneous payments.

The Comptroller General would consider cases recommended for relief by the Department concerned. Financial hardship is expressly made an element for consideration in determining whether collection would be against equity and good conscience.

The bill would be made retroactive to June 30, 1958 or approximately 6 years.

As amended, the bill would authorize waiver by heads of Departments, subject to General Accounting Office regulations, of overpayments which do not exceed $150.

Provision is made for congressional review of proposed action by the Comptroller General of groups of similar indebtedness where the aggregate of amounts erroneously paid may exceed $50,000.

The bill provides for a waiver on the part of the Government of the right to demand repayment in cases where the Government has failed to attempt collection within a 6-year period from the time the indebtedness accrues.

Mr. GROSS. Let me say to the gentleman, and I am sure he is aware of it, and if not I would like to call his attention to the fact that there will be a number of claims bills on the Private Calendar tomorrow, and some of them deal with losses as a result of fire.

I cannot recall of more than one or two, though there may be more, which are less than $150. The bulk of those claims bills exceed $150.

I am sure that this limitation of $150 will not do a very great deal to stop the legislation that comes through on the Private Calendar, seeking to satisfy claims which are, for the most part, well above that amount of money.

I wonder if we are not, by this bill, lending encouragement to people to continue to make mistakes.

I have been disturbed for a long time, as the gentleman well knows, because of the errors being made and the overpayments being made. I have forgotten the exact figure, but I believe the General Accounting Office reports there has been $100 million expended by the Federal Government to satisfy overpayment claims in a period of about 7 years. Perhaps it was 10 years, but I believe it was 7.

I question seriously whether this bill goes to the root cause of the trouble.

Mr. ASHMORE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. ASHMORE. I should like to straighten out the first statement the gentleman made, with reference to the number of bills pending, which come up so often on the Consent Calendar and the Private Calendar. The bills to which the gentleman refers are for property losses, whereas this bill is for erroneous payments made to personnel only. This does not include the bills for property losses.

Mr. GROSS. There are a number of such bills on the Private Calendar, as I am sure the gentleman well knows.

Mr. ASHMORE. That is true, but we must differentiate between bills for property losses and bills for erroneous payments.

Mr. GROSS. Very few of those bills are for an amount of $150 or less. Most of them are for more than the $150 limit that would be set in this bill.

I say to the gentleman that I believe the Judiciary Committee ought to go beyond this legislation. This is a step in the right direction, perhaps, but I believe the committee should go well beyond this to the other claims dealing with personal property losses and take some definitive action with respect to the claims which are coming in ever increasing numbers and amounts.

There is a limit of $6,500 which may be paid out in satisfaction of personal property losses, but we find, for instance, as shown on the Private Calendar, that a colonel in the Army or in one of the branches of the military services claims property valued at $24,000. It seems to me that if administrators are going to be allowed to settle claims up to $6,500, the serviceman ought to carry insurance above that amount or the carrier should be made liable for the transportation of personal effects.

I would hope that the committee would not stop here. Either the Judiciary Committee or the Armed Services Committee should get busy and do something about this situation.

Mr. ASHMORE. I will say to the gentleman that it is a problem that has given us much concern. We have given it a great deal of study. We have heard members of the armed services who appeared before our committee to explain why the insurance did not cover these excessive amounts.

The answer is that to carry policies for large coverage would ultimately result in a loss to the Government, because there are so few of those large claims that the premiums would amount to more than the savings for the relatively few which reach that amount.

Mr. GROSS. As a matter of fact, I do not believe that an officer in the U.S. Army should be claiming he lost property valued at $24,000 or that any claim should be adjudicated on that basis. I do not know why the taxpayers should be moving military personnel from place to place throughout the world with $24,000 worth of personal effects—that is, exclusive of an automobile.

Mr. ASHMORE. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield further, I would like to say that is an unusual case where any person has that much property. In connection with these large claims, I would like the RECORD to show we have had claims officers of the military explain to us the manner in which they arrive at the figure they recommend. In most instances, in fact almost every instance, we have found that claims officers have done a good job. However, there are a few exceptions.

Mr. GROSS. I wish I could agree with the gentleman. I seriously question they are doing the kind of job of which they are capable in many instances.

Mr. ASHMORE. I say in most instances. There are some exceptions. We have reprimanded them, and I hope in the future they will do a better job than they have in the past.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, further reserving the right to object, as the gentleman knows, I extended my remarks after the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS] asked that this bill, H.R. 3800, be passed over without prejudice on August 3. At that time I inserted into the RECORD a series of nine questions to this bill predicated on the fact that primarily it will relieve the responsibility of the House; and, secondarily, it will render nonresponsible, or nonaccountable, the people engaged in the financial services of the various military departments who have been trained in such responsibility and accountability. In the interim I have been called upon and circularized by my own ROA—Reserve Officers Association—but no word from the majority counsel of the committee. I wonder if the gentleman who brings the bill to the floor of the House today would care to comment on any one of the objections specifically or in particular at this time.

Mr. ASHMORE. If the gentleman will yield, for those who are going to prepare the claims or who are responsible for the accounting of such, I would say that the authority will be exercised in accordance with the regulations issued by the Comptroller General. It is under his regulations that these claims would be settled, and I know of no better or higher authority than the Comptroller General.

Mr. HALL. If the gentleman will comment further, actually it would relieve the General Accounting Office from the policing of such situations which might arise, would it not?

Mr. ASHMORE. If the gentleman will turn to section 3, he will see the section he refers to.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, with complete respect for the action of the committee, and certainly of the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. ASHMORE], our colleague who has done such a fine job on this; and realizing it would make the procedure more efficient, it would relieve military finance officers of the responsibility and accountability, so therefore pending further advice, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice again at this date.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BOGGS). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

RETROCESSION OF JURISDICTION TO WYOMING

The Clerk called the bill (S. 51) to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to relinquish to the State of Wyoming jurisdiction over those lands within the Medicine Bow National Forest known as the Pole Mountain district.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I should like to ask someone if an out-of-State hunter, in the case of retrocession of Federal jurisdiction to a State, has the same rights as a hunter who is a resident of the State.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. Yes. Of course.

Mr. POAGE. As far as I can see, the out-of-State hunter, when the jurisdiction of the State of Wyoming is restored, will be in exactly the same position as in any other part of the State of Wyoming. In most cases these States do impose a larger hunting license charge on out-of-State people than they do on people within the State.

Mr. GROSS. This I understand, but my question really goes to whether they are permitted to hunt on the same land.

Mr. POAGE. Oh, yes, sir.

Mr. GROSS. And have the same bag limit.

Mr. POAGE. Exactly the same; yes, sir. The only thing I think that would stand in the way is that he would probably have to pay a larger license fee.

Mr. GROSS. I can understand that, but I do not want to see discrimination otherwise. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being 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 (a) the Secretary of Agriculture is authorized to relinquish to the State of Wyoming such measure as he may deem desirable of legislative jurisdiction heretofore acquired by the United States over lands within the Medicine Bow National Forest constituting the area known as the Pole Mountain District, created by Executive Order Numbered 4245, dated June 5, 1925, as amended by public land order numbered 1897, dated July 10, 1959.

(b) Relinquishment of jurisdiction under the authority of this Act may be made by filing with the Governor of the State of Wyoming a notice of such relinquishment, which shall take effect upon acceptance thereof by the State of Wyoming in such manner as the laws of such State may prescribe.

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.

DISABILITY AND DEATH BENEFITS FOR RESERVISTS

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 11332) to authorize certain veterans' benefits for disability or death resulting from injuries sustained prior to January 1, 1957, by reservists while proceeding directly to or returning directly from active duty for training or inactive duty training.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that this bill is scheduled to be considered under suspension, I ask unanimous consent that it be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

NAMING OF VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION HOSPITALS

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 11461) to provide for the designation of certain Veterans' Administration facilities.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that this bill is scheduled to be considered under suspension, I ask unanimous consent that it be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

ANSLEY WILCOX HOUSE, BUFFALO N.Y.

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 3500) to provide for the acquisition and preservation of the real property known as the Ansley Wilcox House in Buffalo, N.Y., as a national historic site.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

BREAKS INTERSTATE PARK COMPACT

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 11162) granting the consent of Congress to an amendment to the Breaks Interstate Park compact between the Commonwealths of Virginia and Kentucky.

There being 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 consent of Congress is hereby given to an amendment to The Breaks Interstate Park compact between the Commonwealths of Virginia and Kentucky, originally consented to by the Act of July 27, 1954 (68 Stat. 571; Public Law 543, Eighty-third Congress), as that amendment was approved (1) by the Commonwealth of Virginia by chapter 292, Acts of Assembly, 1964, approved March 31, 1964, and (2) by the Commonwealth of Kentucky by an act of the general assembly approved March 19, 1964 (house bill numbered 413, regular session, 1964, General Assembly, Commonwealth of Kentucky), by which amendment the last sentence of article III of said compact is made to read: "Each Commonwealth agrees that it will authorize the Commission to exercise the right of eminent domain to acquire property located within each Commonwealth required by the Commission to effectuate the purposes of this compact."

SEC. 2. The right to alter, amend, or repeal the provisions of this Act is hereby expressly reserved.

Mr. JENNINGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. JENNINGS. Mr. Speaker, H.R. 11162 is a bill that I introduced in the House to grant the consent of Congress to an amendment to the Breaks Interstate Park compact between the Commonwealths of Virginia and Kentucky.

It is a noncontroversial piece of legislation. It involves no expenditure of Federal funds. I urge its immediate approval.

Congress originally gave its consent to the park compact several years ago, and the two States have proceeded to develop a magnificent park. The compact provided that each of the two States would exercise the right of eminent domain to acquire property located with each State and required for the development of the park. The two States have decided, after considerable experience with the original compact, that this procedure can be improved and simplified by giving the Breaks Interstate Park Commission the authority to exercise the right of eminent domain.

The legislatures of Virginia and Kentucky have approved this amendment to the compact and now seek congressional approval, as is required for such compacts.

Mr. Speaker, in addition to urging passage of this legislation, I would invite my colleagues to take it upon themselves to visit the Breaks Interstate Park located on the western border of Virginia and eastern border of Kentucky. It offers spectacular scenery and fine accommodations. It is a fine vacation spot and I commend it to each of you planning to leave Washington upon adjournment of this session.

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.

U.S. DISTRICT COURT, EASTERN DISTRICT, MICH.

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 4989) to amend title 28 of the United States Code to transfer the counties of Genesee and Shiawassee in the State of Michigan from the northern division to the southern division of the eastern judicial district.

There being 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 (a) section 102(a)(1) of title 28, United States Code, is amended by inserting (1) "Genesee," immediately after "counties of", (2) "Shiawassee," immediately after "Sanilac,", and (3) ", Flint," immediately after "Detroit".

(b) Section 102(a)(2) of title 28, United States Code, is amended by striking out "Genesee.", "Shiawassee,", and "and Flint".

SEC. 2. The amendments made by this Act shall take effect on the ninetieth day after the date of its enactment.

Amend the title so as to read: "A bill to amend title 28 of the United States Code to transfer the counties of Genesee and Shiawassee in the State of Michigan from the Northern Division to the Southern Division of the Eastern Judicial District and to authorize a term of court at Ann Arbor."

With the following committee amendments:

1. Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert in lieu thereof the following: "That section 102(a) (1), (2) is amended to read as follows:

"'(a) The Eastern District comprises two divisions.

"'(1) The Southern Division comprises the counties of Genesee, Jackson, Lapeer, Lenawee, Livingston, Macomb, Monroe, Oakland,

Saint Clair, Sanilac, Shiawassee, Washtenaw, and Wayne.

" 'Court for the Southern Division shall be held at Ann Arbor, Detroit, Flint, and Port Huron.

" '(2) The Northern Division comprises the counties of Alcona, Alpena, Arenac, Bay, Cheboygan, Clare, Crawford, Gladwin, Gratiot, Huron, Iosco, Isabella, Midland, Montmorency, Ogemaw, Oscoda, Otsego, Presque Isle, Roscommon, Saginaw, and Tuscola.

" 'Court for the North Division shall be held at Bay City.' "

The committee amendments were agreed to.

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

The title was amended so as to read: "To amend title 28 of the United States Code to transfer the counties of Genesee and Shiawassee in the State of Michigan from the Northern Division to the Southern Division of the Eastern Judicial District and to authorize a term of court at Ann Arbor."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MEDICAL BENEFITS FOR MEDAL OF HONOR RECIPIENTS

The Clerk called the bill (S. 1046) to provide hospital domiciliary, and medical care for non-service-connected disabilities to recipients of the Medal of Honor.

There being 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 paragraph (2) of section 601 of title 38, United States Code, is amended by inserting immediately after "Indian Wars" the following: ", or any veteran awarded the Medal of Honor".

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.

VEGA DAM AND RESERVOIR, COLO.

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 6268) to provide adjustments in order to make uniform the estate acquired for the Vega Dam and Reservoir, Collbran project, Colorado, by authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to reconvey mineral interests in certain lands.

There being 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 in order to provide adjustments in the interests in land heretofore acquired for the Vega Dam and Reservoir, Collbran project, Colorado, and thereby make uniform the estate acquired to fulfill necessary real estate requirement of the project, the Secretary of the Interior is authorized to reconvey to the former owner thereof any mineral interest, including oil and gas, heretofore acquired for said project, whenever the Secretary shall determine that the retention of such mineral interest is not required for public purposes and he shall have received an application for reconveyance as hereinafter provided.

SEC. 2. The Secretary shall give notice to the former owner of such mineral interest of the availability of the interest for reconveyance under the provisions of this Act. The former owner shall thereafter file an application within ninety days of the date of notice if he desires to have the land or interest reconveyed to him.

SEC. 3. Any mineral interest reconveyed under this Act shall be transferred for an amount determined by the Secretary to be equal to the price at which the mineral interest was acquired by the United States.

SEC. 4. As used in this Act the term "former owner" means the person from whom any mineral interest was acquired by the United States or, if such person is deceased, his spouse; or if such spouse is deceased, his children or the heirs at law.

SEC. 5. The Secretary of the Interior may delegate any authority conferred upon him by this Act to any officer or employee of the Department of the Interior. Such officer or employee shall exercise the authority so delegated under regulations prescribed by the Secretary.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 2, line 10, strike out "land or".

Page 2, line 18, strike out "the".

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.

DEVELOPMENT OF COAL ON THE PUBLIC DOMAIN

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 8960) to amend section 27 of the Mineral Leasing Act of February 25, 1920, as amended, in order to promote the development of coal on the public domain.

There being 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 subsection (a) of section 27 of the Act of February 25, 1920, as amended (30 U.S.C. 184), is further amended to read as follows:

"(a) No person, association, or corporation shall take, hold, own, or control at one time, whether acquired directly from the Secretary under this Act or otherwise, coal leases or permits on an aggregate of more than forty-six thousand and eighty acres in any one State."

Amend the title so as to read: "A bill to amend section 27 of the Mineral Leasing Act of February 25, 1920, as amended, in order to promote the development of coal on the public domain and for other purposes."

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert the following language: "That subsection (a) (1) of section 27 of the Act of February 25, 1920, as amended (30 U.S.C. 184), is further amended to read as follows:

" '(a) (1) No person, association, or corporation shall take, hold, own, or control at one time, whether acquired directly from the Secretary under this Act or otherwise, coal leases or permits on an aggregate of more than forty-six thousand and eighty acres in any one State.'

"SEC. 2. (a) Subsection (a) of section 2 of the Act of February 25, 1920, as amended (30 U.S.C. 201(a)), is further amended by the deletion from the first sentence of the words, 'but in no case exceeding two thousand five hundred and sixty acres in any one leasing tract,'.

"(b) Subsection (b) of section 2 of the Act of February 25, 1920, as amended (30 U.S.C. 201(b)), is further amended by changing the words 'two thousand five hundred and sixty acres' in the first sentence thereof to 'five thousand one hundred and twenty acres'.

"(c) For the purpose of more properly conserving the natural resources of any coal field or prospective coal area, or any part or zone thereof, lessees and permittees and their representatives may enter into a contract with each other or others for collective prospecting, development, or operation of such field or prospective coal area, or any part or zone thereof, whenever determined and certified by the Secretary of the Interior to be in the public interest. A contract approved hereunder shall not provide for an apportionment of production or royalties among the separate tracts comprising the contract area, but may provide for the commingling of production with appropriate allocation to the tracts from which produced. Notwithstanding any provision of this section to the contrary, the Secretary may, with the consent of the lessees or permittees involved, establish, alter, change, or revoke mining, producing, rental, minimum royalty, and royalty requirements of such leases or permits, and issue regulations that are applicable to such leases or permits or contracts. The Secretary is authorized to enter into a contract with a single lessee or permittee embracing his leases or permits. The Secretary may authorize the consolidation of separate Federal permits or leases into a lesser number of permits or leases, or into a single permit or lease.

"(d) Coal leases and permits operated under a contract approved or executed by the Secretary pursuant to subsection (c) of this section may be excepted from limitations on maximum holdings or control imposed by this Act if the Secretary finds that such exception is required to permit economic development of the coal resources and is otherwise consistent with the public interest."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

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

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill to amend section 27 of the Mineral Leasing Act of February 25, 1920, as amended, in order to promote the development of coal on the public domain, and for other purposes."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXTENDING TIME FOR COMMITMENT OF VESSEL CONSTRUCTION RESERVE FUNDS

The Clerk called the bill (S. 2995) to amend section 511(h) of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended, in order to extend the time for commitment of construction reserve funds.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, inasmuch as this bill is scheduled for consideration under a suspension of the rules, I ask unanimous consent that it be passed over without prejudice.

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

There was no objection.

AMEND EMERGENCY LIVESTOCK FEED PROGRAM

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 12118) to facilitate pricing of feed made avail-

able for use in emergency areas, to establish penalties for misuse of feed made available for relieving distress or for preservation and maintenance of foundation herds, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, does this mean that in an emergency area a farmer can buy feed from the Commodity Credit Corporation and pay the price that the Government has in the feed at that point rather than the price, based upon Chicago, with a phantom freight rate charged?

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. POAGE. No, that is not quite what it means.

According to the present law, for the last 2 years, I believe, when we have in one of these disaster areas such a situation, the farmer comes in and obtains a certificate which indicates that he is entitled to so much feed. For instance, he obtains a certificate for 100 bushels of corn. Under the present arrangement he has to take that certificate to some predesignated dealer, and normally there is only one such dealer in a county who has been shipping in Commodity Credit Corporation stocks and has the authority to deal in Commodity Credit Corporation-owned stocks at his place of business.

That has worked out to be quite a hardship, particularly in a large county, because a man will come from one area and will have to go to this predesignated dealer and secure his grain. Then, if he wants the grain mixed—and I am sure the gentleman realizes that most of this feed must be ground and mixed—the Government gives him a discount on surplus grain in CCC stocks. If it is corn or oats, he takes that grain to another mill and has it ground and mixed. By the time he has hauled it all over the country he has probably not saved anything.

Mr. Speaker, what this legislation proposes to do is to allow him to get the certificate just as he does at the present time and take it to any feed dealer anywhere in the county who wants to deal with him. He produces the certificate which gives him a 25-percent discount on the price of the feed and the dealer gives him the feed at that 25-percent discount. The dealer then takes the certificate to the Commodity Credit Corporation and replenishes his own stock at the price at which he delivered the feed.

This farmer can take mixed feed at the dealers and he receives the discount based upon percentage of certificated surplus grain that is in his mixed feed.

For instance, if he has a certificate for 100 bushels of corn and he wants 500 bushels of mixed feed, he receives the discount only on that part which involves the corn which goes into it. When he purchases, for instance, soybean meal or anything like that, he pays the full price.

Mr. Speaker, there is one other thing, and that has to do with establishing a uniform penalty for violation of this procedure.

In the past we have had two laws in relation to the use of this surplus grain in disaster areas passed at different times. One of them actually does not carry any penalty whatsoever for violating it. That is for the issuance of fraudulent receipts and so on. So, we make the penalty uniform and apply it to all the circumstances under which a man can obtain surplus feed from the Government under any disaster program.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

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

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 407 of the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended, is hereby amended (1) by changing in the fifth sentence the words "not less than 75 per centum of the current support price for such feed (or a comparable price if there is no current support price)" to read "not less than 75 per centum of the current basic county support rate for such feed including the value of any applicable price support payment in kind (or a comparable price if there is no current basic county support rate)"; (2) by inserting in the fifth sentence "including the Virgin Islands" after "The United States" wherever it appears; (3) by adding at the end of the fifth sentence the following: ": *Provided,* That the Secretary may provide for the furnishing of feed or mixed feed, in accordance with regulations prescribed by him, to such persons by feed dealers under an arrangement whereby the feed grains (or other feed being sold by the Corporation) in the feed so furnished would be replaced with feed owned or controlled by the Corporation and sold to such persons at a price determined as provided above."; and (4) by adding at the end of the sixth sentence "or other area".

SEC. 2. The Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended, is amended by adding at the end of title IV the following:

"SEC. 421. Any person who disposes of any feed which has been made available to him under section 407 of this Act for use in relieving distress or for preservation and maintenance of foundation herds, other than as authorized by the Secretary, shall be subject to a penalty equal to the market value of the feed involved, to be recovered by the Secretary in a civil suit brought for that purpose, and in addition shall be guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be subject to a fine of not more than $1,000 or imprisonment for not more than one year."

SEC. 3. The Act of September 21, 1959 (73 Stat. 574), is amended (1) by changing the words "at current support prices," to read "at not less than the current basic county support rate including the value of any applicable price support payment in kind (or a comparable price if there is no current basic county support rate)," (2) by adding at the end of section 2, the following: "'State' means any State in the United States, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands."; (3) by adding at the end of section 3 the following: "The Secretary may provide for the furnishing of feed grains or mixed feed, in accordance with regulations prescribed by him, to any such person by a feed dealer under an arrangement whereby feed grains in the feed so furnished would be replaced with feed grains owned or controlled by the Corporation and sold to such person at a price determined as provided in section 1."; and (4) by inserting in section 4 after the word "purchased" the words "or furnished".

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

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill S. 400, which is identical to one section of H.R. 12118 and which deals with the same subject matter, strike out all after the enacting clause of the Senate bill and substitute the language of the House bill as passed by the House.

The Clerk read the title of the Senate bill.

The Clerk read the Senate bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 407 of the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended, is hereby amended by adding after the sixth sentence the following: "Any person who disposes of any feed, which has been made available to him for use in relieving distress or for preservation and maintenance of foundation herds, other than as authorized by the Secretary, shall be subject to a penalty equal to the market value of the feed involved, to be recovered by the Secretary in a civil suit brought for that purpose, and in addition shall be guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be subject to a fine of not more than $1,000 or imprisonment for not more than one year."

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

There was no objection.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. POAGE: Strike out all after the enacting clause of S. 400 and insert the provisions of H.R. 12118, as passed.

The amendment was agreed to.

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

A similar House bill, H.R. 12118, was laid on the table.

AUTHORIZING EXCHANGE OF PUBLIC DOMAIN LANDS FOR USE OF HANFORD PROJECT OF THE ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 11960) to authorize the exchange of public domain lands heretofore withdrawn and reserved for the use of the Hanford project of the Atomic Energy Commission, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I should like to ask someone if this is a fair exchange. I note that the Government is exchanging 10,000 acres for 7,000 acres. Can someone tell me whether this is a fair exchange for the taxpayers of this country?

Mr. MORRIS. Yes; this is land that may be exchanged for land of approximate equal value. The Government is getting land of equal value.

Mr. GROSS. The 7,000 acres is worth as much as the 10,000 acres the Government is turning over?

Mr. MORRIS. That is correct.

Mr. GROSS. On a fair market appraisal basis?

Mr. MORRIS. That is correct.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

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

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That all interests of the United States in the public domain lands lying south and west of the Columbia River, and within:

Township 14 north, range 26 east, section 28;

Township 14 north, range 27 east, section 34;

Township 13 north, range 25 east, section 14;

Township 10 north, range 28 east, sections 2, 4, and 10;

Township 12 north, range 26 east, sections 2, 4, 6, 8, 10, 12, 14, and 18;

Township 12 north, range 25 east, sections 2, 12, and 14;

Township 13 north, range 26 east, sections 28, 30, 32, and 34;

Willamette meridian, comprising approximately 10,000 acres, which lands are now withdrawn and reserved for the use of the Hanford project of the Atomic Energy Commission, shall hereafter be held by the Atomic Energy Commission as an agent of and on behalf of the United States, and the Atomic Energy Commission shall exercise all of the authorities with respect thereto as provided in the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, and the Atomic Energy Community Act of 1955, as amended: *Provided,* That any disposal of such lands pursuant to such Acts shall be subject to valid existing rights in third parties.

SEC. 2. All lands within the Hanford project lying north and east of the Columbia River and within:

Township 14 north, range 28 east, sections 18, 19, west half section 20, west half sections 29, 30, 31, and 32;

Township 13 north, range 27 east, sections 1, 12, and 13;

Township 13 north, range 28 east, sections 5, 6, 7, and 8;

Willamette meridian, that were acquired by the Manhattan Engineering District or by the Atomic Energy Commission and that are now under the administrative control of the Atomic Energy Commission, comprising approximately 7,000 acres, are hereby designated public domain lands of the United States subject to all of the laws and regulations applicable thereto, and are withdrawn from all forms of appropriation under the public land laws, including the mining and mineral leasing laws, and are reserved for the use of the Atomic Energy Commission in connection with its Hanford operations until such withdrawal and reservation are revoked by order of the Secretary of the Interior with the concurrence of the Atomic Energy Commission.

SEC. 3. The Secretary of the Interior and the Atomic Energy Commission may by agreement designate not to exceed 1,920 additional acres of public domain lands reserved for the Hanford project, which shall thereafter be held by the Atomic Energy Commission in accordance with the provisions of section 1 of this Act, and acquired lands of approximately equal value under the administrative control of the Atomic Energy Commission, which shall thereafter be held by the Atomic Energy Commission in accordance with the provisions of section 2 of this Act.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 2, line 19, strike out "parties." and insert "parties: *Provided further,* that nothing herein shall be deemed to add to, modify, or eliminate any authority of the Commission pursuant to such acts to dispose of property."

Page 2, lines 23 and 24, strike out "west half sections 29, 30, 31, and 32;" and insert "west half section 29, and sections 30, 31, and 32;"

Mr. MORRIS. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment in the nature of a substitute to the first committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment to the committee amendment offered by Mr. MORRIS: Page 2, line 19, strike out "parties." and insert "parties: *Provided further,* That nothing herein shall be deemed to add to, modify, or eliminate any authority of the Commission pursuant to such Acts to dispose of property."

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The amendments as amended 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.

ALASKA CENTENNIAL COMMISSION

The Clerk called the bill (S. 49) to provide for the establishment of the Alaska Centennial Commission, to cooperate with the State of Alaska to study and report on the manner and extent to which the United States shall participate in the celebration in 1967 of the centennial anniversary of the purchase of the Territory of Alaska, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would like to ask a question or two concerning this proposed legislation. I note that it authorizes an appropriation of $15,000. Is it customary to make such a request?

Mr. CORMAN. Yes. This is the same thing we did in connection with the centennial for West Virginia, for example. It authorized a study by the Department of Commerce to ascertain what part the United States should play in the centennial.

Mr. FORD. It is my understanding this is not the usual case. Heretofore there have been authorizations for Federal participation, but no Federal funds contributed.

Mr. CORMAN. This is identical with the West Virginia case. There may be other cases too in which this request was not made.

Mr. FORD. When was the authorization for the West Virginia case?

Mr. RIVERS of Alaska. I will say to the gentleman that in 1960 a bill almost identical with this was passed on behalf of West Virginia for the purpose of determining what part the Federal Government should play during the year 1963, which was West Virginia's centennial year. There was $15,000 authorized for the Secretary of Commerce to make a study in regard to the proposed centennial celebration of the State of West Virginia. This legislation is almost identical to what occurred in 1960.

Mr. FORD. What will they do with the $15,000? I am a little concerned about what the Department will undertake to study in order to determine Federal participation.

Mr. RIVERS of Alaska. The State has a commission created and appropriated $50,000, I will say to the gentleman.

This Commission is very desirous of consulting with some authorized representative of the Federal Government with the hope that the Federal Government would see fit to share to some extent in this celebration. The Secretary of Commerce could designate some person on his staff or contract with a specialist to make a survey around the State in communities in which the celebration is going to be carried out, and then report by March of next year.

Mr. FORD. It is my understanding that several States have had similar studies all leading up to centennials and that in those cases there was no federally authorized program. I am thinking of Kansas, for example.

I think the circumstances are a little bit different here. Alaska just became a State a few years ago. I voted for its admission to the Union. This is not a celebration of Alaska's admission to the Union, it is a different kind of celebration.

Mr. RIVERS of Alaska. Correct. This is to celebrate the 100th anniversary of Alaska's life under the American flag. This is something we would like to develop without worrying about the fact that Alaska has been a State for only 6 years.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FORD. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. If the State of Alaska wants to put up the $15,000 I have no quarrel with the bill. I can recall a few years ago when the State of Iowa celebrated an anniversary of its admission to the Union, but I cannot recall that State getting a single dime from the Federal Government. I am glad it was that way. I hope Alaska will have its celebration, but let it provide whatever finances are necessary.

Mr. RIVERS of Alaska. We are hoping that the Department of Commerce could pay its own way in making this survey, because Alaska has its hands full financially.

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

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

There was no objection.

DISPLAY OF THE FLAG AT LEXINGTON, MASS.

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 11327) to provide that the flag of the United States of America may be flown for 24 hours of each day in Lexington, Mass.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. ICHORD. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, I am concerned about the precedent we may be setting here. May I ask the gentleman handling the bill how many places in the United States are authorized to fly the flag 24 hours a day?

Mr. CORMAN. There are about six. One is the Capitol Building and one is the Iwo Jima Monument.

Mr. ICHORD. It has always been the tradition to lower the flag at sundown. I am concerned about the precedent we might be setting for many other places over the United States to fly the flag 24 hours a day.

Mr. MORRIS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ICHORD. I yield to the gentleman from New Mexico.

Mr. MORRIS. There are some places in the United States, for instance in Taos, N. Mex., which is one of the oldest settlements there is in the country, that are authorized to fly the flag 24 hours a day. It is only in places where great historical events have happened.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ICHORD. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. HALL. I think maybe I can shed a little light on the official right to fly the flag around the clock, that is, 24 hours a day. They are the Capitol, Fort McHenry, the White House, the Betsy Ross Home, and the Iwo Jima Monument; only five today. The colors may fly anywhere at a prominent point, if well lighted, around the clock. They may fly it for 24 hours a day in other places although it is not particularly authorized. Taos, Sante Fe, Pueblo, and other places near El Paso del Norte were official seats of government long before the Pilgrims landed on Plymouth Rock, and perhaps this is why. I agree with my colleague from Missouri that this is a dangerous precedent, although I agree it was where the "shot was fired that was heard around the world."

Mr. ICHORD. Of course Lexington is a great national shrine. I withdraw my reservation of objection, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

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

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, notwithstanding any rule or custom pertaining to the display of the flag of the United States of America as set forth in the joint resolution entitled "Joint resolution to codify and emphasize existing rules and customs pertaining to the display and use of the flag of the United States of America", approved June 22, 1942 (36 U.S.C. 171–178), the flag of the United States of America may be flown for twenty-four hours of each day on the green of the town of Lexington, Massachusetts. The flag may not be flown pursuant to the authority contained in this Act during the hours from sunset to sunrise unless it is illuminated.

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.

LEIF ERIKSON DAY

The Clerk called the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 393) to authorize the President to proclaim October 9 in each year as Leif Erikson Day.

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

Whereas Lief Erikson did make the original discovery by nonnative Americans of the North America Continent in about the year 1000 anno Domini, and subsequently explored portions thereof; and

Whereas proof of this historical fact rests solidly, not only on two independent accounts in the Norse sagas, but on archeological discoveries and evidence from the archives of European libraries; and

Whereas the fact of this discovery is further supported by the writings of numerous historians, and in encyclopedias and textbooks for school use; and

Whereas it is fitting that due recognition should be accorded to this historic exploit in early American history: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the President of the United States is authorized and requested to officially proclaim October 9 in each year as Leif Erikson Day, and to issue annually a proclamation calling upon officials of the Government to display the flag of the United States on all Government buildings on such day, and inviting the people of the United States to observe such day in schools, churches, and other suitable places with appropriate ceremonies and activities.

With the following committee amendments:

On pages 1 and 2, strike the "whereas" clauses.

On page 2, lines 3 and 4, strike the words "and requested".

On page 2, line 5, change the comma to a period and strike out the remainder of the bill.

The committee amendments were agreed to.

Mr. KARTH. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of House Joint Resolution 393 which would proclaim October 9 in each year as Leif Erikson Day. This legislation belatedly would serve to recognize officially the now scientifically established claim that Leif Erikson settled on the North American Continent around the year A.D. 1000.

I hope that the Congress does adopt this House joint resolution and will authorize the President of the United States to proclaim October 9, which historians have settled upon to be Erikson's birthday, as the day to celebrate his Vikings' heroic journey and the establishment of a colony near what is now the village of L'Anse aux Meadows, on Newfoundland Island.

Erikson and his Vikings were the first of many Norsemen to explore and to settle on the shores of North America. For centuries their bold achievement was little recognized. However, last year the outstanding efforts of Dr. Helge Ingstad and an expedition supported by the National Geographic Society have incontrovertibly established through radiocarbon dating of ancient ruins at L'Anse aux Meadows in Newfoundland that the site was, in fact, occupied about A.D. 1000 by Erikson and his Vikings.

All Americans are interested in the history of their land in paying well-deserved tribute to the hardy Norsemen who braved the terrors of unknown seas and the forbidding shores in the quest for adventure and glory.

I want to acknowledge my special debt to Dr. Helge Ingstad, Dr. O. G. Landsverk and the many others who have devoted so much of their energies, time, and resources to verifying Leif Erikson's role in American history.

I am pleased to support House Joint Resolution 393 and urge its adoption.

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

WHITE CANE SAFETY DAY

The Clerk called the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 753) to provide that October 15, 1963, shall be designated as White Cane Safety Day.

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

Whereas the protection of the lives and limbs of blind pedestrians is a major concern of all the blind persons of the United States; and

Whereas public safety education as to the meaning of the white cane and the requirements of laws concerning white canes is necessary to obtain the maximum safety of such pedestrians: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the President is hereby authorized and requested to issue a proclamation designating October 15, 1963, as White Cane Safety Day and calling upon the people of the United States to observe such day with appropriate ceremonies and activities.

With the following committee amendments:

On page 1, strike the "Whereas" clauses.

On page 1, line 3, strike out "and requested".

On page 1, line 4, after "issue", insert "annually", and strike ", 1963,".

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The joint resolution 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: "Joint resolution to authorize the President to proclaim October 15 of each year as White Cane Safety Day."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

INTERNATIONAL EXPOSITION FOR SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA

The Clerk called the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 952) extending recognition to

the International Exposition for Southern California in the year 1968 and authorizing the President to issue a proclamation calling upon the several States of the Union and foreign countries to take part in the exposition.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the joint resolution?

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I wonder if we could have from the sponsor of this resolution the assurance that it will not result in an expenditure of funds on the part of the taxpayers of this country to support this international exposition.

Mr. CORMAN. There is no request for funds in this proposal, sir.

Mr. GROSS. Does the gentleman give us the assurance that he is not going to come in and ask for funds later on for this exposition; that this is not a foot in the door?

Mr. CORMAN. No, sir; neither is this the camel's head under the tent.

Mr. GROSS. Does the gentleman say that it is not going to cost the taxpayers any money in the future?

Mr. CORMAN. So far as I am concerned, as to this action today, that is correct. However, in the future it would depend on the Members of Congress in the future Congresses.

Mr. GROSS. You say it depends on the voters in your district?

Mr. CORMAN. In all of the districts in southern California this is a matter of great importance. Whether or not there may be a request by some Member for Federal funds in the future, perhaps our colleague the gentleman from California [Mr. HOSMER] is in a better position than I am to respond to the gentleman's question.

Mr. HOSMER. There is no request for the use of Federal funds for this exposition. The reason the resolution is before us today and the reason such a resolution is necessary is in order that international participation in this exposition may be invited. We passed a resolution a year ago naming the year 1966 for the exposition. Since then officials have delayed the exposition until 1968. The only purpose of this bill before the House is to correct the date.

Mr. GROSS. The gentleman does not anticipate that he will be asking for a subsidy out of the U.S. Treasury for the purpose of staging this exposition?

Mr. HOSMER. I do not anticipate asking for any subsidy.

Mr. GROSS. Well, do you anticipate asking for any money—call it whatever you want, long green or anything else. You do not anticipate that you will be in here asking for funds?

Mr. HOSMER. The answer is "No."

Mr. GROSS. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the joint resolution?

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

Whereas the International Exposition for Southern California, to be held at Long Beach, California, in the year 1968, the Planet of Man Exposition, will depict the role of arts and sciences, commerce and industry as it applies to the life of mankind on the planet of Earth; and

Whereas the exposition will encompass the five phases of man's life in the realms of living, learning, working, moving, and playing; and

Whereas the exposition will exhibit the various cultures of the nations of the Earth; and

Whereas the exposition will provide an adequate medium for interchange of information by which all people may evaluate the attainments of men of other nations; and

Whereas the exposition will encourage tourist travel to the United States, and stimulate foreign trade; and

Whereas the exposition has met with enthusiastic response from official bodies, organizations, and individuals in California, Los Angeles County, and the city of Long Beach: Therefore be it

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Congress hereby recognizes the International Exposition for Southern California in the year 1968 as an event designed to develop and intensify a climate of good will and understanding among men and nations, thereby promoting a lasting peace among all people on the planet of the Earth.

SEC. 2. To implement the recognition declared in the first section of this Act, the President, at such time as he deems appropriate, is authorized and requested to issue a proclamation calling upon the several States of the Union and foreign countries to take part in the exposition.

SEC. 3. The joint resolution approved August 31, 1962 (76 Stat. 414), is repealed.

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

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of an identical Senate joint resolution, Senate Joint Resolution 162.

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

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

Whereas the International Exposition for Southern California, to be held at Long Beach, California, in the year 1968, the Planet of Man Exposition, will depict the role of arts and sciences, commerce and industry, as it applies to the life of mankind on the planet Earth; and

Whereas the exposition will encompass the five phases of man's life in the realms of living, learning, working, moving, and playing; and

Whereas the exposition will exhibit the various cultures of the nations of the Earth; and

Whereas the exposition will provide an adequate medium for interchange of information by which all people may evaluate the attainments of men of other nations; and

Whereas the exposition will encourage tourist travel to the United States, and stimulate foreign trade; and

Whereas the exposition has met with enthusiastic response from official bodies, organizations, and individuals in California, Los Angeles County, and the city of Long Beach: Therefore be it

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Congress hereby recognizes the International Exposition for Southern California in the year 1968 as an event designed to develop and intensify a climate of good will and understanding among men and nations, thereby promoting a lasting peace among all people on the planet of the Earth.

SEC. 2. To implement the recognition declared in the first section of this Act, the President, at such time as he deems appropriate, is authorized and requested to issue a proclamation calling upon the several States of the Union and foreign countries to take part in the exposition.

SEC. 3. The joint resolution approved August 31, 1962 (76 Stat. 414), is repealed.

The Senate 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.

A similar House joint resolution, House Joint Resolution 952, was laid on the table.

PROVIDING FOR THE APPOINTMENT OF A COMMISSIONER GENERAL FOR U.S. PARTICIPATION IN THE CANADIAN UNIVERSAL AND INTERNATIONAL EXHIBITION

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 11707) to provide for the appointment of a Commissioner General for U.S. participation in the Canadian Universal and International Exhibition, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I should like to ask the gentleman from Florida [Mr. FASCELL], the author of the bill, several questions.

Is it true that the person who would be serving in this capacity as Commissioner General would receive a salary of $28,500 per year?

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FORD. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. HAYS. The bill came from my subcommittee. The gentleman is correct; that is, under the new salary scale.

Mr. FORD. What will he do?

Mr. HAYS. He will be the American representative representing this country in negotiations with Canada for the American exhibit. Also, I might say, he will be the ambassador for all American firms who will exhibit there.

Mr. FORD. For how long a term will he hold this sinecure?

Mr. HAYS. Presumably from the time he is appointed until the fair is over. We had a similar chap at the Brussels Fair. I believe he held that sinecure for about 3 years.

Mr. FORD. Did he receive the same compensation?

Mr. HAYS. He was eligible for it, but he, being a wealthy individual, decided the honor was enough and turned back his salary.

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection and ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

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

There was no objection.

RETROCEDING TO THE STATE OF KANSAS EXCLUSIVE JURISDICTION OVER CERTAIN HIGHWAYS BORDERING FORT LEAVENWORTH MILITARY RESERVATION

The Clerk called the bill (S. 2369) to retrocede to the State of Kansas exclusive jurisdiction over certain State highways bordering Fort Leavenworth Military Reservation and the U.S. Penitentiary at Leavenworth.

There being 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 there is hereby retroceded to the State of Kansas by the United States exclusive jurisdiction over all of the following described areas bordering Fort Leavenworth Military Reservation and the United States Penitentiary at Leavenworth:

A strip of land one hundred feet in width along the southern boundary of the Fort Leavenworth Military Reservation and along the southern boundary of the Leavenworth Penitentiary lands being that portion of the Fort Leavenworth Military Reservation donated for exclusive use as a public road by Act of Congress approved July 27, 1868 (15 Stat. 238), which remains United States Government property, being a part of State Highways Numbered 92 and 7, the highway numbered United States 73, and the public road known as Mount Zion Road;

Also, a strip of land one hundred feet in width being fifty feet on each side of the centerline of the highway numbered United States 73 and State Highway Numbered 7 extending from the north boundary of the above described one hundred-foot strip northwesterly to the point of intersection of the centerline of said highway with the westerly boundary of said Fort Leavenworth Military Reservation;

Also, that portion of the right-of-way of the public road known as Mount Zion Road which extends in a northwesterly direction along the southwesterly boundary of the Leavenworth Penitentiary lands.

SEC. 2. The retrocession of exclusive jurisdiction provided by this Act shall take effect upon acceptance by the State of Kansas.

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.

STABILIZE AND IMPROVE COUNTY ASC COMMITTEE SYSTEM

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 9178) to amend section 8(b) of the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. OLIVER P. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I wonder if we could have an explanation of the bill?

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. OLIVER P. BOLTON. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Speaker, this bill would change the method of electing the county chairman of the ASC Committee. Previously, the county chairman has been elected by the vote of the chairmen of the several precinct or community committees within the county.

This bill would make all of the members of the community committees eligible to vote for the county chairman. There are always at least three members of each community committee. Thus at least three times as many people would be voting for the county chairman as presently vote.

Mr. OLIVER P. BOLTON. The gentleman feels that this would give a greater recognition to the members of the committees throughout the counties?

Mr. POAGE. We believe it would give a little more recognition to the localities, because all members of the local committees could vote, instead of merely the chairmen of the local committees.

Mr. OLIVER P. BOLTON. Was the bill passed unanimously by the committee?

Mr. POAGE. As I recollect, it was passed unanimously. I feel certain it was.

Mr. OLIVER P. BOLTON. I thank the gentleman. I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

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

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the seventh and eighth sentences of section 8(b) of the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act, as amended (16 U.S.C. 590h(b)), are deleted and the following inserted in lieu thereof: "Farmers within any such local administrative area, and participating or cooperating in programs administered within such area, shall elect annually from among their number a local committee of not more than three members for such area. The members of the local committees shall, in a county convention, nominate and elect a county committee which shall consist of three members who are farmers in the county. At the first county convention held hereunder, one member of the county committee shall be elected for one year; one member shall be elected for two years; and one member shall be elected for three years. Thereafter, each member of a county committee shall be elected for a term of three years. No member of the county committee shall be elected for more than three consecutive terms."

SEC. 2. Section 503 of the Act of August 26, 1954 (68 Stat. 908; 16 U.S.C. 590h–3), is repealed.

SEC. 3. Section 1 of this Act shall become effective for elections of committeemen held on or after January 1, 1964.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Speaker, I offer amendments to the bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendments offered by Mr. POAGE: Page 2, line 3, strike out "hereunder," and insert "on or after the effective date of this sentence,".

Page 2, line 9, strike out the period at the end of the sentence and insert "(exclusive of any term which began prior to the effective date of this sentence)."

Page 2, line 13, strike out "1964" and insert "1965".

The 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.

AUTHORIZATION FOR SECRETARY OF THE ARMY TO ACQUIRE YMCA BUILDING ON THE FORT JAY MILITARY RESERVATION

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 9803) to authorize the Secretary of the Army to acquire the building constructed on the Fort Jay Military Reservation, N.Y., by the Young Men's Christian Association.

There being 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 Secretary of the Army is authorized to acquire on behalf of the United States, out of funds appropriated pursuant to section 2 of this Act, fee simple title to the building constructed on the Fort Jay Military Reservation, New York, by the Young Men's Christian Association.

SEC. 2. There is authorized to be appropriated the sum of $150,000 to carry out the provisions of the first section of this Act.

With the following committee amendment:

The amendment is as follows:

Strike all of section 2 and, in lieu thereof, substitute the following:

"SEC. 2. The purchase price for the property acquired under this Act shall be $150,000, provided that no funds may be expended for acquisition of title to the property in the absence of specific appropriation of funds for such acquisition, which appropriation is hereby authorized."

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.

REPEALING RECAPTURE PROVISION ON MASSACHUSETTS LAND

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 11338) to remove certain conditions subject to which certain real property in South Boston, Mass., was conveyed to the Massachusetts Port Authority.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object—and I wish I could address my questions to the sponsor of the bill, but I know that is not possible—I notice this provides for an exchange of almost 16 acres of so-called surplus land in South Boston for a little less than 4 acres.

Mr. PHILBIN. Yes. There are some other equities involved here. For 17 years prior to the amendment of the first bill to make this land available the Navy had the use of the land.

This land was appraised for $167,000, I may say to the distinguished gentleman. The appraisal estimated the land to have a fair rental value of $6,500 a year. The Congress recognized this factor and permitted the Navy to waive 50 percent of the difference in the values of the two parcels. Since the difference in the appraised value of the lands is $96,000, all that the Secretary could waive was $48,000, which would be approximately, not the $6,500, which the appraisal deemed the land to be worth, but only $2,800 per year.

Mr. GROSS. The difference in the valuation of the land was fixed at $96,000, of which the Secretary waived 50 percent, or $48,000?

Mr. PHILBIN. That is right.

Mr. GROSS. Am I correct that the port authority will get this 50 percent reduction because the Government has been using publicly owned land at no cost? If so, for what period of time or for how many years did the Government use it?

Mr. PHILBIN. For the period of 17 years.

Mr. GROSS. I cannot understand why there was no charge to the Government for the use of the land during those 17 years.

Mr. PHILBIN. The appraiser valued the rental to be $6,500 a year, but actually, in accordance with the bill, the Government is paying off only on the basis of $2,800 a year. So the Government is getting a very good deal in this matter, in my estimation.

Mr. GROSS. The Government is?

Mr. PHILBIN. A very good deal, I should say, because we are getting more than the equivalent value of the property on the basis of the exchange and the rental appraisal for the use of the authority's property.

Mr. GROSS. I hope you are right, but I would be constrained to object to it were it not for the fact that the Government had the use of some land for a period of years.

Mr. PHILBIN. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. GROSS. The report does not say how many years, but you say it is 17 years?

Mr. PHILBIN. Seventeen years, according to the evidence, and that is the fact of the matter. I think the gentleman may be assured that the Government is receiving at least the equivalent value in the transaction.

Mr. GROSS. In view of the fact that the Government had the use of the property for 17 years, I think we can take that into consideration.

Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

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

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) section 2 of the Act entitled "An Act to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to transfer to the Massachusetts Port Authority, an instrumentality of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, certain lands and improvements thereon comprising a portion of the so called E Street Annex, South Boston Annex, Boston Naval Shipyard, in South Boston, Massachusetts, in exchange for certain other lands", approved July 7, 1960 (Public Law 86-602; 74 Stat. 355), is repealed.

(b) The Secretary of the Navy shall conform the conveyance made under such Act of July 7, 1960, to the repeal of the conditions imposed by section 2 of such Act.

With the following committee amendment:

Strike everything after the enacting clause and substitute the following: "That section 2 of the Act entitled "An act to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to transfer to the Massachusetts Port Authority, an instrumentality of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, certain lands and improvements thereon comprising a portion of the so-called E Street Annex, South Boston Annex, Boston Naval Shipyard, in South Boston, Massachusetts, in exchange for certain other lands", approved July 7, 1960 (Public Law 86-602; 74 Stat. 355), is repealed."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

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

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill to remove certain conditions subject to which certain real property in South Boston, Massachusetts, was authorized to be conveyed to the Massachusetts Port Authority."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXCHANGE OF LANDS—NAVY DEPARTMENT AND CALIFORNIA

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 11594) to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to convey to the State of California certain lands in the county of Monterey.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, does not the delivery of the land on the part of the State of California require legislative action?

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. Yes. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. COHELAN. I am not sure of whether it does require legislative action. However, I can assure the gentleman that the details of the exchange and the wording of the bill have been developed through numerous and very extensive discussions between representatives of the State and of the Department of the Navy. The values that are involved, the appraised market value of the property to be conveyed to the Navy, is approximately $163,000. The property to be acquired by the Navy has an appraised market value of approximately the same amount.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, let me ask the gentleman this question: Does he not think that in the absence of authority on the part of the State of California to deliver this land there ought to be some kind of a saving clause in the bill based upon the terms and conditions of the bill? I cannot find anything like that in the report.

Mr. COHELAN. I may say to the gentleman that on second thought, as I reflect on his question as to the legislative authorization for the conveyance of this property, I am quite certain the State Highway Commission which is involved in this transaction has that authority.

Mr. GROSS. Has the authority as of the present time?

Mr. COHELAN. Yes.

Mr. GROSS. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

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

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That notwithstanding any other provisions of law, the Secretary of the Navy, or his designee, is authorized to convey to the State of California, subject to the terms and conditions hereinafter stated, and to such other terms and conditions as the Secretary of the Navy, or his designee, shall deem to be in the public interest, all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to the land located in the county of Monterey, State of California, described substantially as follows:

PARCEL 1

For freeway purposes that parcel of land in the city of Monterey, county of Monterey, State of California, described as follows: Beginning at a brass cap monument designated M-145, which said monument is the southwesterly terminus of course (38) described in the deed to the State of California, recorded December 12, 1960, in volume 2105 of official records, at page 396, records of said county;

thence (a) along the westerly line of the United States Navy property also being course (39) in last said deed, south 06 degrees 36 minutes 03 seconds west, 15.28 feet;

thence (b) north 38 degrees 48 minutes 10 seconds east, 235.86 feet;

thence (c) north 28 degrees 11 minutes 44 seconds east, 546.05 feet;

thence (d) north 20 degrees 05 minutes 51 seconds east, 66.49 feet to a point on the westerly line of the United States Navy property, which last said line is also the above said course (38);

thence (e) along said course (38) south 30 degrees 56 minutes 03 seconds west, 830.46 feet to the point of beginning; subject to easements and rights-of-way for pipelines as granted by Pacific Improvement Company to the Monterey County Waterworks, by deed dated August 27, 1907, and recorded September 3, 1907, in volume 98 of deeds at page 154, Monterey County records.

Together with the release and relinquishment of all abutter's rights of access, appurtenant to the Navy's remaining property, in and to said freeway. Containing 0.45 of an acre, more or less.

Bearings and distances used herein are based on the California coordinate system, zone 4; multiply distances called by 1.0000592 to obtain ground level distances.

PARCEL 2

For highway purposes, that part of the portion of real property in the city of Monterey, county of Monterey, State of California, conveyed to the United States of America by deed recorded June 15, 1948, in volume 1068 of official records at page 1, records of said county, described as follows: Beginning at monument M-124 as said monument is delineated on the map filed February 13, 1953, in volume 4 of surveys, at page 105, records of said county;

thence (aa) along a line connecting said monument M-124, with monument M-151, as delineated on said map, south 11 degrees 12 minutes 09 seconds east, 65.42 feet;

thence (bb), south 36 degrees 00 minutes 14 seconds east, 58.12 feet;

thence (cc), north 62 degrees 57 minutes 51 seconds east, 8.79 feet to a point on the westerly line of Aguajito Road as shown on last said map;

thence (dd) along the said westerly line north 27 degrees 02 minutes 09 seconds west, 120.34 feet to the point of beginning; subject to easements and rights-of-way for pipelines as granted by Pacific Improvement

Company to the Monterey County Water Works, by deed dated August 27, 1907, and recorded September 3, 1907, in volume 98 of deeds at page 154, Monterey County records. Containing 0.03 of an acre, more or less.

Bearings and distances used herein are based on the California coordinate system, zone 4; multiply distances called by 1.0000592 to obtain ground level distances.

PARCEL 3

For a freeway and adjacent frontage road that part of the portion of land in the city of Monterey, county of Monterey, State of California, conveyed to the United States of America by deed recorded June 15, 1948, in volume 1068 of official records, at page 1, records of said county, described as follows: Beginning at monument M–103 on the northeasterly line of the existing State highway, "Road V–Mon–117–Mon, A," as shown on the map recorded May 27, 1957, in volume 5 of surveys, at page 110, records of said county;

thence (1A) northeasterly along the property line of said portion conveyed to the United States of America to a concrete monument with a disk stamped "R.E. 707" set at an angle point in the property line of the Monterey Peninsula Airport as shown on said map recorded at page 110;

thence (2A) along course (10) under parcels III and IV in said deed to the United States of America, north 12 degrees 33 minutes 55 seconds west, 189.49 feet;

thence (3A) tangent to a line bearing north 74 degrees 43 minutes 41 seconds west, along a curve to the left with a radius of 642.69 feet through an angle of 6 degrees 10 minutes 12 seconds for an arc length of 69.21 feet;

thence (4A), north 75 degrees 39 minutes 00 seconds west, 221.21 feet;

thence (5A), along a tangent curve to the right with a radius of 400 feet through an angle of 57 degrees 41 minutes 19 seconds for an arc length of 402.74 feet;

thence (6A), north 14 degrees 24 minutes 42 seconds west, 163.72 feet;

thence (7A), north 27 degrees 30 minutes 56 seconds west, to a point on course (14) under said parcels III and IV in said deed to the United States of America;

thence (8A), westerly along said course (14) to said northeasterly line of said existing State highway; thence (9A), southeasterly along said northeasterly line to the point of beginning; subject to covenants, conditions, restrictions, easements, and reservations of record, if any.

Together with the release and relinquishment of all abutter's rights to access including access rights appurtenant to the Navy's remaining property in and into said freeway, provided however, that such remaining property shall abut upon and have access to said frontage road which will be connected to the freeway only at such points as may be established by public authority. Containing 6.47 acres, more or less.

Bearings and distances used herein are based on the California coordinate system, zone 4; multiply distances called by 1.0000592 to obtain ground level distances.

SEC. 2. In consideration of the conveyance by the United States of the aforesaid lands, the State of California shall convey to the United States lands located in the County of Monterey, State of California, described substantially as follows:

PARCEL 4

That parcel of land in the City of Monterey, County of Monterey, State of California, described as follows: Beginning at the southwesterly corner of that certain 94.984-acre tract conveyed by David Jacks to the Pacific Improvement Company, by deed dated May 11, 1880, and recorded in volume 1 of deeds at page 5, records of said county; thence (1B) northerly along the westerly line of said 94.984-acre tract to the northwesterly corner thereof, said corner being marked on the ground by a monument designated M–92; thence (2B) south 01 degree 20 minutes 04 seconds east, 53.25 feet;

thence (3B), south 02 degrees 31 minutes 54 seconds west, 648.36 feet;

thence (4B), south 03 degrees 49 minutes 15 seconds east, 308.63 feet;

thence (5B), south 18 degrees 11 minutes 15 seconds east, 341.40 feet;

thence (6B), south 27 degrees 30 minutes 56 seconds east, to the southerly line of the parcel of land conveyed to the State of California by final order of condemnation, recorded April 10, 1962 in reel 41 of official records, at page 251, records of said County;

thence (7B), easterly along last said line to the point of beginning; subject to a right of way from T. A. Work to Pacific Gas and Electric Company by instrument dated September 28, 1928, recorded October 3, 1929, in book 209 of official records at page 407, records of Monterey County, subject also to covenants, restrictions, easements, and reservations of record, if any. Containing 5.13 acres, more or less.

Excepting and reserving unto the State of California any and all rights of ingress to or egress from the real property herein conveyed to or from the freeway lying westerly of said real property; provided, however, that said real property shall abut upon and have access to a frontage road which will be connected with said freeway only at such points as may be established by public authority.

Bearings and distances used herein are based on the California coordinate system, zone 4; multiply distances called by 1.0000592 to obtain ground level distances.

PARCEL 5

That portion of lot 1 in block 1, city of Monterey, county of Monterey, State of California, as said lot and block are shown on the map of "Tract No. 370 Del Monte Research Park" filed in volume 7, of cities and towns, sheet 2 of 5 at page 19, records of said county, described as follows: Beginning at a 1½-inch iron pipe with copper disc stamped "L.S. 2975," said point marking the intersection of the southerly line of the Monterey Peninsula Airport district property with the northeasterly line of Garden Road, as said two lines are delineated on said map recorded in volume 7;

thence (1), along said northeasterly line, tangent to a line bearing south 42 degrees 42 minutes 45 seconds east, along a curve to the left with a radius of 809.95 feet, through an angle of 14 degrees 45 minutes 30 seconds for an arc length of 208.63 feet;

thence (2) north 77 degrees 26 minutes 05 seconds east, 225.00 feet;

thence (3), north 02 degrees 28 minutes 53 seconds west, 167.59 feet to a point on said southerly line of the Monterey Peninsula Airport;

thence (4), along last said southerly line south 77 degrees 26 minutes 05 seconds west, 381.07 feet to the point of beginning; subject to covenants, conditions, restrictions, easements and reservations of record, if any. Containing 1.17 acres, more or less.

Bearings and distances used herein are based on the California coordinate system, zone 4; multiply distances called by 1.0000592 to obtain ground level distances.

SEC. 3. The Secretary of the Navy, or his designee, is also authorized to accept from the State of California, or any local agency or subdivision thereof, such appropriate interests in other land as may be considered necessary for protection of the interests of the United States in connection with the exchange.

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.

PROCESSING OF GRAIN FOOD PRODUCTS

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 11846) to amend the act of August 19, 1958, to permit purchase of processed food grain products in addition to purchase of flour and cornmeal and donating the same for certain domestic and foreign purposes.

There being 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 Act of August 19, 1958, is amended to read as follows:

"That at any time Commodity Credit Corporation has any grain available for donation pursuant to clause (3) or (4) of section 416 of the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended, section 210 of the Agricultural Act of 1956, or title II of the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act, as amended, the Corporation, in lieu of processing all or any part of such grain into human food products, may purchase such processed food products in quantities not to exceed the equivalent of the respective grain available for donation on the date of such purchase and donate such processed food products pursuant to clause (3) or (4) of such section 416, and to such section 210, and make such processed food products available to the President pursuant to such title II, and may sell, without regard to the provisions of section 407 of the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended, a quantity of the grain equivalent to the processed food products so purchased: *Provided,* That no food product purchased pursuant to the authority contained herein shall constitute less than 50 per centum by weight of the grain from which processed, or contain any additive other than for normal vitamin enrichment, preservative, and bleaching purposes."

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.

DISPOSAL OF ANTIMONY FROM NATIONAL STOCKPILE

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 11913) to authorize the sale, without regard to the 6-month waiting period prescribed, of antimony proposed to be disposed of pursuant to the Strategic and Critical Materials Stock Piling Act.

There being 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 Administrator of General Services is hereby authorized to dispose of, by negotiation or otherwise, approximately seven million pounds of antimony now held in the national stockpile. Such dispositions may be made without regard to the provisions of section 3 of the Strategic and Critical Materials Stock Piling Act, relating to dispositions on the basis of a revised determination pursuant to section 2 of said Act, to the effect that no such disposition shall be made until six months after publication in the Federal Register and transmission to the Congress and to the Armed Services Committees thereof of a notice of the proposed disposition, but in such disposition the Administrator of General Services shall comply with the other provisions of such section 3, particularly those which require that the plan and date of disposition shall be fixed with due regard to the protection of producers, processors,

and consumers against avoidable disruption of their usual markets.

With the following committee amendment:

Strike everything after the enacting clause and substitute the following: "That the Administrator of General Services is hereby authorized to dispose of, by negotiation or otherwise, approximately five thousand short tons of antimony now held in the national stockpile established pursuant to the Strategic and Critical Materials Stock Piling Act (50 U.S.C. 98–98h) and the supplemental stockpile established pursuant to section 104(b) of the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954, as amended (7 U.S.C. 1704(b)). Such dispositions may be made without regard to the provisions of section 3 of the Strategic and Critical Materials Stock Piling Act: *Provided*, That the time and method of disposition shall be fixed with due regard to the protection of the United States against avoidable loss and the protection of producers, processors, and consumers against avoidable disruption of their usual markets."

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: "To authorize the disposal, without regard to the prescribed six-month waiting period, of antimony from the national stockpile and the supplemental stockpile."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DISPOSAL OF SISAL FROM THE NATIONAL STOCKPILE

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 12091) to authorize the disposal, without regard to the prescribed 6-month waiting period, of approximately 9,500,000 pounds of sisal from the national stockpile.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I should like to direct a question to the gentleman in charge of this bill. Can he tell us the present market price of sisal? The report indicates that the sisal should be sold, for one reason, because of the high market price at the present time. There is no mention of the price of sisal today.

Mr. PHILBIN. The proposal is to sell the sisal, of which we have a surplus, at the market price, and to eliminate all sisal from the national stockpile because it has been determined that it is no longer needed in the stockpile. The average current price of the sisal in the stockpile is 18¾ cents per pound. Naturally we would receive the current price. We would expect the Government to receive the Government market price.

Mr. CONTE. What was the cost of the sisal when we bought it?

Mr. PHILBIN. The sisal actually cost the Government 13½ cents. We expect to receive 18¾ cents, so the Government should make some profit out of it.

Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman's inquiry.

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

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

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Administrator of General Services is hereby authorized to dispose of approximately nine million five hundred thousand pounds of sisal now held in the national stockpile. Such disposal may be made without regard to the provision of section 3(e) of the Strategic and Critical Materials Stock Piling Act (50 U.S.C. 98b(e)), that no disposition of materials held in the national stockpile shall be made prior to the expiration of six months after the publication in the Federal Register and the transmission to the Congress and to the Armed Services Committee of each House thereof of the notice of the proposed disposition required by said section 3(e).

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.

DISPOSAL OF PORTIONS OF 10 MATERIALS

The Clerk called House Concurrent Resolution 320, to express the sense of the Congress on disposal from the national stockpile of certain materials.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the concurrent resolution?

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this concurrent resolution be passed over without prejudice.

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

There was no objection.

REVENUES FROM NATIONAL WILDLIFE REFUGE SYSTEM

The Clerk called the bill (S. 1363) to increase the participation by counties in revenues from the national wildlife refuge system by amending the act of June 15, 1935, relating to such participation, and for other purposes.

There being 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 401 of the Act of June 15, 1935, as amended (49 Stat. 378, 383; 16 U.S.C. 715s.), relating to the participation by the counties in revenues from wildlife refuges, is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 401. (a) Beginning with the next full fiscal year and for each fiscal year thereafter, all revenues received by the Secretary of the Interior from the sale or other disposition of animals, timber, hay, grass, or other products of the soil, minerals, shells, sand, or gravel, from other privileges, or from leases for public accommodations or facilities incidental to but not in conflict with the basic purposes for which those areas of the National Wildlife Refuge System were established, during each fiscal year in connection with the operation and management of those areas of the National Wildlife Refuge System that are solely or primarily administered by him, through the United States Fish and Wildlife Service, shall be covered into the United States Treasury and be reserved in a separate fund for disposition as hereafter prescribed. Amounts in the fund shall remain available until expended, and may be expended by the Secretary without further appropriation in the manner hereafter prescribed. The National Wildlife Refuge System (hereafter referred to as the "System") includes those lands and waters administered by the Secretary as wildlife refuges, wildlife ranges, game ranges, wildlife management areas, and waterfowl production areas established under any law, proclamation, Executive, or public land order.

"(b) The Secretary may pay from the fund any necessary expenses incurred by him in connection with the revenue-producing measures set forth in subsection (a).

"(c) The Secretary, at the end of each fiscal year, shall pay, out of the net receipts in the fund (after payment of necessary expenses) for such fiscal year, which funds shall be expended solely for the benefit of public schools and roads as follows:

"(1) to each county in which reserved public lands in an area of the System are situated, an amount equal to 25 per centum of the net receipts collected by the Secretary from such reserved public lands in that particular area of the System: *Provided*, That when any such area is situated in more than one county the distributive share to each county from the aforesaid receipts shall be proportional to its acreage of such public lands therein; and

"(2) to each county in which areas in the System are situated that have been acquired in fee by the United States, either (A) three-fourths of 1 per centum of the cost of the areas, exclusive of any improvements to such areas made subsequent to Federal acquisition, such cost to be adjusted to represent current values as determined by the Secretary for the first full fiscal year after enactment of this Act and as redetermined by him at five-year intervals thereafter, or (B) 25 per centum of the net receipts collected by the Secretary from such acquired lands in that particular area of the System within such counties, whichever is greater. The determinations by the Secretary under this subsection shall be accomplished in such manner as he shall consider to be equitable and in the public interest, and his determinations hereunder shall be final and conclusive.

"(d) The payments under subsection (c) of this section to the counties in the United States for any one fiscal year shall not exceed the amount of net receipts in the fund for that fiscal year and, in case the net receipts are insufficient for a particular fiscal year to pay the aggregate amount of the payments for the fiscal year to the counties, the payment to each county shall be reduced proportionately.

"(e) Any moneys remaining in the fund after all payments are made for any fiscal year may be used by the Secretary thereafter for management of the System, including but not limited to the construction, improvement, repair, and alteration of buildings, roads, and other facilities, and for enforcement of the Migratory Bird Treaty Act, as amended (16 U.S.C. 703–711).

"(f) The disposition or sale of surplus animals, minerals, and other products, the grant of privileges, and the carrying out of any other activities that result in the collection of revenues within any areas of the System may be accomplished upon such terms, conditions, or regulations, including sale in the open markets, as the Secretary shall determine to be in the best interest of the United States. Further, the Secretary may dispose of such surplus animals by exchange of the same or other kinds, gift or loan to public institutions for exhibition or propagation purposes and for the advancement of knowledge and the dissemination of information relating to the conservation of wildlife in accordance with such regulations as he may prescribe.

"(g) Beginning with the first day of the next full fiscal year hereafter, the provisions

of this Act shall supersede and repeal the provisions of the paragraph entitled 'Management of National Wildlife Refuges' in the General Appropriation Act, 1951, approved September 6, 1950 (64 Stat. 595, 693–694)."

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.

Mr. OSTERTAG. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. OSTERTAG. Mr. Speaker, I wish to express my support for this measure to increase the participation by counties in the revenues from the National Wildlife Refuge System. I introduced similar legislation in this Congress in an effor to correct the inequities which presently exist in the program. While some areas are adequately reimbursed for the loss of local tax revenues which occur when the Federal Government takes land for wildlife refuge purposes, many areas such as mine in western New York receive almost nothing in return from the refuge revenues. Let me point out, too, that location of a refuge in an area does not produce the fringe benefits which normally accompany establishment of a Federal installation—that is, increased employment, payrolls and economic activity.

It is not surprising then that the refuge program as it presently operates in some areas, is not designed to encourage local acceptance and cooperation, and has encountered outright opposition in some areas.

The Oak Orchard National Wildlife Refuge was created in my congressional district 6 years ago, and the Bureau of Sports Fisheries and Wildlife of the Department of Interior has acquired more than half of the 11,174 acres planned for the refuge. The refuge spreads into two counties—Genesee and Orleans. Last year these two counties received a total of $275 as their share of the refuge revenues; this is in sharp contrast to the total $8,173 in taxes which the county and town governments would have received from the same land under my legislative proposal, if the land had remained on the local tax rolls.

In all fairness, we should do something about this inequitable situation. As mentioned a moment ago, some counties in other States are far more fortunate under the present system and have no desire to change it. For that reason this bill would provide a choice: counties desiring to retain the present system of receiving 25 percent of the refuge revenues developed in their area, may do so; the others will be allowed to select a reimbursement system providing three-fourths of 1 percent of the cost of the land taken by the Federal Government for refuge purposes. In the case of the refuge in my area, this would provide less than half the amount the local governments would receive in taxes, but it would be a great improvement over the present conditions.

Mr. Speaker, the population of our Nation is increasing rapidly, new land is being settled at a rapid pace, and there is a great need to establish and retain areas for wildlife refuges. This is an important and necessary program. However, there is no need to penalize some areas in the operation of this program, particularly when sufficient revenues are produced by the wildlife refuge system to make adequate reimbursement to each participating area. I believe this bill provides a wise and sound solution to the present problem, and I urge the Members of the House to give it their support.

LAND EXCHANGE—NAVY DEPARTMENT AND SUNNYVALE, CALIF.

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 12278) to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to convey to the city of Sunnyvale, State of California, certain lands in the county of Santa Clara, State of California, in exchange for certain other lands.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, here is another bill where there is an exchange of 75 acres of Government lands for 14 acres of municipally owned land.

How are we coming out in this deal?

Mr. GUBSER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. GUBSER. I would say to the gentleman from Iowa that the 14 acres will be in addition to other lands which will be acceptable to the Secretary of the Navy and which will protect the financial interest of the United States; in other words, bring the value of land conveyed to the United States up to a value of $441,000.

The reason the exact acreage is not specified at this date is because as of about 2 weeks ago the property to be conveyed by the Navy was declared as excess by the General Services Administration. The city of Sunnyvale, Calif., was prepared to write a check for the land, but the Navy Department decided that perhaps in the future they might need land suitable for housing and they desired to change the procedure to a land exchange rather than an outright cash payment.

Mr. GROSS. This represents a pretty fair-sized deal. The Government is turning over land appraised at $882,000 and it is only getting $441,000, when and if additional land is put up. This is also on the basis of a 50-percent discount for recreational purposes.

I do not find anything in the report—it may be in the report or it may be in the bill and I have not seen it—that would provide for recapture unless the land is used for recreational purposes.

Mr. GUBSER. This is specifically in the bill. Section 2 states that in the event the land should at any time in the future be used for other than recreational purposes, the payment for the remaining 50 percent of fair market value shall be made to the Government. It is specifically spelled out in the bill.

Mr. GROSS. If any portion of the land is taken out of the present reservation for recreational purposes?

Mr. GUBSER. That is absolutely correct.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

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

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, notwithstanding any other provisions of law, the Secretary of the Navy, or his designee, is authorized to convey to the city of Sunnyvale, State of California, subject to the terms and conditions hereinafter stated, and to such other terms and conditions as the Secretary of the Navy, or his designee, shall deem to be in the public interest, all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to lands located in the county of Santa Clara, State of California, described substantially as follows:

A parcel of land situate in the Rancho Pastoria de las Borregas, Santa Clara County, California, said parcel being a portion of that certain 153.133 acre tract of land described in judgment entered August 26, 1952, in civil action numbered 31783 had in the District Court of the United States in and for the Northern District of California, Southern Division, a copy of said judgment being recorded in book 2477, official records, at page 487, Records of Santa Clara County, and the boundaries of said parcel being described as follows:

Beginning at a granite monument set at the point of intersection of the northerly line of Maude Avenue with the centerline of Mountain View and Alviso Road as said monument is shown on that certain map entitled, "Map of the Partition of Part of the Rancho Pastoria de las Borregas Patented to Martin Murphy, Jr." filed April 29, 1893, in the office of the recorder, Santa Clara County, California, in book G of maps at pages 74 and 75, from said point of beginning; thence,

(1) north 57 degrees 00 minutes 30 seconds east, 54.33 feet to a point in the centerline of Mountain View and Alviso Road; thence

(2) north 15 degrees 21 minutes east, 1,757.62 feet to a point; thence

(3) north 74 degrees 44 minutes 10 seconds west, 432.23 feet to a point; thence

(4) north 16 degrees 24 minutes east 430.00 feet to a point; thence

(5) north 74 degrees 44 minutes 10 seconds west, 415.16 feet to a point; thence

(6) north 16 degrees 24 minutes east, 555.00 feet to the northerly terminus of the course designated at "(16)" in the aforesaid judgment; thence

(7) south 74 degrees 44 minutes 10 seconds east, along the course designated as "(15)" in the aforesaid judgment, 800.00 feet to a point; thence

(8) south 22 degrees 20 minutes 30 seconds east, 1,877.07 feet to a point in the centerline of Mountain View and Alviso Road, as said road existed in the year 1952; thence along said centerline the following two courses;

(9) north 57 degrees 00 minutes 30 seconds east, 1,898.20 feet; and

(10) north 74 degrees 05 seconds east, 173.08 feet to a point therein; thence crossing said road;

(11) south 15 degrees 55 minutes east, 30.00 feet to a point in the southerly line of said road, said point being the point of curvature of the course next following; thence

(12) northeasterly, on the circumference of a circle, the radius point of which bears south 15 degrees 55 minutes east, 100.00 feet from the point of curvature, through a central angle of 19 degrees 13 minutes 23 seconds an arc distance of 33.55 feet (from the

point of curvature, the long chord bears north 83 degrees 41 minutes 41.5 seconds east, 33.39 feet) to a point of tangency; thence nontangentially, and following the easterly and southerly boundaries of the aforesaid 153.133 acre tract, the following six courses:

(13) south 14 degrees 52 minutes west, 2,027.23 feet to a point; thence

(14) north 75 degrees 08 minutes west, 525.95 feet to a point; thence

(15) north 14 degrees 52 minutes east, 192.52 feet to a point; thence

(16) north 75 degrees 08 minutes west, 910.59 feet to a point, thence

(17) south 14 degrees 52 minutes west, 1,095.29 feet to a point in the northerly line of Maude Avenue; thence

(18) north 67 degrees 32 minutes west, along the northerly line of Maude Avenue 1,208.24 feet to the point of beginning.

Containing within the above-described boundaries, 95.229 acres, more or less.

SEC. 2. In consideration of the conveyance to the city of Sunnyvale by the United States of the aforesaid lands, the city of Sunnyvale shall convey to the United States such lands located in the county of Santa Clara, State of California, which are acceptable to the Secretary of the Navy, or his designee. The city of Sunnyvale shall pay to the United States the difference, if any, between the value of the property so conveyed by the United States, as hereinafter provided, and the fair market value of the lands and interests in lands accepted in exchange therefor. The land conveyed to the city of Sunnyvale shall be used for park or recreational purposes and valued at 50 per centum of its fair market value. The conveyance shall provide that the land be used for park or recreational purposes, and that in the event the land ceases to be used or maintained for park or recreational purposes, the city of Sunnyvale, its grantees or assignees, shall pay to the United States 50 per centum of the then fair market value.

SEC. 3. The Secretary of the Navy, or his designee, is also authorized to accept from the city of Sunnyvale such appropriate interests in other lands as may be considered necessary for protection of the interests of the United States in connection with the exchange.

With the following committee amendment:

On page 3, line 20, strike the figure "74" and insert in lieu thereof the figure "75".

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.

ENFORCEMENT OF ARTICLE 19, UNITED NATIONS CHARTER

The Clerk called House Concurrent Resolution 343, expressing the sense of the Congress with respect to the enforcement of the provisions of article 19 of the United Nations Charter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the concurrent resolution?

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I note on page 2 of the concurrent resolution it says on lines 1, 2, and 3 at the bottom thereof:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That it is the sense of the Congress that the President should direct the Permanent United States Delegate to the United Nations to continue efforts toward securing payment by members of the United Nations of their assessments in arrears.

I ask the gentlewoman from New York [Mrs. KELLY] why it is not more specific. In other words, should it not be changed to "shall" or should we not drop the word "should" altogether in order to make it more specific?

Mrs. KELLY. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, I am very happy that the gentleman from Michigan has raised this point. In a "sense" resolution, as he is aware, this is the customary language. It reflects the courtesy generally extended by the Congress in making such a request of the Chief Executive, particularly on matters which involve foreign relations.

I want to add that this resolution was reported unanimously by the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Mr. Speaker, I would hope that the gentleman will not press his point because any controversy, disagreement, or delay in the enactment of this resolution may be misunderstood around the world, particularly in areas with respect to which we desire that our action should produce prompt and constructive results.

Because of this, I would like to have this resolution adopted as quickly as possible without an amendment of any kind.

Mr. FORD. I would like to state categorically that I fully support what I believe to be the intent of this concurrent resolution, but in my support of it I want it clearly understood that the President and our representatives at the United Nations shall be very hard and tough. There is no room for compromise. Our U.N. delegates should demand that these other nations make their payments as they are required to do under the charter and the World Court decision. This is not a negotiable issue in the U.N. Payment is to be made, or else.

Mrs. KELLY. I agree with the gentleman from Michigan. This is the very purpose of the resolution. It accomplishes it in two ways, as follows:

First, it reiterates the sense of the Congress that effort should be made to get U.N. members to pay up the arrears on their assessments; and

Second, it goes a step further by urging that the overly delinquent members be subject to the penalty provisions of article 19 of the U.N. Charter: loss of vote in the General Assembly.

Mr. Speaker, 188 years ago we fought a war to uphold—among others—the principle that there shall be "no taxation without representation." Today, I propose that the Congress insist on the corollary of that principle: that there shall be "no representation without taxation" in the United Nations.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that very little needs to be said about the financial situation of the United Nations.

As of June 30 of this year, the deficit position of the United Nations was $134.5 million.

On that same date, the unpaid assessments of U.N. members—for both the regular budget and the peacekeeping operations—amounted to $123 million.

This was $22 million more than the total regular budget of that organization for the calendar year 1964.

These statistics speak for themselves. The United Nations cannot be expected to operate effectively—perhaps even to operate at all—if the budgetary decisions of the General Assembly continue to be defied, and if the members do not fulfill their financial obligations to the Organization.

As I mentioned earlier, the Congress has already expressed itself on this subject. Two years ago, in enacting the United Nations Loan Act, the Congress urged that prompt steps be taken to restore the financial integrity of the United Nations by getting its members to pay up their dues.

Today, 2 years later, the financial situation of the U.N. is even worse. This year, for the first time in the United Nations' history, some 15 member countries are more than 2 years behind in paying their assessments.

Under article 19 of the U.N. Charter, these 15 countries are subject to a loss of vote in the General Assembly unless they reduce their arrears before the Assembly meets in November.

There is no question about this point. The penalty provision is spelled out clearly in the U.N. Charter. It applies to the current arrears of those 15 member countries. And its application is automatic.

The executive branch of our Government has made it perfectly clear that the United States supports prompt and vigorous application of article 19. Nevertheless, some of the delinquent U.N. members are still balking and stalling.

I believe, therefore, that it is incumbent upon the Congress of the United States to tell the world that the United States—both branches of our Government and the American people—are united in our determination to see that the provisions of the U.N. Charter be given effect. To repeat what I said earlier, there should be "no representation without taxation" at the U.N.

Mr. Speaker, the resolution before the House—House Concurrent Resolution 343—clearly expressed the sense of the Congress with respect to this issue. It is a strong—and a timely—resolution. It has bipartisan sponsorship, and it was reported unanimously by the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

For these reasons, I urge its prompt and unanimous adoption by the House.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FORD. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. It was the very purpose of serving notice around the world that we want these assessments paid that I offered an amendment in committee to strike the words the President "should" direct the United Nations in two instances in the resolving part of this resolution. I support the resolution but I insist it would be a stronger and better resolution had the two "shoulds" been removed from the resolution.

Mr. FORD. Would it be your interpretation if the House approves this concurrent resolution it is the sense of the

Congress that our delegation in the United Nations is expected to insist upon the assessments being paid?

Mr. GROSS. It would be my opinion that this is a mandate to do exactly that.

Mr. MAILLIARD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FORD. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. MAILLIARD. I think this colloquy is valuable. There is not any basic difference of opinion. I introduced an identical resolution to the one we are now considering. The language is a question of nicety, and I do not think anyone should be in doubt as to what we mean here. It seems to me this is the natural result of the record that was made on the floor of the House when we approved the bond issue to bail out the United Nations. At that time I felt the Committee on Foreign Affairs, the executive branch of the Government and everyone involved made a commitment to the Members of Congress that we would do this bailing out only with the understanding that article 19 of the charter was fully enforced so far as the United States could enforce it.

Mrs. KELLY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FORD. I yield to the gentlewoman from New York.

Mrs. KELLY. Mr. Speaker, I would like to add that this is a bipartisan resolution. It was cosponsored by the gentleman from California [Mr. MAILLIARD], In my opinion, this concurrent resolution should be agreed to immediately.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FORD. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, I wish to join with my distinguished colleague the gentlewoman from New York [Mrs. KELLY] and my friend the gentleman from California [Mr. MAILLIARD] in urging the adoption of House Concurrent Resolution 343.

The Subcommittee on International Organizations and Movements, which I have the honor to chair, has followed closely, and with growing concern, developments relating to the financial position of the United Nations.

In the course of our consultations with the executive branch, we have endeavored to stress the necessity for exerting every effort—including our determination to support the application of the penalty provisions of article 19 of the U.N. Charter—to prompt U.N. members who are in arrears to pay up their assessments.

We have tried to make it clear that the Congress fully supports the executive branch in its firm position on this issue.

I believe that House Concurrent Resolution 343 serves a very useful purpose and should be enacted. Currently, some 15 members of the United Nations are 2 or more years in arrears on their assessments. On January 1, 1965, other U.N. members may find themselves in a similar position.

It is obvious to everyone who has followed the affairs of the United Nations that the Organization cannot long operate effectively unless its financial integrity is restored. The sense of the Congress on this point is outlined in the resolution before the House. I believe that the adoption of this resolution will strengthen the hand of the executive branch in trying to help resolve the financial crisis at the U.N. and may have a salutary effect in prompting the delinquent U.N. members to pay up their dues.

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FORD. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. CONTE. I want to concur with the gentleman from Michigan in strongly supporting this resolution. I too would have felt better if we had the word "shall" rather than "should" in the resolution. In any case, I shall strongly support the resolution.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the table on page 2 of the report No. 1756, the committee report, be inserted in the RECORD at this point. This shows the delinquent accounts of the different countries.

I would also like to say, Mr. Speaker, that we must continue to pursue this matter with all of the personal and individual strength we have as a nation.

The principle of collective security is one that is indeed binding on all members and for a particular country, or countries, to overlook their indebtedness at this time would be most tragic.

Example is another important and essential aspect of collective living, and the great dream and steady accomplishments at the United Nations are such that each new nation coming within its purview be aware of its responsibilities.

Certainly, a new nation coming into this organization could feel—in lieu of evidence to the contrary—that payment of necessary debts would not be necessary. Since these nations—many of them—are comparatively poorer, they might feel justified in avoiding these obligations. They might, in fact, point to certain richer nations as an example.

It is precisely this point that is so important. And it is why this resolution is so important. Article 19 of the United Nations Charter must be enforced.

As one who has consistently supported the aims and purposes of the United Nations—I think that I was one of only two Members of Congress who stood on this floor and fought to increase the funds for the UN voluntary organizations in 1963—I feel that it is absolutely essential that this resolution be something more than a simple affirmation of purpose. I hope and trust that it will.

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

There was no objection.

The matter referred to follows:

Status of contributions of U.N. members subject to article 19 in 1964 (based on actual payments as of June 30, 1964)

Country	1963 and prior years arrears				
	Working capital fund	Regular budget	UNEF [1]	UNOC [2]	Total arrear
Africa: None					
Europe:					
Byelorussian S.S.R.		$74,511	$493,083	$1,280,137	$1,847,731
Czechoslovakia			933,084	2,603,920	3,537,004
Hungary		720,881	456,043	918,775	2,095,699
Poland			1,390,410	2,274,641	3,665,051
Rumania			405,581	862,613	1,268,194
Ukrainian S.S.R.		283,714	1,887,904	4,889,673	7,061,291
U.S.S.R.		2,145,051	15,638,166	36,984,971	54,768,188
Far East: China	$358,605	3,624,229	4,347,629	6,454,590	14,785,053
Latin America:					
Argentina		1,569,529	913,350	565,756	3,048,635
Bolivia	6,000	54,536	32,970	31,484	124,990
Guatemala	7,500	60,826	20,874	38,209	127,409
Haiti	6,000	77,935	16,726	30,567	131,228
Paraguay	6,000	78,885	26,726	20,880	132,491
Uruguay	16,391	143,618	31,188	88,453	279,650
Near East: Yemen	6,000	58,851	36,364	40,253	141,468

[1] United Nations Emergency Force in the Middle East.
[2] United Nations operation in the Congo.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, this resolution is needed to assure our delegation to the United Nations of our continuing support of their efforts to compel the Soviet Union and others now willfully delinquent to pay their just share of U.N. expenses.

I strongly support the resolution and hope the United Nations will act in accordance with the U.N. Charter to deny the vote in the General Assembly to all willful delinquents.

Membership in the United Nations is not a one-way street, to be traveled only when things are going your own way. With participation goes responsibility, and all who are able to assume that responsibility should do so, without further delay.

Mr. MAILLIARD. Mr. Speaker, as the author of an identical resolution, I wish to join my distinguished colleague from New York [Mrs. KELLY] in urging prompt and unanimous adoption of the resolution before the House.

The reasons which argue for this action on our part are clear and persuasive.

As the largest single contributor to the United Nations, the United States has a special interest and responsibility for the financial integrity of that organization.

In the past, we have endeavored to discharge that responsibility by paying our dues regularly and by urging other

U.N. members to do likewise, by contributing over and above our share of the regular U.N. budget to special U.N. programs and operations, and by bailing the U.N. out of temporary financial difficulties.

We intend to continue on this course. We will do so because we believe that the United Nations serves a very useful and important function in promoting international understanding, cooperation, and world peace.

At the same time, Mr. Speaker, we will not stand idly by and see the United Nations plunged into an ever deeper financial crisis through the refusal of some members to pay their share of that organization's expenses.

And it is for this reason that we ought to—that we must—give our support and endorsement to the sentiments outlined in House Concurrent Resolution 343.

Mr. Speaker, all of us are aware, I am certain, that the financial woes of the United Nations cannot be attributed solely, or even primarily, to the inability of the member countries to pay their assessments. Rather, these woes find their origin in the refusal of a handful of countries to pay their proper share of the cost of the United Nation's peacekeeping operations.

With respect to this subject, one thing is perfectly clear: U.N. assessments for peacekeeping operations constitute the expenses of the Organization within the meaning of article 17 of the United Nations Charter and assessments voted by the General Assembly to cover such expenses are binding upon all U.N. members.

This was established in an advisory opinion rendered by the International Court of Justice on July 20, 1962.

This opinion, to carry the matter one step further, was overwhelmingly adopted by the United Nations General Assembly.

There is no justification, therefore, for claims to the effect that peacekeeping assessments are not binding on member nations—or that the arrears in such assessments may not be counted in applying the penalty provision of article 19 of the U.N. Charter: the provision which states that members which are 2 years or more in arrears on their assessments shall lose their vote in the U.N. General Assembly.

The opinion of the International Court of Justice, and the acceptance of this opinion by the General Assembly, show such claims to be spurious in character.

Nevertheless, Mr. Speaker, certain members of the United Nations which are delinquent in paying their assessments, refuse to accept this fact. Further, they apparently feel that in the final hour before the showdown on this issue, the United States is going to back down and allow this provision of the U.N. Charter—and the budgetary decisions of the General Assembly—to be defied with impunity.

I am confident, Mr. Speaker, that such expectations badly misinterpret our national resolve.

For more than 1 year, while the financial crisis of the United Nations continued to worsen, the United States has taken the position that we will support, and insist on, vigorous application of the penalty provisions of article 19 to members with excessive arrears. Last year, while serving as U.S. Delegate to the U.N. 18th General Assembly, I participated in a number of discussions—and made several speeches in the 5th Committee of the General Assembly—in an effort to make this point perfectly clear to delegates of other member nations. I do not deceive myself, however, that those efforts resolved the problem. Doubts about the firmness of our resolve, and expectations of a last-minute change in the position of the United States, are still evident.

It is for these reasons, Mr. Speaker, that I urge the House to adopt the resolution before us. By this action, we shall demonstrate the unity and the strength of our resolve. And, hopefully, we will convince the delinquent members that they must "fish or cut bait"—in other words, pay up or lose their voting rights in the U.N. General Assembly.

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Speaker, the situation which calls for this resolution, expressing the sense of Congress that all members of the United Nations should pay their assessments or lose their vote, may be a crisis in the development of the United Nations comparable, in some respects, to the several which arose during the early days of our own country. Questions which were resolved through the genius of the great Chief Justice, John Marshall.

Questions which involved the survival of the Republic and its ability to make effective its will in those areas of delegated authority. If the Soviets and others successfully refuse to comply with the charter and the resolutions of the General Assembly, then the United Nations is impotent and a mere debating society. If compliance is secured then the United Nations has taken a big step toward becoming an effective force for peace in the world.

In passing this resolution, we must not forget that the day may come when the United States may disagree with the actions of the United Nations, to the support of which this same article 19 will commit us. Recognizing this factor, however, does not change the need for continued efforts for an effective world peace organization such as the United Nations can become and, therefore, I support this resolution.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the concurrent resolution?

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

Whereas one hundred and thirteen nations have accepted the obligations of the Charter of the United Nations to maintain international peace and security and have agreed "to take effective collective measures for the prevention and removal of threats to the peace, and for the suppression of acts of aggression or other breaches of the peace, and to bring about by peaceful means, and in conformity with the principles of justice and international law, adjustment or settlement of international disputes or situations which might lead to a breach of the peace"; and

Whereas the International Court of Justice in an advisory opinion on July 20, 1962, held that expenditures for peacekeeping operations constitute expenses of the Organization which shall be borne by the members as apportioned by the General Assembly under article 17 of the United Nations Charter; and

Whereas the advisory opinion of the International Court of Justice was accepted by the General Assembly in a resolution on December 19, 1962, by a vote of seventy-six in favor, seventeen against, and eight abstentions; and

Whereas article 19 of the United Nations Charter provides that a member of the United Nations which is in arrears in the payment of its financial contributions to the Organization shall have no vote in the General Assembly if the amount of its arrears equals or exceeds the amount of the contributions due from it for the preceding two full years, unless relieved of that penalty by a vote of the General Assembly on the grounds that "the failure to pay is due to conditions beyond the control of the member"; and

Whereas at the convening of the Nineteenth General Assembly of the United Nations in 1964, certain members of the United Nations which are now in arrears may fall within the purview of the provisions of article 19 of the United Nations Charter; and

Whereas legislation has been enacted expressing the sense of the Congress that "the United Nations should take immediate steps to give effect to the advisory opinion of the International Court of Justice on the financial obligations of members of the United Nations in order to assure prompt payment of all assessments, including assessments to cover the cost of operations to maintain or restore international peace and security": Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That it is the sense of the Congress that the President should direct the Permanent United States Delegate to the United Nations to continue efforts toward securing payment by members of the United Nations of their assessments in arrears. It is further the sense of the Congress that if, upon the convening of the Nineteenth General Assembly, the arrears of any member of the United Nations equals or exceeds the amount of the contribution due from it for the preceding two full years, the President should direct the Permanent United States Delegate to make every effort to assure invocation of the penalty provisions of article 19 of the Charter of the United Nations.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the House concurrent resolution.

The question was taken.

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 352, nays 0, not voting 78, as follows:

[Roll No. 231]

YEAS—352

Abbitt	Ashbrook	Becker
Abele	Ashmore	Beckworth
Abernethy	Aspinall	Beermann
Addabbo	Auchincloss	Belcher
Albert	Ayres	Bell
Anderson	Baker	Bennett, Fla.
Andrews, Ala.	Baldwin	Berry
Andrews, N. Dak.	Barrett	Betts
Arends	Barry	Blatnik
	Bates	Boggs

Boland	Griffiths	O'Konski
Bolling	Gross	Olsen, Mont.
Bolton, Oliver P.	Grover	Olson, Minn.
Bonner	Gubser	O'Neill
Bow	Hagan, Ga.	Ostertag
Brademas	Hagen, Calif.	Passman
Bray	Haley	Patman
Brock	Hall	Patten
Brooks	Halleck	Pelly
Broomfield	Halpern	Perkins
Brotzman	Hansen	Philbin
Brown, Ohio	Harding	Pickle
Broyhill, N.C.	Hardy	Pike
Broyhill, Va.	Harris	Pillion
Bruce	Harrison	Poage
Burke	Harsha	Poff
Burkhalter	Harvey, Ind.	Pool
Burleson	Hawkins	Powell
Burton, Calif.	Hays	Price
Burton, Utah	Hébert	Purcell
Byrne, Pa.	Hechler	Quie
Byrnes, Wis.	Henderson	Quillen
Cahill	Herlong	Reid, Ill.
Carey	Holifield	Reid, N.Y.
Casey	Holland	Reifel
Cederberg	Horan	Reuss
Chamberlain	Hosmer	Rhodes, Ariz.
Chelf	Huddleston	Rhodes, Pa.
Chenoweth	Hull	Rich
Clancy	Hutchinson	Riehlman
Clark	Ichord	Rivers, Alaska
Clausen, Don H.	Jarman	Rivers, S.C.
Clawson, Del	Jennings	Roberts, Ala.
Cleveland	Jensen	Roberts, Tex.
Cohelan	Joelson	Robison
Collier	Johansen	Rodino
Colmer	Johnson, Calif.	Rogers, Colo.
Conte	Johnson, Pa.	Rogers, Fla.
Cooley	Johnson, Wis.	Rogers, Tex.
Corbett	Jonas	Rooney, N.Y.
Corman	Karsten	Rooney, Pa.
Cramer	Karth	Roosevelt
Cunningham	Kastenmeier	Rosenthal
Curtin	Keith	Rostenkowski
Curtis	Kelly	Roudebush
Dague	Keogh	Roush
Daniels	Kilburn	Rumsfeld
Davis, Ga.	Kilgore	Ryan, N.Y.
Davis, Tenn.	King, Calif.	St Germain
Delaney	King, N.Y.	St. Onge
Dent	Kirwan	Saylor
Denton	Knox	Schadeberg
Derounian	Kornegay	Schenck
Derwinski	Kunkel	Schneebeli
Devine	Laird	Schweiker
Dole	Landrum	Schwengel
Donohue	Langen	Secrest
Dorn	Latta	Selden
Dowdy	Leggett	Senner
Downing	Lennon	Short
Dulski	Libonati	Shriver
Duncan	Lindsay	Sickles
Dwyer	Lipscomb	Sikes
Edmondson	Lloyd	Siler
Edwards	Long, La.	Sisk
Everett	Long, Md.	Skubitz
Evins	McCulloch	Slack
Fallon	McDade	Smith, Iowa
Farbstein	McFall	Smith, Va.
Fascell	McIntire	Snyder
Feighan	McLoskey	Springer
Findley	Macdonald	Stafford
Finnegan	Mahon	Staggers
Fino	Mailliard	Steed
Fisher	Marsh	Stinson
Flood	Martin, Calif.	Stratton
Flynt	Martin, Mass.	Stubblefield
Fogarty	Martin, Nebr.	Sullivan
Ford	Matthews	Taft
Foreman	May	Talcott
Forrester	Meader	Taylor
Fountain	Michel	Teague, Calif.
Frelinghuysen	Mills	Teague, Tex.
Friedel	Minish	Thomas
Fulton, Pa.	Minshall	Thompson, N.J.
Fuqua	Monagan	Thompson, Tex.
Gallagher	Moore	Thomson, Wis.
Garmatz	Moorhead	Trimble
Gary	Morgan	Tuck
Gathings	Morris	Tupper
Giaimo	Morse	Tuten
Gibbons	Morton	Udall
Gilbert	Mosher	Ullman
Gill	Multer	Utt
Glenn	Murphy, Ill.	Van Deerlin
Gonzalez	Murphy, N.Y.	Vanik
Goodell	Murray	Van Pelt
Goodling	Natcher	Vinson
Grant	Nelsen	Waggonner
Green, Oreg.	Nix	Watson
Green, Pa.	Norbald	Watts
Griffin	O'Brien, N.Y.	Weaver
	O'Hara, Ill.	Weltner
	O'Hara, Mich.	Westland
Wharton	Widnall	Young
White	Willis	Younger
Whitener	Wilson, Ind.	Zablocki
Whitten	Wright	
Wickersham	Wydler	

NAYS—0

NOT VOTING—78

Adair	Healey	Pilcher
Alger	Hoeven	Pirnie
Ashley	Hoffman	Pucinski
Avery	Horton	Rains
Baring	Jones, Ala.	Randall
Bass	Jones, Mo.	Roybal
Battin	Kee	Ryan, Mich.
Bolton, Frances P.	Kluczynski	St. George
Bromwell	Kyl	Scott
Brown, Calif.	Lankford	Sheppard
Buckley	Lesinski	Shipley
Cameron	McClory	Sibal
Celler	McDowell	Smith, Calif.
Daddario	McMillan	Staebler
Dawson	MacGregor	Stephens
Diggs	Madden	Thompson, La.
Dingell	Mathias	Toll
Elliott	Matsunaga	Tollefson
Ellsworth	Miller, Calif.	Wallhauser
Fraser	Miller, N.Y.	Whalley
Fulton, Tenn.	Milliken	Williams
Grabowski	Montoya	Wilson, Bob
Gray	Morrison	Wilson, Charles H.
Gurney	Moss	Winstead
Hanna	Nedzi	Wyman
Harvey, Mich.	Osmers	
	Pepper	

So the concurrent resolution was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Mr. Toll with Mr. Whalley.
Mr. Randall with Mr. Battin.
Mr. Ashley with Mr. MacGregor.
Mr. Kluczynski with Mr. Adair.
Mr. Morrison with Mr. Tollefson.
Mr. Hanna with Mr. Smith of California.
Mr. Thompson of Louisiana with Mr. Ellsworth.
Mr. Dingell with Mr. Sibal.
Mr. Pucinski with Mr. Pirnie.
Mr. Buckley with Mr. Osmers.
Mr. Lesinski with Mr. Mathias.
Mr. Daddario with Mr. McClory.
Mr. Ryan of Michigan with Mr. Horton.
Mr. Montoya with Mr. Gurney.
Mr. Nedzi with Mr. Harvey of Michigan.
Mr. Miller of California with Mr. Bob Wilson.
Mr. Madden with Mr. Wyman.
Mr. Shipley with Mrs. Frances P. Bolton.
Mr. Jones of Alabama with Mrs. St. George.
Mr. Baring with Mr. Kyl.
Mr. Cameron with Mr. Bromwell.
Mr. Brown of California with Mr. Wallhauser.
Mr. Elliott with Mr. Miller of New York.
Mr. Grabowski with Mr. Milliken.
Mr. Fulton of Tennessee with Mr. Hoeven.
Mr. Roybal with Mr. Hoffman.
Mr. Macdonald with Mr. Avery.
Mr. Charles H. Wilson with Mrs. Kee.
Mr. Fraser with Mr. Diggs.
Mr. Matsunaga with Mr. Dawson.
Mr. Scott with Mr. Healey.
Mr. Moss with Mr. Celler.
Mr. Pilcher with Mr. Lankford.
Mr. Williams with Mr. Gray.
Mr. Winstead with Mr. Staebler.
Mr. Pepper with Mr. Rains.
Mr. Stephens with Mr. Bass.
Mr. Sheppard with Mr. McMillan.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The doors were opened.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mrs. KELLY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members desiring to do so have permission to extend their remarks immediately prior to the concurrent resolution just passed.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from New York?

There was no objection.

AUTHORIZATION OF URBAN SOIL SURVEYS

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 5406) to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to cooperate with States and other public agencies in planning for changes in the use of agricultural land in rapidly expanding urban areas and in other nonagricultural use areas, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. OLIVER P. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would like to ask the committee several questions regarding this bill. In the first place, I see on page 3 of the report, that the Department of Agriculture is actively cooperating with other departments of the executive branch. Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the spokesman for the committee, the distinguished gentleman from Texas, could tell us how many Federal Government planning agencies are now making plans for urban land use.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Speaker, I have not the slightest idea how many agencies are making plans regarding urban land use, but the Department of Agriculture is the only agency that makes these soil surveys. The soil surveys are of importance in doing this urban planning for all of this multitude of agencies to which the gentleman refers.

Mr. OLIVER P. BOLTON. Would the gentleman from Texas specify what kind of land he is talking about? This is privately owned land?

Mr. POAGE. This is both publicly and privately owned land. It is all the land within a specific area.

Mr. OLIVER P. BOLTON. And this is land that is going out of agricultural use into some other use, as determined by the owners of that land?

Mr. POAGE. Not necessarily. The soil survey of the United States is going on now. It includes both urban and rural areas. It includes every acre of land in the United States, whether it is in New York City or whether it is in Nevada. But it is a slow process. It will probably take from 20 to probably 40 years before the whole United States is mapped for soil purposes at the rate we are going.

What this legislation proposes to do is to authorize local governmental units—and that primarily means a city, of course—to cooperate with—and that means to share the cost with the Department of Agriculture in conducting this general soil survey program.

The surveys which are made under this bill will be no different from the surveys which are presently being made. However, it is anticipated that through this method we will be able to do a good deal of planning in some of the urban areas which we hope will put up half of the

cost and move this thing along a little faster than it is presently moving.

Mr. OLIVER P. BOLTON. I am interested in the gentleman's choice of words, because it is different than that contained in the report. The report states that this bill would authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to cooperate with other departments in local government. The gentleman stated that it would authorize local governments to cooperate with the Department of Agriculture.

Mr. POAGE. If the gentleman will yield further, it will. By that I mean primarily it will authorize a local agency to pay a part of the cost of these surveys. Under existing practices this share is 50 percent at the present time, and we anticipate that it will continue to be 50 percent of the cost of these surveys.

Mr. OLIVER P. BOLTON. In its report the committee mentions that one of the reasons that cities would need this land-use study and land study is because of the open air programs provided for under the Housing Act.

The gentleman is familiar, of course, with the responsibility for such land studies now which is in the Housing and Home Finance Administration?

Mr. POAGE. That is right.

Mr. OLIVER P. BOLTON. And that one of the great pitches that has been made for the authority that has been given to the Housing and Home Finance Administrator is that there are so many other departments cooperating with him.

I took it for granted that one of them was the Department of Agriculture and that the Department of Agriculture had this ability.

Mr. POAGE. It was not and is not my understanding as a member of the committee that this bill contemplates that kind of cooperation which the gentleman is suggesting. On the contrary, it is my understanding that the legislation does contemplate that those communities which find that they need a soil map—and in most cases they will need a soil map for any kind of redevelopment of a community because you can do it better and cheaper and more expeditiously if you do have a soil map—will seek such a map from the Department of Agriculture which ultimately under the present program will map every acre of land in the United States, but which does not have existing maps of large areas as yet.

Mr. OLIVER P. BOLTON. The gentleman backs up what they say in the report; namely, that the Department of Agriculture has this responsibility under the present law, but under the priority system it will not get anywhere near to this type thing, I believe the gentleman said, for about 20 years. So those who recognize the great contribution which the Soil Conservation Service is making to the agricultural land would certainly not object to the program until it got into the, shall we say, concrete farming areas?

Mr. POAGE. If the gentleman will yield further, it was the thought of the Committee on Agriculture that this service should be available to everyone in the United States, whether they were located in Kansas or in New York City.

We hope that the program can be expedited by allowing those communities which feel they have an immediate financial interest in getting something done this year or next year—that if they felt it was worth their consideration and their money they might expedite and hasten the survey of their immediate areas by joining in and cooperating with the cost of the program.

Actually, the Department of Agriculture will make the survey. There will be no surveys authorized by anybody other than the Department of Agriculture.

Mr. OLIVER P. BOLTON. My basic question is this: It is my understanding that the Department of Agriculture now has the authority to make such surveys?

Mr. POAGE. That is right.

Mr. OLIVER P. BOLTON. It is under the direction of the executive department, and under the direction of the Congress and under legislation to cooperate with the other departments in carrying out their programs that the Home and Finance Administration is required to make surveys that will take in the local governments. They will encompass different spaces. The Department of Housing and Home Finance Administration has the responsibility to make studies or to see to it that studies are made on a regional or metropolitan basis that will take into account mass transportation. I am under the impression that the sole requirement is that the Department of Agriculture cooperate with the other departments. It seems to me we are adding another bit of fire in this interdepartmental authorization.

Mr. POAGE. No. I do not so interpret the legislation, and neither did the Committee on Agriculture so interpret this legislation. As we understand it, although the Department of Agriculture has the authority to map every acre of the United States, it would take between 20 to 50 years to do it. Therefore the Department of Agriculture cannot do it all at one time. There are certain areas where they have already done this work and where they have soil maps. There are other areas where such maps are needed and needed very quickly. Most of these are urban areas. It could save a great deal of money. It is a good deal cheaper to have the Department of Agriculture make that soil map as a part of the soil map of the United States than for a particular agency to go ahead and do it on their own. In case any agency of government, whether local or a departmental, wants to put up some of the money for the cost of these programs, the Department of Agriculture can under this bill accept it and cooperate with them and thus speed up very materially the work in urban areas. This work is now pretty largely confined to rural areas, because the Department of Agriculture naturally finds that it has a greater need for maps of rural areas.

This bill is an effort to make this soil survey a little more helpful to the urban areas because we think this soil survey should be a national program.

Mr. OLIVER P. BOLTON. I appreciate the gentleman's answer.

It seems to me, Mr. Speaker, this is an obvious example of another duplication of planning authority. I withdraw my reservation of objection and ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

ADDITION TO EVERGLADES NATIONAL PARK

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 8290) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to accept a transfer of certain lands within Everglades National Park, Dade County, Fla., for administration as a part of said park, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, if I understand this proposal correctly this is an authorization to the extent of $452,000 for reimbursement to the Farmers Home Administration. This reimbursement would permit, in effect, the purchase of 4,420 acres of land within Everglades National Park.

As I understand it, the Farmers Home Administration apparently made a bad loan. The parties who borrowed the money could not pay, therefore the Farmers Home Administration took over a defaulted mortgage. It follows if we are to turn this land over to the Everglades National Park the Farmers Home Administration has to be bailed out to the extent of $452,000. I am for the Everglades National Park, but I raise the question about the business wisdom of the Farmers Home Administration in making the loan in the first place. How could they make such a poor loan? The evidence is clear the business could not make a "go" of it.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FORD. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. POAGE. I do not think the record will show the Farmers Home Administration made a bad loan.

Mr. FORD. They have lost $452,000.

Mr. POAGE. No; they have not lost anything. They made a loan of about $98,000. This was a second mortgage on this property, on which the Connecticut Mutual Life Insurance Co. had a loan of about $200,000. After they foreclosed the second mortgage, the life insurance company thought they could make some settlement, and the Farmers Home Administration paid them off, because there was and is substantial equity in the property. The Farmers Home Administration paid them off. They had property there which we were told would easily sell for more than the total of FHA's investment.

This is the property about which there was considerable dispute at the time of the creation of the Everglades National Park. This was some of that high-priced bean and vegetable land which had been reclaimed by the drainage of the swamps. It was a piece of land

which the local people strongly objected to going into the park, because they felt it would cripple the local economy. But when this land was finally taken over by the Farmers Home Administration the local objection had ceased and instead the local people and the Congressmen from that area would like to see this area included in the park.

This bill is to make sure that the Farmers Home Administration not make a profit on what they could make a profit out of but that they come out whole in a transaction by delivering to the park a piece of property they could unquestionably sell at far more than the Department of Interior is prepared to pay them. But it was the feeling of the committee that we in the Agricultural Committee should not hold up another agency of Government and make them pay a greater price for a piece of property than the Government had invested in it. This is the total cost. It is to make sure that the Farmers Home Administration suffers no loss and that the Government gets the property at the cost the Government has invested in it, rather than having to pay the higher price that they would have to if the Farmers Home Administration sold this property in the open market and then the Government had to purchase it from private owners.

Mr. FORD. Would the gentleman indicate what party has a substantial equity, as he has indicated?

Mr. POAGE. The Farmers Home Administration has the equity.

Mr. FORD. The gentleman would have to concede that the Farmers Home Administration did make a loan to an organization that could not make good the loan?

Mr. POAGE. I do not undertsand that that is true. I do understand that this corporation had title to the property. It did get into a good deal of speculative activities. The weather was bad for a number of years. They went broke, and had to go into bankruptcy, and when they went broke the Farmers Home Administration had to protect the loan, which was good, against the general creditors.

Mr. FORD. The gentleman from Texas will have to admit that the organization that borrowed the money went bankrupt and the Farmers Home Administration made a loan, which ended up with a foreclosure.

Mr. POAGE. That is quite a different thing from what the gentleman said a while ago. I think that statement is probably correct. The company did go broke. The loan did end in a foreclosure. But it is not a correct statement to say the Farmers Home Administration made the loan for more than the value of the property.

Mr. FORD. I do not think I said that, but if we can agree on my last statement, that is good enough.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FORD. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. FASCELL. The gentleman from Michigan has cleared up the point that it was not a bad loan in the first place. But the equity was there when the loan was made. So I do not think in that sense it is fair to question the business judgment of the Farmers Home Administration in this particular case.

Mr. FORD. I do not think the Farmers Home Administration is in the business of lending money to organizations that go bankrupt.

Mr. FASCELL. Not if they can help it. I certainly agree with the gentleman. The only point I am making is that these things must be considered as of the time of making the loan. It is pretty hard to go back as a Monday quarterback and find that at that time it was a bad loan. These men who were in business are good substantial businessmen and the property value is there. I just want to point out also that this agricultural area had 5 bad years in a row, because of freezes and floods and a lot of people went broke.

One final thing, the land that we are talking about compromises some 4,000 acres of what is known as the hole in the doughnut in the Everglades National Park. This land is already within the boundaries of the park. But in the congressional act which was previously passed, it is not subject to condemnation. So the gentleman from Texas is correct that the only thing that needs to be done at this point is an authorization to see to it that the revolving fund of the Farmers Home Administration is made whole. It would not make sense to do anything else.

Mr. GROSS. This involves 4,428 acres of swampland and at $452,000 it apparently means it is worth $100 an acre. Do I understand that this swampland is worth $100 an acre?

Mr. FASCELL. It is debatable that it is all swampland in the technical engineering sense. I would certainly think it is worth more than $100 an acre—there is no question about it—if it were tomato land.

Mr. GROSS. All right then, that leads me to this question. Since this is supposedly farmland, for the Farmers Home Administration is supposed to finance farming operations, how many tillable acres were there in this 4,420-acre tract?

Mr. FASCELL. I do not have the slightest idea how many tillable acres there are. I know one thing. Down there you can grow tomatoes just about anywhere that you can turn up the soil and if you do not have any soil, you can grind up rocks and grow tomatoes. You could put the entire 4,000 acres in tomatoes.

Mr. GROSS. The whole 4,000 acres in tomatoes? Somebody said there were some beans raised on this land.

Mr. POAGE. The committee was told that the land was cultivated whether it was in tomatoes, beans, or carrots. I do not know. But that is another question. The land is not undrained everglade land. It was represented to us as some of the best farming land in Florida and is in production or has been in production for a number of years. Certainly it is worth $100 an acre and is probably worth $500 an acre.

Mr. GROSS. How come it got in the financial shape it is in now if it is worth $500 an acre?

Mr. POAGE. Because, as the gentleman from Florida pointed out, there were five successive failures in that area and 5 years of failure is likely to break almost any farmer. Unfortunately, I have had experiences of this kind of failure for 5 years in our section of the country and it bends almost everybody if it does not break them.

Mr. FORD. Could I ask the question of someone concerned with the legislation: What was the amount of the first mortgage?

Mr. POAGE. About $200,000.

Mr. FORD. What was the mortgage of the FHA?

Mr. POAGE. Not quite $100,000.

Mr. FORD. So there was about $300,000-plus in the equity of the Farmers Home Administration when they took it over on the foreclosure proceeding; is that correct?

Mr. POAGE. Approximately $300,000, but I really suspect it was more than that.

Mr. FORD. How could there be larger equity if they loaned about $100,000 and the insurance company loaned $250,000?

Mr. POAGE. There was roughly $350,000 of debt on this land at that time, but the equity was somewhat considerably in excess of that. The equity is the difference between the value of the land and the debt.

Mr. FORD. I understand that, but you admit there is $350,000 of funds, either the first mortgage or the second mortgage.

Mr. POAGE. Yes.

Mr. FORD. And now we are authorizing the transfer of property that is worth $452,000 to the Everglades National Park. Congress will by this authorization pay up to $452,000 to the FHA revolving fund. So FHA's revolving fund will make about $100,000. What kind of business is that?

Mr. POAGE. No. Unfortunately they have not made it. I wish they had.

Mr. FORD. Why should we pay them, if they have not made it?

Mr. POAGE. Because the total cost will stand, by November, at about $442,000. That includes all of it.

Mr. FORD. Whose cost?

Mr. POAGE. The total cost of this land to the Farmers Home Administration. That includes the court costs, bankruptcy procedures, costs of all those who have handled this land, the litigation costs, the back taxes paid. All of the costs bring this up to the point that it is now available for transfer on the market.

Mr. FORD. Does the gentleman mean to tell me that it took $100,000 in various costs to get control of the land which was worth $350,000?

Mr. POAGE. I did not say that—but I would not be surprised if it were true. The costs of bankruptcy and foreclosure often eat up large estates.

Mr. FORD. What kind of operation are they running over there in FHA's Florida operation?

Mr. POAGE. The gentleman continues to put words in my mouth. I have never valued the land at $350,000. In my opinion, the land always was worth

a great deal more than $350,000. The debt a few years ago was approximately $350,000. The debt has increased, as debt always does when it is necessary to go through foreclosure. When one goes through court proceedings he is lucky to come out with only 25 percent added. That is roughly what happened to the Government. The Government costs went up just about the same as yours or mine would have.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FORD. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. POAGE] says that this land may well be worth $1,000 per acre.

Mr. POAGE. I did not use the words "$1,000 an acre." I used the words "$500."

Mr. GROSS. The gentleman has cut it in half, to $500 an acre.

Mr. POAGE. I have not cut or changed my estimate but the gentleman was within $500 an acre of what I said.

Mr. GROSS. Is this not pretty expensive land to make a wallow for the crocodiles or alligators, at $500 an acre? Is there not plenty of other swamp down there?

Mr. POAGE. I believe the whole misunderstanding arises from the fact that this is not untreated everglades land. It is drained land. It is cultivated land. It is land that has been in cultivation for a number of years. It is high-priced land, and not swampland. Once it was swampland, but the cost of draining the everglades is expensive, just as is the cost of tilling on Iowa farms expensive. That has been done. Those expenses have been incurred and are in the present capital value of the land.

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I feel certain that to anyone listening to this discussion it is quite obvious there are a number of unanswered questions. None of us doubts the need, the necessity, or the desirability of making the land available to the Everglades National Park, but I believe we ought to have a better explanation of the financial aspects of this transaction.

Therefore, I withdraw my reservation of objection and ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

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

There was no objection.

AUTHORIZING THE SMITHSONIAN INSTITUTION TO EMPLOY ALIENS IN A SCIENTIFIC OR TECHNICAL CAPACITY

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 10178) to authorize the Smithsonian Institution to employ aliens in a scientific or technical capacity.

There being 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 Secretary of the Smithsonian Institution, subject to adequate security and other investigations as he may determine to be appropriate, and subject further to a prior determination by him that no qualified United States citizen is available for the particular position involved, is authorized to employ and compensate aliens in a scientific or technical capacity at authorized rates of compensation without regard to statutory provisions prohibiting payment of compensation to aliens.

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 UNITED SPANISH WAR VETERANS TO ERECT A MEMORIAL IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, OR ITS ENVIRONS

The Clerk called the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 793) authorizing the United Spanish War Veterans to erect a memorial in the District of Columbia.

There being 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 the Secretary of the Interior is authorized and directed to grant authority to the United Spanish War Veterans to erect a memorial on public grounds in the District of Columbia in honor and commemoration of the men who served in the war with Spain, the Philippine Insurrection, and the China Relief Expedition (1898–1902).

SEC. 2. The United States shall be put to no expense in the erection of such memorial.

SEC. 3. The authority conferred pursuant to this joint resolution shall lapse unless (1) the erection of such memorial is commenced within five years from the date of enactment of this joint resolution, and (2) prior to its commencement funds are certified available in an amount sufficient, in the judgment of the Secretary of the Interior, to insure completion of the memorial.

SEC. 4. The memorial erected under authority of this joint resolution shall be maintained by the Secretary of the Interior as a national monument.

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all language after the enacting clause and insert the following: "That the United Spanish War Veterans are authorized to erect a memorial on public grounds in the District of Columbia, or its environs, in honor and commemoration of the men who served in the war with Spain, the Philippine Insurrection, and the China Relief Expedition (1898–1902).

"SEC. 2 (a). The Secretary of the Interior is authorized and directed to select, with the approval of the National Commission of Fine Arts and the National Capital Planning Commission, a suitable site on public grounds in the District of Columbia, or its environs, upon which may be erected the memorial authorized in the first section of this Act: *Provided,* That if the site selected is on public grounds belonging to or under the jurisdiction of the government of the District of Columbia, the approval of the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia shall also be obtained.

"(b) The design and plans for such memorial shall be subject to the approval of the Secretary of the Interior, the National Commission of Fine Arts, and the National Capital Planning Commission, and the United States or the District of Columbia shall be put to no expense in the erection thereof.

"SEC. 3. The authority conferred pursuant to this joint resolution shall lapse unless (1) the erection of such memorial is commenced within five years from the date of enactment of this joint resolution, and (2) prior to its commencement funds are certified available in an amount sufficient, in the judgment of the Secretary of the Interior, to insure completion of the memorial.

"SEC. 4. The maintenance and care of the memorial erected under the provisions of this Act shall be the responsibility of the Secretary of the Interior."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The joint resolution 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: "Authorizing the United Spanish War Veterans to erect a memorial in the District of Columbia, or its environs."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. 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 Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, it is 62 years since the end of the 4-year period, 1898 to 1902, of the war with Spain, the Boxer Rebellion in China, and the Aguinaldo resistances in the Philippines. Those four historic and world reshaping years marked the start of America's march to meet her destiny of world responsibility.

I am very happy that at long last a memorial in honor and commemoration of the men who served in the war with Spain, the Philippine Insurrection and the China Relief Expedition, is to be erected in the District of Columbia. Every cent of the cost of the monument will be borne by the veterans of that war of long, long ago. They wish it that way. The monument will be a heroic size bronze statue portrayal of the Spanish War soldier. I have seen a photograph of the monument to be erected and I can assure my colleagues, and I think it proper I should leave here the record for the future, it is a strikingly correct and accurate representation of the American soldier of that period—with his campaign hat, his leggings, his cartridge rolls, all items of clothing and equipment exactly correct.

As the last veteran of the Spanish-American War in the Congress, the last of over 90 who have served either in this or the other body, I am deeply touched and to my good and close friend, the distinguished gentleman from Missouri [Mr. JONES], chairman of the subcommittee, to my warm friend, the distinguished gentleman from Texas [Mr. BURLESON], chairman of the full committee, and all the members of the great Committee on House Administration, one and all, I extend my deepest thanks.

It is good to learn that after all are gone who played their parts in the unveiling of our country's destiny at the turn of the century there will be standing on the soil of our country's Capital a replica in granite of the Spanish war soldier, a reminder to the oncoming generations of the dreams, the service, and

the sacrifice of American youth in uniform in 1898 to 1902.

Mr. Speaker, Archie House is the present commander in chief of the United Spanish War Veterans. He and I served together in Company I, 33d Michigan Volunteer Infantry, at the siege of Santiago in Cuba. Each had just turned 16. Archie will be succeeded as commander in chief at the encampment later this summer by Sam Black, fellow member of mine in Columbia Camp in Chicago for many, many years, from the time we had 1,000 or more members until the present when we have just 7. Time surely has thinned our ranks. But it will be a gladsome day for the remaining veterans of the war with Spain when the monument authorized by this resolution is unveiled here in the District of Columbia, and among those present, providence willing, will be Archie House, Sam Black, the ever-faithful adjutant General McElroy, and the gentleman from Illinois.

STATUE OF FATHER EUSEBIO FRANCISCO KINO

The Clerk called the resolution (H. Con. Res. 273) to place temporarily in the rotunda of the Capitol a statue of Father Eusebio Francisco Kino, and to hold ceremonies on such occasion.

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

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the State of Arizona is hereby authorized to place temporarily in the rotunda of the Capitol a statue of the late Father Eusebio Francisco Kino, of Arizona, and to hold ceremonies in the rotunda on said occasion; and the Architect of the Capitol is hereby authorized to make the necessary arrangements therefor.

The House concurrent resolution was agreed to. A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

STATUE OF FATHER EUSEBIO FRANCISCO KINO

The Clerk called the resolution (H. Con. Res. 274) accepting the statue of Father Eusebio Francisco Kino, of Arizona, presented by the State of Arizona, to be placed in Statuary Hall.

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

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the statue of Father Eusebio Francisco Kino, presented by the State of Arizona, to be placed in the Statuary Hall, is accepted in the name of the United States, and that the thanks of the Congress be tendered said State for the contribution of the statue of one of its most eminent pioneers, illustrious for his early missionary work, exploration, and cartography; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of these resolutions, suitably engrossed and duly authenticated, be transmitted to the Governor of Arizona.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 4, strike out "Statuary Hall" and insert in lieu thereof "the Statuary Hall collection".

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The House concurrent resolution was agreed to.

The title was amended so as to read: "Concurrent resolution accepting the statue of Father Eusebio Francisco Kino, of Arizona, presented by the State of Arizona, to be placed in the Statuary Hall collection".

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PLACEMENT OF A MEMORIAL TABLET IN THE U.S. CAPITOL

The Clerk called the resolution (H. Res. 530) to provide for the placement of a memorial tablet in the U.S. Capitol in honor of the troops quartered in the Capitol during the Civil War.

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

Whereas President Abraham Lincoln, on April 15, 1861, issued a proclamation calling into the service of the United States the militia of the several States, to the extent of seventy-five thousand men; and

Whereas response was forthcoming from the State of Massachusetts, which sent the Sixth Regiment, the Eighth Regiment, and the Fifth Regiment; the State of New York, which sent the Seventh Regiment (New York State Militia), Ellsworth's Fire Zouaves (Eleventh New York Regiment), the Seventy-first Regiment, and the Fifth New York Regiment; the State of Pennsylvania, which sent the Logan Guards of Lewistown, the Washington Artillerists of Pottsville, the National Light Infantry of Pottsville, the Allen Infantry Rifles of Allentown, the Ringgold Light Artillery of Reading, and the Seventeenth Regiment of Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry; and the District of Columbia, which sent Companies E, A, C, and F (National Guard), and the Mechanics' Union Rifles; and

Whereas these troops were quartered in the United States Capitol to perform the important functions assigned to them: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Architect of the Capitol shall provide for the placing, with appropriate ceremonies, of a tablet at a location in the House Wing of the Capitol determined by him to be appropriate, which tablet shall read as follows:

"This tablet records the fact that the following troops were quartered in the United States Capitol in response to President Lincoln's call for volunteers April 15, 1861:

"MASSACHUSETTS

"Sixth Regiment of Massachusetts.
"Eighth Regiment of Massachusetts.
"Fifth Regiment of Massachusetts.

"NEW YORK

"Seventh Regiment (New York State Militia).
"Ellsworth's Fire Zouaves (Eleventh New York Regiment).
"Seventy-first Regiment.
"Fifth New York Regiment.

"PENNSYLVANIA

"Logan Guards of Lewistown.
"The Washington Artillerists of Pottsville.
"The National Light Infantry of Pottsville.
"The Allen Infantry Rifles of Allentown.
"The Ringgold Light Artillery of Reading.
"The Seventeenth Regiment of Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry.

"DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

"Companies E, A, C, and F (National Guard).
"Mechanics' Union Rifles."

SEC. 2. The size and design of the tablet referred to in the first section of this Act shall be approved by the Architect of the Capitol, and shall be provided without cost to the United States.

With the following committee amendment:

On page 3, lines 3 and 4, strike out all wording following "and" and insert in lieu thereof the following: "the cost of the tablet shall be borne by the Architect of the Capitol from funds under his control."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The House resolution was agreed to. A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CONDEMN CERTAIN PROPERTY IN ST. AUGUSTINE, FLA.

The Clerk called the bill (S. 2419) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to condemn certain property in the city of St. Augustine, Fla., within the boundary of the Castillo de San Marcos National Monument, and for other purposes.

There being 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 notwithstanding the provisions in section 1(b) of the Act entitled "An Act to add certain lands to Castillo de San Marcos National Monument in the State of Florida", approved July 5, 1960 (74 Stat. 317; 319), that certain lands may be acquired only by negotiation, the Secretary of the Interior is authorized to acquire the following described land, interests therein, and improvements thereon, for the purposes of said Act by condemnation with funds that are hereby authorized to be appropriated for that purpose:

All of lots 1 and 5 of block 6 less and except that portion acquired by the Florida Highway Department in 1959 in connection with relocated State Route A–1–A, as shown on the subdivision plat of the city of Saint Augustine prepared June 12, 1923, and filed in the official plat book in the circuit clerk's office of Saint Johns County, Florida, lying northeast of a survey line which is the southerly boundary of the proposed Castillo Drive shown on that certain map in three sheets prepared by E. W. Pacetti and Associates, April 23, 1960, and revised June 2, 1960 (map numbered NM–CSM–3012), and more particularly described as follows:

Beginning at a point on the survey line which is south 53 degrees 05 minutes west a distance of 24.0 feet from survey station 31+81.00 of Florida State Highways A–1–A and 5, section 7801–114 being station 0+00 of the proposed relocated highway; thence, south 36 degrees 55 minutes east a distance of 7.46 feet to a point; thence, on a curve to the right with a radius of 612.0 feet for a distance of 160.22 feet to a point which is station 1+67.68; thence, south 21 degrees 55 minutes east for a distance of 185.22 feet to a point which is station 3+52.90; thence, on a curve to the left with a radius of 465.0 feet for a distance of 328.69 feet to a point which is station 6+81.59; thence, south 62 degrees 25 minutes east for a distance of 251.13 feet to a point which is station 9+32.72; thence, on a curve to the right with a radius of 158.0 feet for a distance of 158.98 feet to the end of this survey line description and being station 10+91.70 of the proposed relocated highway, containing 3,850 square feet more or less.

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.

DEVELOPMENT OF PHOSPHATE ON THE PUBLIC DOMAIN

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 9638) to amend section 27 of the Mineral Leasing Act of February 25, 1920, as amended, in order to promote the development of phosphate on the public domain.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, nowhere in the report do I find any estimate of the cost, if any, to the Federal taxpayers.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. Yes. I will be glad to yield.

Mr. EDMONDSON. I do not think any cost to the taxpayers is involved. As a matter of fact, this should yield greater revenue to the Treasury through the ability to lease larger parcels of land to companies in a position to develop the phosphate reserves.

Mr. GROSS. The gentleman is saying as far as he knows there will be no additional cost to the Federal taxpayers?

Mr. EDMONDSON. Without doubt it should increase revenues to the Government rather than incur costs.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

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

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That subsection (c) of section 27 of the Act of February 25, 1920, as amended (30 U.S.C. 184), is further amended to read as follows:

(c) No person, association, or corporation shall take, hold, own, or control at one time, whether acquired directly from the Secretary under sections 181–184, 185–188, 189–192, 193, 194, 201, 202–209, 211–214, 223, 224–226, 226–2, 227–229a, 241, 261, 261–263 of this title or otherwise, phosphate leases or permits on an aggregate of more than twenty thousand four hundred and eighty acres in the United States.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, lines 8, 9, and 10, strike out "sections 181–184, 185–188, 189–192, 193, 194, 201, 202–209, 211–214, 223, 224–226, 226–2, 227–229a, 241, 261, 261–263 of this title" and insert "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.

DISPOSAL FROM NATIONAL STOCKPILE OF CERTAIN MATERIALS

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to return for immediate consideration to Consent Calendar No. 427, the resolution (H. Con. Res. 320) to express the sense of the Congress on disposal from the national stockpile of certain materials.

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

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

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the Congress expressly approves, pursuant to section 3(e) of the Strategic and Critical Materials Stock Piling Act (50 U.S.C. 98b(e)), the disposal from the national stockpile of the following materials in approximately the following quantities:

1. One thousand five hundred and sixty-seven short tons of Bolivian blue (soft) crocidolite asbestos.
2. One hundred and sixty-five short tons (copper content) of copper and copper base alloys in scrap and thin strip form.
3. Three hundred and sixty-six short tons of cupro-nickel ingots.
4. Three hundred and fifty-five pieces of diamond dies.
5. Forty-six thousand eight hundred pounds of lead castings.
6. Two hundred and twenty thousand two hundred and thirty pounds of punch mica.
7. Sixty-six thousand eight hundred and thirty-four pounds of nickel in fabricated and miscellaneous forms, such as wire, tubing, anodes, cathodes, pellets, and cut cathodes.
8. Twenty-five thousand seven hundred and forty pounds of tantalum in various forms.
9. Two hundred and twenty-one thousand and eighty-seven pounds of zinc in the form of engraving plates.
10. Two hundred and fifty short tons of low-grade manganese ore.

The House concurrent resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DISABILITY AND DEATH BENEFITS FOR RESERVISTS

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to return for immediate consideration to Consent Calendar No. 401, the bill (H.R. 11332) to authorize certain veterans' benefits for disability or death resulting from injuries sustained prior to January 1, 1957, by reservists while proceeding directly to or returning directly from active duty for training or inactive duty training.

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

There being 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 subsection 106(d)(2) of title 38, United States Code, is amended by striking out "after December 31, 1956,".

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.

The SPEAKER. This concludes the call of all eligible bills on the Consent Calendar.

REGISTRATION OF CONTRACTORS OF MIGRANT AGRICULTURAL WORKERS

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 6242) to provide for the registration of contractors of migrant agricultural workers, and for other purposes, with amendments.

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 this Act may be cited as the "Farm Labor Contractor Registration Act of 1963".

CONGRESSIONAL FINDINGS AND DECLARATION OF POLICY

SEC. 2. (a) The Congress hereby finds that the channels and instrumentalities of interstate commerce are being used by certain irresponsible contractors for the services of the migrant agricultural laborers who exploit producers of agricultural products, migrant agricultural laborers, and the public generally, and that, as a result of the use of the channels and instrumentalities of interstate commerce by such irresponsible contractors, the flow of interstate commerce has been impeded, obstructed, and restrained.

(b) It is therefore the policy of this Act to remove the impediments, obstructions, and restraints occasioned to the flow of interstate commerce by the activities of such irresponsible contractors by requiring that all persons engaged in the activity of contracting for the services of workers for interstate agricultural employment comply with the provisions of this Act and all regulations prescribed hereunder by the Secretary of Labor.

DEFINITIONS

SEC. 3. As used in this Act—

(a) The term "person" includes any individual, partnership, association, joint stock company, trust, or corporation.

(b) The term "farm labor contractor" means any person, who, for a fee, either for himself or on behalf of another person, recruits, solicits, hires, furnishes, or transports ten or more migrant workers (excluding members of his immediate family) at any one time in any calendar year for interstate agricultural employment. Such term shall not include (1) any nonprofit charitable organization, public or nonprofit private educational institution, or similar organization; (2) any farmer, processor, canner, ginner, packing shed operator, or nurseryman who engages in any such activity for the purpose of supplying migrant workers solely for his own operation; (3) any fulltime or regular employee of any entity referred to in (1) or (2) above; or (4) any person who engages in any such activity for the purpose of obtaining migrant workers of any foreign nation for employment in the United States, if the employment of such workers is subject to (A) an agreement between the United States and such foreign nation, or (B) an arrangement with the government of any foreign nation under which written contracts for the employment of such workers are provided for and the enforcement thereof is provided for in the United States by an instrumentality of such foreign nation.

(c) The term "fee" includes any money or other valuable consideration paid or promised to be paid to a person for services as a farm labor contractor.

(d) The term "interstate agricultural employment" means employment in any service or activity included within the provisions of section 3(f) of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, as amended (29 U.S.C. 203(f)), or section 3121(g) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (26 U.S.C. 3121(g)), when such service or activity is performed by an individual worker who has been transported from one State to another or from any place outside of a State to any place within a State.

(e) The term "Secretary" means the Secretary of the United States Department of Labor or his duly authorized representative.

(f) The term "State" means any of the States of the United States, the District of Columbia, the Virgin Islands, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, and Guam.

(g) The term "migrant worker" means an individual whose primary employment is in agriculture, as defined in section 3(f) of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 (29 U.S.C. 203(f)), or who performs agricultural labor, as defined in section 3121(g) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (26 U.S.C. 3121(g)), on a seasonal or other temporary basis.

CERTIFICATION OF REGISTRATION REQUIRED

SEC. 4. (a) No person shall engage in activities as a farm labor contractor unless he first obtains a certificate of registration from the Secretary, and unless such certificate is in full force and effect and is in such person's immediate posssession.

(b) A full-time or regular employee of any person holding a valid certificate of registration under the provisions of this Act shall not, for the purpose of engaging in activities as a farm labor contractor solely on behalf of such person, be required to obtain a certificate of registration hereunder in his own name. Any such employee shall be required to have in his immediate personal possession when engaging in such activities such identification as the Secretary may require showing such employee to be an employee of, and duly authorized to engage in activities as a farm labor contractor for, a person holding a valid certificate of registration under the provisions of this Act. Except as provided in the foregoing provisions of this subsection, any such employee shall be subject to the provisions of this Act and regulations prescribed hereunder to the same extent as if he were required to obtain a certificate of registration in his own name.

ISSUANCE OF CERTIFICATE OF REGISTRATION

SEC. 5. (a) The Secretary shall, after appropriate investigation, issue a certificate of registration under this Act to any person who—

(1) has executed and filed with the Secretary a written application subscribed and sworn to by the applicant containing such information (to the best of his knowledge and belief) concerning his conduct and method of operation as a farm labor contractor as the Secretary may require in order effectively to carry out the provisions of this Act;

(2) has filed, within such time as the Secretary may prescribe, proof satisfactory to the Secretary of the financial responsibility of the applicant or proof satisfactory to the Secretary of the existence of a policy of insurance which insures such applicant against liability for damages to persons or property arising out of the applicant's ownership of, operation of, or his causing to be operated any vehicle for the transportation of migrant workers in connection with his business, activities, or operations as a farm labor contractor. The amount of any such policy of insurance shall be not less than the amount required under the law or regulation of any State in which such applicant operates a vehicle in connection with his business, activities, or operations as a farm labor contractor; but in no event shall the amount of such insurance be less than $5,000 for bodily injuries to or death of one person; $20,000 for bodily injuries to or death of all persons injured or killed in any one accident; $5,000 for the loss or damage in any one accident to property of others; and

(3) has filed, within such time as the Secretary may prescribe, a set of his fingerprints.

(b) Upon notice and hearing in accordance with regulations prescribed by him, the Secretary may refuse to issue, and may suspend, revoke, or refuse, to renew a certificate of registration to any farm labor contractor if he finds that such contractor—

(1) knowingly has made any misrepresentations or false statements in his application for a certificate of registration or any renewal thereof;

(2) knowingly has given false or misleading information to migrant workers concerning the terms, conditions, or existence of agricultural employment;

(3) has failed, without justification, to perform agreements entered into or arrangements with farm operators;

(4) has failed, without justification, to comply with the terms of any working arrangements he has made with migrant workers;

(5) has failed to show financial responsibility satisfactory to the Secretary required by subsection (a)(2) of this section or has failed to keep in effect a policy of insurance required by subsection (a)(2) of this section;

(6) has recruited, employed, or utilized the services of a person with knowledge that such person is violating the provisions of the immigration and nationality laws of the United States;

(7) has been convicted of any crime under State or Federal law relating to gambling or to the sale, distribution, or possession of alcoholic liquors in connection with or incident to his activities as a farm labor contractor; or has been convicted of any crime under State or Federal law involving robbery, bribery, extortion, embezzlement, grand larceny, burglary, arson, violation of narcotics laws, murder, rape, assault with intent to kill, assault which inflicts grievous bodily injury, or prostitution;

(8) has failed to comply with rules and regulations promulgated by the Interstate Commerce Commission that are applicable to his activities and operations in interstate commerce;

(9) knowingly employs or continues to employ any person to whom subsection (b) of section 4 of this Act applies who has taken any action, except for that listed in paragraph (5) of this subsection, which could be used by the Secretary under this subsection to refuse to issue a certificate of registration; or

(10) has failed to comply with any of the provisions of this Act or to any regulations issued hereunder.

(c) A certificate of registration, once issued, may not be transferred or assigned and shall be effective for the remainder of the calendar year during which it is issued, unless suspended or revoked by the Secretary as provided in this Act. A certificate of registration may be renewed each calendar year upon approval by the Secretary of an application for its renewal.

OBLIGATIONS AND PROHIBITIONS

SEC. 6. Every farm labor contractor shall—

(a) carry his certificate of registration with him at all times while engaging in activities as a farm labor contractor and exhibit the same to all persons with whom he intends to deal in his capacity as a farm labor contractor prior to so dealing;

(b) ascertain and disclose to each worker at the time the worker is recruited the following information to the best of his knowledge and belief: (1) the area of employment, (2) the crops and operations on which he may be employed, (3) the transportation, housing, and insurance to be provided him, (4) the wage rates to be paid him, and (5) the charges to be made by the contractor for his services;

(c) upon arrival at a given place of employment, post in a conspicuous place a written statement of the terms and conditions of that employment;

(d) in the event he manages, supervises, or otherwise controls the housing facilities, post in a conspicuous place the terms and conditions of occupancy; and

(e) in the event he pays migrant workers engaged in interstate agricultural employment, either on his own behalf or on behalf of another person, keep payroll records which shall show for each worker total earnings in each payroll period, all withholdings from wages, and net earnings. In addition, for workers employed on a time basis, the number of units of time employed and the rate per unit of time shall be recorded on the payroll records, and for workers employed on a piece rate basis, the number of units of work performed and the rate per unit shall be recorded on such records. In addition he shall provide to each migrant worker engaged in interstate agricultural employment with whom he deals in a capacity as a farm labor contractor a statement of all sums paid to him (including sums received on behalf of such migrant worker) on account of the labor of such migrant worker. He shall also provide each such worker with an itemized statement showing all sums withheld by him from the amount he received on account of the labor of such worker, and the purpose for which withheld. The Secretary may prescribe an appropriate form for recording such information.

AUTHORITY TO OBTAIN INFORMATION

SEC. 7. The Secretary or his designated representative may investigate and gather data with respect to matters which may aid in carrying out the provisions of this Act. In any case in which a complaint has been filed with the Secretary regarding a violation of this Act or with respect to which the Secretary has reasonable grounds to believe that a farm labor contractor has violated any provisions of this Act, the Secretary or his designated representative may investigate and gather data respecting such case, and may, in connection therewith, enter and inspect such places and such records (and make such transcriptions thereof), question such persons, and investigate such facts, conditions, practices, or matters as may be necessary or appropriate to determine whether a violation of this Act has been committed.

AGREEMENTS WITH FEDERAL AND STATE AGENCIES

SEC. 8. The Secretary is authorized to enter into agreements with Federal and State agencies, to utilize (pursuant to such agreements) the facilities and services of the agencies, and to delegate to the agencies such authority, other than rulemaking, as he deems necessary in carrying out the provisions of this Act, and to allocate or transfer funds or otherwise to pay or to reimburse such agencies for expenses in connection therewith.

PENALTY PROVISIONS

SEC. 9. Any farm labor contractor or employee thereof who willfully and knowingly violates any provision of this Act or any regulation prescribed hereunder shall be fined not more than $500.

APPLICABILITY OF ADMINISTRATIVE PROCEDURE ACT

SEC. 10. The provisions of the Administrative Procedure Act (5 U.S.C. 1001 and the following) shall apply to all administrative proceedings conducted pursuant to the authority contained in this Act.

JUDICIAL REVIEW

SEC. 11. Any person aggrieved by any order of the Secretary in refusing to issue or renew, or in suspending or revoking, a certificate of registration may obtain a review of any such order by filing in the district court of the United States for the district wherein such person resides or has his principal place of business, or in the United States District Court for the District of Columbia, and serving upon the Secretary, within thirty days after the entry of such order, a written petition praying that the order of the Secretary be modified or set aside in whole or in part. Upon receipt of any such petition, the Secretary shall file in such court a full, true, and correct copy of the transcript of the proceedings upon which the order complained of

was entered. Upon the filing of such petition and receipt of such transcript, such court shall have jurisdiction to affirm, set aside, modify, or enforce such order, in whole or in part. In any such review, the findings of fact of the Secretary shall not be set aside if supported by substantial evidence. The judgment and decree of the court shall be final, subject to review as provided in sections 1254 and 1291 of title 28, United States Code.

STATE LAWS AND REGULATIONS

SEC. 12. This Act and the provisions contained herein are intended to supplement State action and compliance with this Act shall not excuse anyone from compliance with appropriate State law and regulation.

SEVERABILITY

SEC. 13. If any provision of this Act, or the application thereof to any person or circumstance, shall be held invalid, the remainder of the Act and the application of such provision to other persons or circumstances shall not be affected thereby.

RULES AND REGULATIONS

SEC. 14. The Secretary is authorized to issue such rules and regulations as he determines necessary for the purpose of carrying out the provisions of sections 4, 5, 6, and 8 of this Act.

EFFECTIVE DATE

SEC. 15. The provisions of this Act shall become effective on January 1, 1965.

The SPEAKER. Is a second demanded?

Mr. MARTIN of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I demand a second.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, a second will be considered as ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. POWELL.] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, I arise on behalf of H.R. 6242 and on behalf of 400,000 of our citizens who leave their homes every year and cross State lines to engage in agricultural employment for low wages and suffer unreasonable and unimaginable abuses.

It is our intention, through this bill, to protect these workers. This is the least that the Government can do for workers who are so vulnerable to exploitation.

The Department of Labor made a survey of crew leader practices in 1960 and rechecked their findings just before the hearings held by the Committee on Education and Labor. The surveys indicated that employer-type responsibility is increasingly being assumed by the crew leaders, and that the crew leaders are, in large part, responsible for the abuses to migrant workers. The surveys indicated that the crew leaders often maintain payrolls and report taxes. They indicated that it was common practice for farm employers to advance transportation costs to the crew leaders on a loan basis and that the advances are later deducted from the worker's earnings. The surveys indicated that the crew leaders are responsible for the misrepresentation of crop conditions, of available jobs, and of anticipated earnings. Workers were overcharged for transportation advances and transportation expenses were accepted from farmers without reporting to work or with a smaller crew than contracted for. Crews are abandoned without means of transportation. Workers are not returned to their homes. Workers do not get social security credit for their earnings. The transportation and living conditions are far below the general standard of living—are indeed inhuman, the very worst conditions of human life in this country, totally unacceptable for human beings.

Since the labor contractor is at the core of this problem, has control over the migrant workers in a way that others do not, the sanction against these abuses is directed toward the crew leader.

The object of this bill is to protect workers against exploitation. This is done by requiring certificates of registration to be issued by the Secretary of Labor to any person who engages in the activities of a farm labor contractor. The certificates will be issued upon the submission of satisfactory information regarding the contractor's conduct and method of operation.

Satisfactory proof must also be furnished of the existence of a public liability insurance policy on vehicles used in the contractor's business covering personal and property damage in amounts conforming to applicable State standards or a specified minimum. The certificate of registration may be refused, revoked, or suspended if the abuses I have referred to are discovered in the case of any farmworker. The abuses which will lead to such revocation, suspension, or refusal are: Giving false or misleading information to migratory workers concerning the terms, conditions, or existence of agricultural employment; failure to perform agreements entered into with farm operators; failure to comply with working arrangements made with migratory workers; and use, with knowledge, of a person who has been determined to be in violation of the immigration and nationality laws. Conviction under a State or Federal law relating to gambling, prostitution, or sale, distribution or possession of alcoholic liquors or narcotics in connection with his activities as a farm labor contractor; and failure to comply with applicable Interstate Commerce Commission regulations are also grounds for refusing, revoking, or suspending a certificate.

Mr. Speaker, legislation for the protection of these workers is long overdue and I earnestly hope that the House will look with favor on this legislation.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, this bill establishes a system of Federal registration for interstate farm labor contractors or crew leaders as they are frequently called. These labor contractors are the middle men in making work arrangements between growers and migratory farmworkers.

There were a number of other bills introduced on the same subject besides that of the author of this bill, the gentleman from Hawaii [Mr. GILL]. In essence, Mr. Speaker, the purpose of this bill is to protect not only the farmer himself or the grower but also the migratory worker who is primarily at the mercy of the crew leader.

It will be noted in the report of the committee that my distinguished friend from Nebraska [Mr. MARTIN] and the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. SNYDER] who issued the minority report agreed that there was really nothing wrong with this particular bill. Their fear was that it might lead to other legislation in this area; and I can assure them that speaking at least for myself in this session there will be no other legislation in this area.

The purpose of the bill is to cause the registration by the Secretary of Labor of these crew leaders. It provides that they are only subject to this registration if they transport 10 or more migrant workers for interstate agricultural employment. The bill specifically exempts certain groups which are important to note. First, charitable, educational, or similar nonprofit organizations in their full-time or regular employees.

Second, farmers, processors, and certain related businesses which recruit migrant workers solely for their own operation and their full-time or regular employees.

Third, persons engaged in obtaining farmworkers for employment arranged under the supervision of a foreign nation.

I think it is important to note that there are approximately 8,000 farm labor contractors or crew leaders in this country and that about half of all the interstate migratory workers are crew members of these contractors. It is important to note that these contractors do a number of most important things and I shall list only a few of them.

First of all, they make the arrangement for these workers with the employer.

Second, they are responsible for their payment.

Third, they are responsible for the working conditions under which they are employed. In other words, they actually control the lives of these migratory workers during the period that the worker is under contract. Many of the crew leaders perform their functions in a satisfactory and responsible manner and I think it should always be understood that when we ask for legislation of this kind we are not casting aspersions upon those who are doing a fair, a good, and a decent job in this area. But unfortunately there is mounting evidence that the workers' dependency on this one-sided relationship is being violated by an increasing number and therefore abused.

The Department of Labor surveys have revealed numerous abuses. I shall mention just a few of them: Overcharging workers for transportation, abandoning a crew without means of transportation, the failure to return workers to their homes, the underpayment of wages and the illegal sale of liquor and dope.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the growers are also at times exploited. A typical abuse is the crew leader accepting transportation

advances, but failing to report for work, or reporting with a smaller crew than promised.

Mr. Speaker, unfortunately, the record also shows a frequency of criminal records among crew leaders. These have been disclosed as a result of the few State laws providing for crew leader licensing.

In New York State, for example, 52 crew leaders have been found to have criminal records out of a total group of 401.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that this bill is essentially noncontroversial.

There are four amendments which I should describe. One of them is on page 9, line 4, of the bill where the proposed amendment would strike out "migrant agricultural" and insert in lieu thereof "farm."

The reason for that is that we want to make the bill conform in all respects. In other parts of the legislation the term "farm labor contractor" is used and it is so described in the terminology which is described in the definition part of the bill.

On page 9, line 17, the word "by" is stricken where it first appears on that line. It was inserted through a typographical error.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 1 additional minute.

Mr. Speaker, on page 11, line 9, the word "many" is a typographical error, and we shall ask that it be stricken and in lieu thereof insert the word "may," which was the word intended to replace it.

On page 14, line 3, we strike the date of "1964" and insert in lieu thereof "1965" in order to bring the bill up to date.

I believe, in general, that covers what is carried in the bill. I believe it will be noncontroversial in most respects and I indeed hope it will pass.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the author of the bill, the distinguished gentleman from Hawaii [Mr. GILL].

Mr. GILL. Mr. Speaker, this bill is basically a registration law. It is really a very minimal piece of legislation.

Mr. Speaker, the reason we need a law of this sort is so we can keep track of people in this business, because they travel across State lines and move from jurisdiction to jurisdiction.

Mr. Speaker, the need for this legislation is very obvious. These crew chiefs deal with a type of labor in this country which is often undereducated or in many instances completely uneducated. The literacy level is generally low. Their ability to understand their rights is, of course, minimal.

Many of these migrant laborers have no voting residence. They have no Congressman to whom they can complain, nor do they have access to other officials who may help them with their problems. Therefore, they are easy to victimize.

This bill would be of great assistance to the good crew leaders who, of course, are the vast majority. It will prevent them from being daubed with the same brush used on the bad.

Certainly, Mr. Speaker, if we can be sure that all who are engaged in this business are honest and will carry out their responsibilities, then the character of the trade will improve.

It has been asked why do we not allow the States to regulate this activity. Quite a number of States do. But the problem is that the States who do regulate crew leaders and which do require that they meet certain standards cannot enforce their regulations across State lines. If they find a crewleader who is guilty of a violation of their regulations, all he has to do is to move across the State line and continue in his improper activity.

This legislation, if enacted, will permit the Federal Government to register these crew chiefs in all States.

The Members will note that in section 8 of the bill cooperation with the States can be had by agreement. The key requirement in this bill is found in section 5, under "Financial responsibility." Here we require that there be certain insurance or certain other evidence showing that the operator is financially responsible. Once this is done there will be fewer instances of trucks turning over with loss of life and limb and without recompense to the injured.

Mr. Speaker, the rights of the crew leaders are protected in this bill through the application of the provisions of the Administrative Procedures Act. Judicial review is included under the substantial evidence ruling.

We are dealing with several hundred thousand people. In the poverty bill recently passed we gave the States and localities certain assistance in providing housing and education for migrant workers and their families. This bill provides minimal legal protection for the heads of households when they are hired, and gives them certain basic rights to honest treatment by crew chiefs.

This is a "fair shake" bill, and I hope it will be passed.

Mr. MARTIN of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. GRIFFIN].

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this legislation. A record has been made in our committee demonstrating the need for the registration of crew leaders who are in charge of transporting migratory workers.

In many cases, migratory workers do not speak English, they often have little or no education. They are peculiarly subject to exploitation if their crew leader should be unscrupulous. This bill will provide better accountability for social security purposes and for tax purposes.

In particular, I endorse the provision requiring a crew leader to prove financial responsibility or establish that he has liability insurance; this is a good provision that is in the public interest. I may say that if I were to direct a criticism to that section it would be that the limits of liability are set too low, requiring only $5,000 of liability insurance coverage in the case of injury to one person, and only $20,000 of coverage for all persons involved in an accident.

As I look at this legislation and note how carefully it has been drawn and considered, I cannot help but notice the contrast between this bill and the migratory labor provision that was inserted very hastily in the so-called antipoverty bill passed last week. In that bill, the Congress, in effect, said to the Director of the poverty program: "You develop and implement a program to assist migratory workers; and here are millions of dollars to do it with." That was a very loose and poorly drafted provision.

By contrast, we can be proud of the legislation before us today, and I hope that the bill will pass.

Mr. MARTIN of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Maine [Mr. MCINTIRE].

Mr. MCINTIRE. Mr. Speaker, I rise to ask a question of the gentleman from Hawaii.

In connection with the coverage of this bill, does it apply to workers who come from another country, just crossing an international boundary line, and working in an area only for a harvesting season, but do not travel into any other States?

Mr. GILL. The bill does not apply to foreign workers covered by an international agreement. There is a section on that point. It does not apply to workers who work within a single State. They have to be workers recruited in one State and crossing over to another State, therefore being in interstate commerce.

Mr. MCINTIRE. The arrangement I refer to is one that is not entered into as a nation-to-nation agreement. It is in fact simply a working agreement under immigration law for the importation of seasonal help. This legislation would not apply under those circumstances if the worker does not travel in interstate commerce, but simply returns to his home following the period of employment.

Mr. GILL. My understanding is that the gentleman is correct.

Mr. MCINTIRE. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. BENNETT].

Mr. BENNETT of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of legislation to provide registration and adequate controls over contractors of migrant agricultural workers. For many years I have been keenly aware of the need for remedial legislation in this field. In this session, in February of 1963, I introduced a bill to provide for registration of such contractors. Subsequently I testified before the House Education and Labor Committee in behalf of this approach and specifically on behalf of my bill, H.R. 3802, which is substantially like the bill now before us, and is, I believe, the first bill of this nature introduced in this session of Congress.

Many abuses have been shown in this field. Among those abuses most frequently attributed to crew leaders are: Overcharging for transportation advances; underpaying workers by giving them reduced figures for total weight or units produced; overcharging growers through inflated production figures; abandoning workers without their pay;

illegal traffic in gambling, liquor, narcotics, prostitution; and overcharging workers for services, housing, and food.

The plight of the migrant laborer in this country is an inexcusable and cancerous sore in the body politic. Though few of us come in close contact with it, its tragedies should be eliminated by every legal means, and this legislation can do much to greatly improve the situation.

This is by no means all that should be done in the field of improving the conditions of migratory labor in this country, but it is a step forward, and I urge that we take this much needed step.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. RYAN].

Mr. RYAN of New York. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this legislation. I introduced similar legislation in the 87th and 88th Congresses.

H.R. 6242, providing for the registration of contractors of migrant agricultural workers, will cover more than 8,000 crew leaders who recruit migratory farm laborers for interstate employment. In the 87th Congress I introduced in the House, and Senator HARRISON WILLIAMS of New Jersey introduced in the other body, a package of bills designed to protect the migrant laborer and provide essential assistance for migrants and their families. The bill before us today is identical in all major respects to my bill, H.R. 4905.

This legislation is shamefully tardy. The conditions under which the 400,000 migratory farm laborers live and work are disastrously below the national standard of living. At the same time practically none of the benefits or protective measures of Federal law enjoyed by other workers are extended to migratory laborers. They are excluded from protection under the Fair Labor Standards Act, so their wages are below the level of decency. They have been denied the safeguards of the National Labor Relations Act, so they have been handicapped in organizing for their own welfare.

Yet we cannot plead ignorance as an excuse for our inaction. Since the early 1930's the problems of migratory labor have been a subject of Federal study and investigation. In 1951, fully 13 years ago, a President's Committee on Migratory Labor spelled out the plight of these rootless, vulnerable workers. Our delay is a sad commentary on our responsiveness to the needs of the people.

The contractors of migratory labor play a unique and important role in the lives of their employees. Crew leaders who act as middlemen between the farmer and the laborer often recruit, transport, house, feed, pay, and oversee the work of the employees. In short, the welfare of the employees is in the hands of the crew leader who can exploit them with relative freedom from Federal and State regulation. In 1961 the average annual earnings for migratory farm laborers was only $902. Unscrupulous and irresponsible crew leaders have been known to misrepresent wages, travel costs, available jobs, crop conditions, and exploit child labor.

The bill would require crew leaders to register with the Secretary of Labor if they recruit 10 or more migratory laborers for interstate employment. They would also be required to give satisfactory proof of financial responsibility or proof of insurance covering liability for damages arising out of ownership or operation of any vehicle for the transportation of migrant workers. A certificate of registration may be denied, suspended or revoked if a contractor misrepresents terms of employment to workers or to farmers, fails to live up to commitments to workers or farmers, fails to comply with ICC regulations, and for other reasons spelled out in the bill.

Crew leaders are required to disclose to workers terms of employment, including housing and wages, and to keep payroll records.

While the bill is intended to correct the abuses which attend the present status of the crew leader, simple regulation and registration of the crew leaders is not enough to make a substantial change in the conditions of migrant workers. I have introduced other proposals dealing with migrant labor, such as measures for child day care, sanitation, education, the extension of child labor laws to migratory labor, and the establishment of a National Advisory Council on Migratory Labor. The migrant laborer should no longer be neglected. This bill is a belated recognition of his plight. We must also pass the other bills which have already been approved in the other body.

The SPEAKER. The question is, Will the House suspend the rules and pass the bill H.R. 6242?

The question was taken, and the Speaker announced that two-thirds appeared to have voted in the affirmative.

Mr. STINSON. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 343, nays 7, not voting 80, as follows:

[Roll No. 232]

YEAS—343

Abbitt	Boggs	Chamberlain
Abele	Boland	Chelf
Addabbo	Bolling	Chenoweth
Albert	Bolton,	Clancy
Anderson	Oliver P.	Clark
Andrews, Ala.	Bonner	Clausen,
Andrews,	Bow	Don H.
N. Dak.	Brademas	Clawson, Del
Arends	Bray	Cleveland
Ashbrook	Brock	Cohelan
Ashmore	Brooks	Collier
Aspinall	Broomfield	Colmer
Ayres	Brotzman	Conte
Baker	Brown, Ohio	Cooley
Baldwin	Broyhill, N.C.	Corbett
Barrett	Broyhill, Va.	Corman
Barry	Bruce	Cramer
Bates	Burke	Cunningham
Battin	Burkhalter	Curtin
Becker	Burleson	Curtis
Beckworth	Burton, Calif.	Dague
Beermann	Burton, Utah	Daniels
Belcher	Byrne, Pa.	Davis, Ga.
Bell	Byrnes, Wis.	Davis, Tenn.
Bennett, Fla.	Cahill	Dawson
Berry	Carey	Delaney
Betts	Casey	Dent
Blatnik	Cederberg	Denton
Derounian	Karth	Reifel
Derwinski	Kastenmeier	Reuss
Devine	Keith	Rhodes, Ariz.
Dole	Kelly	Rhodes, Pa.
Donohue	Keogh	Rich
Dorn	Kilburn	Riehlman
Dowdy	Kilgore	Rivers, Alaska
Downing	King, Calif.	Rivers, S.C.
Dulski	King, N.Y.	Roberts, Ala.
Duncan	Kirwan	Robison
Dwyer	Knox	Rodino
Edmondson	Kornegay	Rogers, Colo.
Edwards	Kunkel	Rogers, Fla.
Ellsworth	Laird	Rooney, N.Y.
Everett	Langen	Rooney, Pa.
Fallon	Latta	Roosevelt
Farbstein	Lennon	Rosenthal
Fascell	Libonati	Rostenkowski
Feighan	Lindsay	Roudebush
Findley	Lipscomb	Roush
Fino	Lloyd	Rumsfeld
Flood	Long, La.	Ryan, N.Y.
Flynt	Long, Md.	St Germain
Fogarty	McCulloch	St. Onge
Ford	McDade	Saylor
Foreman	McFall	Schadeberg
Forrester	McIntire	Schenck
Fountain	McLoskey	Schneebeli
Fraser	Macdonald	Schweiker
Frelinghuysen	Madden	Schwengel
Friedel	Mailliard	Secrest
Fulton, Pa.	Marsh	Selden
Fuqua	Martin, Calif.	Short
Gallagher	Martin, Mass.	Shriver
Garmatz	Martin, Nebr.	Sickles
Gary	Mathias	Sikes
Giaimo	Matsunaga	Siler
Gibbons	Matthews	Sisk
Gilbert	May	Skubitz
Gill	Meader	Slack
Glenn	Michel	Smith, Iowa
Gonzalez	Milliken	Snyder
Goodell	Mills	Springer
Goodling	Minish	Stafford
Grant	Minshall	Staggers
Green, Oreg.	Monagan	Stinson
Green, Pa.	Moore	Stratton
Griffin	Moorhead	Stubblefield
Griffiths	Morgan	Sullivan
Gross	Morris	Taft
Grover	Morse	Talcott
Gubser	Morton	Taylor
Hagan, Ga.	Mosher	Teague, Calif.
Hagen, Calif.	Multer	Thomas
Haley	Murphy, Ill.	Thompson, N.J.
Hall	Murphy, N.Y.	Thompson, Tex.
Halleck	Murray	Thomson, Wis.
Halpern	Natcher	Trimble
Hansen	Nelsen	Tuck
Harding	Nix	Tupper
Hardy	Norblad	Tuten
Harris	O'Brien, N.Y.	Udall
Harrison	O'Hara, Ill.	Ullman
Harsha	O'Hara, Mich.	Utt
Harvey, Ind.	O'Konski	Van Deerlin
Hawkins	Olsen, Mont.	Vanik
Hays	Olson, Minn.	Van Pelt
Hechler	O'Neill	Vinson
Henderson	Ostertag	Waggonner
Herlong	Passman	Watson
Holifield	Patman	Watts
Holland	Patten	Weaver
Horan	Pelly	Weltner
Hosmer	Perkins	Westland
Huddleston	Philbin	Wharton
Hull	Pickle	White
Hutchinson	Pike	Whitener
Ichord	Pillion	Wickersham
Jarman	Poage	Widnall
Jennings	Poff	Willis
Jensen	Pool	Wilson, Ind.
Joelson	Powell	Wright
Johansen	Price	Wydler
Johnson, Calif.	Purcell	Young
Johnson, Pa.	Quie	Younger
Johnson, Wis.	Quillen	Zablocki
Jonas	Reid, Ill.	
Karsten	Reid, N.Y.	

NAYS—7

Abernethy	Roberts, Tex.	Whitten
Gathings	Rogers, Tex.	
Mahon	Teague, Tex.	

NOT VOTING—80

Adair	Brown, Calif.	Fisher
Alger	Buckley	Fulton, Tenn.
Ashley	Cameron	Grabowski
Auchincloss	Celler	Gray
Avery	Daddario	Gurney
Baring	Diggs	Hanna
Bass	Dingell	Harvey, Mich.
Bolton,	Elliott	Healey
Frances P.	Evins	Hébert
Bromwell	Finnegan	Hoeven

Hoffman	Morrison	Smith, Calif.
Horton	Moss	Smith, Va.
Jones, Ala.	Nedzi	Staebler
Jones, Mo.	Osmers	Steed
Kee	Pepper	Stephens
Kluczynski	Pilcher	Thompson, La.
Kyl	Pirnie	Toll
Landrum	Pucinski	Tollefson
Lankford	Rains	Wallhauser
Leggett	Randall	Whalley
Lesinski	Roybal	Williams
McClory	Ryan, Mich.	Wilson, Bob
McDowell	St. George	Wilson, Charles H.
McMillan	Scott	Winstead
MacGregor	Senner	Wyman
Miller, Calif.	Sheppard	
Miller, N.Y.	Shipley	
Montoya	Sibal	

So (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Mr. Toll with Mr. Whalley.
Mr. Hébert with Mrs. St. George.
Mr. Buckley with Mr. Pirnie.
Mr. Healey with Mr. Horton.
Mr. McDowell with Mr. Kyl.
Mr. Daddario with Mr. McClory.
Mr. Celler with Mr. Miller of New York.
Mr. Montoya with Mr. Alger.
Mr. Dingell with Mr. Osmers.
Mr. Nedzi with Mr. Harvey of Michigan.
Mr. Ryan of Michigan with Mr. Bromwell.
Mr. Lesinski with Mr. Hoffman.
Mr. Morrison with Mr. Hoeven.
Mr. Thompson of Louisiana with Mr. Auchincloss.
Mr. Pucinski with Mr. Sibal.
Mr. Kluczynski with Mr. MacGregor.
Mr. Randall with Mr. Gurney.
Mr. Baring with Mr. Adair.
Mr. Moss with Mr. Smith of California.
Mr. Brown of California with Mr. Tollefson.
Mr. Ashley with Mrs. Frances P. Bolton.
Mr. Evins with Mr. Wallhauser.
Mr. Jones of Alabama with Mr. Avery.
Mr. Miller of California with Mr. Bob Wilson.
Mr. Grabowski with Mr. Wyman.
Mr. Roybal with Mr. Staebler.
Mr. Cameron with Mr. Winstead.
Mr. Senner with Mr. Williams.
Mr. Charles H. Wilson with Mr. Fisher.
Mr. Hanna with Mr. Finnegan.
Mr. Leggett with Mr. Lankford.
Mr. Landrum with Mrs. Kee.
Mr. Shipley with Mr. Diggs.
Mr. Elliott with Mr. Gray.
Mr. Scott with Mr. McMillan.
Mr. Fulton of Tennessee with Mr. Sheppard.
Mr. Steed with Mr. Bass.
Mr. Pepper with Mr. Pilcher.
Mr. Stephens with Mr. Smith of Virginia.

Messrs. TEAGUE of Texas, ROGERS of Texas, and ROBERTS of Texas changed their vote from "yea" to "nay."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The doors were opened.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (S. 524) to provide for the registration of contractors of migrant agricultural workers, and for other purposes, a similar bill to the bill just passed.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the Senate bill.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. ROOSEVELT

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. ROOSEVELT: Strike out all after the enacting clause of S. 524 and insert in lieu thereof the text of H.R. 6242, as passed.

The amendment was agreed to.

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

A similar House bill (H.R. 6242) was laid on the table.

FEDERAL COAL MINE SAFETY ACT AMENDMENTS

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 9000) to amend the Federal Coal Mine Safety Act so as to provide further for the prevention of accidents in coal mines.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the "Federal Coal Mine Safety Act Amendments of 1963".

SEC. 2. (a) Subsection (b) of section 201 of the Federal Coal Mine Safety Act (66 Stat. 693; 30 U.S.C. 471(b)) is repealed.

(b) For a period of six months following the month during which this Act becomes effective, the amendments made by section 3 of this Act to the Federal Coal Mine Safety Act shall not apply to any mine in which on the effective date of this Act no more than fourteen individuals are regularly employed underground, except that the amendments made by subsections (c) and (d) of such section shall become effective on the date of enactment of this Act.

(c) For a period of six months following the month during which this Act becomes effective, paragraph (5) of subsection (h) of section 209 of the Federal Coal Mine Safety Act shall not apply to any mine in which on the effective date of this Act (1) no more than fourteen individuals are regularly employed underground and (2) the storage, handling, or use of black powder is expressly permitted by a statute of the State in which such mine is located.

SEC. 3. (a) Section 203 of the Federal Coal Mine Safety Act (66 Stat. 694; 30 U.S.C. 473) is amended by adding a new subsection (d) and a new subsection (e), reading as follows, and by redesignating present subsections (d), (e), and (f) as subsections (f), (g), and (h), respectively, and by amending those subsections to read as follows:

"(d) (1) If a duly authorized representative of the Bureau, upon making an inspection of a mine as authorized in section 202, finds that any provision of section 209 is being violated, and if he also finds that, while the conditions created by such violation do not cause danger that a mine explosion, mine fire, mine inundation, or man-trip or man-hoist accident will occur in such mine immediately or before the imminence of such danger can be eliminated, such violation is of such nature as could significantly and substantially contribute to the cause or effect of a mine explosion, mine fire, mine inundation, or man-trip or man-hoist accident, and if he finds such violation to be caused by an unwarrantable failure of such operator to comply with the provisions of section 209, he shall include such finding in the notice given to the operator under subsection (b) of this section. Within ninety days of the time such notice was given to such operator, the Bureau shall cause such mine to be reinspected to determine if any similar such violation exists in such mine. Such reinspection shall be in addition to any special inspection required under section 203 or section 206. If, during any special inspection relating to such violation or during such reinspection, a representative of the Bureau finds such similar violation does exist, and if he finds such violation to be caused by an unwarrantable failure of such operator to comply with the provisions of section 209, he shall forthwith issue an order requiring the operator to cause all persons in the area affected by such violation, except those persons referred to in paragraph (3) of this subsection, to be withdrawn from, and to be debarred from entering, such area. Such finding and order shall state the provision or provisions of section 209 which have been violated and shall contain a detailed description of the conditions which such representative finds cause and constitute such violation, and a description of the area from which persons must be withdrawn and debarred. The representative of the Bureau shall promptly thereafter advise the Director in writing of his findings and his action.

"(2) If a withdrawal order with respect to any area in a mine has been issued pursuant to paragraph (1) of this subsection, thereafter a withdrawal order shall promptly be issued by a duly authorized representative of the Bureau who finds upon any following inspection the existence in such mine of violations similar to those that resulted in the issuance of the withdrawal order under paragraph (1) of this subsection until such time as an inspection of such mine discloses no similar violations. Following an inspection of such mine which discloses no similar violations, the provisions of paragraph (1) of this subsection shall again be applicable to that mine.

"(3) No order issued under paragraphs (1) or (2) of this subsection shall require any of the following persons to be withdrawn from, or to be debarred from entering, the area described in the order: (A) Any person whose presence in such area is necessary, in the judgment of the operator of the mine, to abate the violation described in the order; (B) any public official whose official duties require him to enter such area; or (C) any legal or technical consultant or any representative of the employees of the mine, who is a certified person qualified to make mine examinations, or is accompanied by such a person, and whose presence in such area is necessary, in the judgment of the operator of the mine, for the proper investigation of the conditions described in the order.

"(e) Except as provided in subsection (g) of this section an order issued under subsection (c) or (d) of this section may be annulled, canceled, or revised by the duly authorized representative of the Bureau who issued such order or any other duly authorized representative of the Bureau.

"(f) If a duly authorized representative of the Bureau, upon making an inspection of a mine, as authorized in section 202, finds that methane has been ignited in such mine or finds methane by use of a permissable flame safety lamp or by air analysis in an amount of 0.25 per centum or more in any open workings of such mine when tested at a point not less than twelve inches from the roof, face or rib, he shall make an order requiring the operator of such mine to comply with the provisions of section 209 of this title which pertain to gassy mines, in the operation of such mine.

"(g) (1) If an order is made pursuant to subsection (a) of this section with respect to a mine in a State in which a State plan approved under section 202(b) is in effect, and a State inspector did not participate in the inspection on which such order is based, the operator of the mine may request the agency designated in the State plan to assign a State inspector to inspect the

mine. The State inspector assigned in accordance with such request shall inspect such mine promptly after the request is made.

"(2) No order shall be made pursuant to subsection (c) or (d) of this section with respect to a mine in a State in which a State plan approved under section 202(b) is in effect unless a State inspector participated in the inspection on which such order is based and concurs in such order, or an independent inspector apointed under paragraph (3) of this subsection concurs in such order. If the State inspector does not concur in such order, the operator of the mine, the duly authorized representative of the Bureau who proposes to make such order, or the State inspector may apply, within twenty-four hours after the completion of the inspection involved, for the appointment of an independent inspector under paragraph (3). Within five days after the date of his appointment, the independent inspector shall inspect the mine. The representative of the Bureau and the State inspector shall be given the oportunity to accompany the independent inspector during such inspection. If, after such inspection is completed, either the independent inspector or the State inspector concurs in the order, it shall be issued.

"(3) Within five days after the date of receipt of an application under paragraph (2) of this subsection, the chief judge of the United States district court for the district in which the mine involved is located (or in his absence, the clerk of such court) shall appoint a graduate engineer with experience in the coal-mining industry to serve as an independent inspector under this subsection. Each independent inspector so appointed shall be compensated at the rate of $50 for each day of actual service (including each day he is traveling on official business) and shall, notwithstanding the Travel Expense Act of 1949, be fully reimbursed for traveling, subsistence, and related expenses.

"(4) An order made pursuant to subsection (a) or (c) or (d) of this section with respect to a mine in a State in which a State plan approved under section 202(b) is in effect shall not be subject to review under section 206, but shall be subject to review under section 207.

"(h) Notice of each finding and order made under this section shall promptly be given to the operator of the mine to which it pertains, by the person making such finding or order."

(b) Section 202 of the Federal Coal Mine Safety Act (66 Stat. 693; 30 U.S.C. 472) is amended as follows:

(1) Subsection (a) is amended by striking out the reference to "section 203(d)" and inserting in lieu thereof "section 203(f)"; and by striking out the reference to "section 203(c)" and inserting in lieu thereof "section 203(c) and (d)".

(2) Subsection (b)(2)(C) is amended by striking out the reference to "section 203(e)(1)" and inserting in lieu thereof "section 203(g)(1)".

(3) Subsection (c) is amended by striking out the reference to "section 203(e)(3)" and inserting in lieu thereof "section 203(g)(3)".

(c) Subsections (a), (b), (c), and (d) of section 205 of the Federal Coal Mine Safety Act (66 Stat. 697; 30 U.S.C. 475) are amended to read as follows:

"(a) The Federal Coal Mine Safety Board of Review is hereby continued as an agency of the United States, except that the Board shall consist of five members, instead of three members, who shall be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate.

"(b) The terms of office of members of the Board shall be five years, except that—

"(1) the terms of office of members in office on the date of enactment of the Federal Coal Mine Safety Act Amendments of 1963, shall expire on the date originally fixed for their expiration,

"(2) the term of office of one of the members appointed to fill a vacancy resulting from the enactment of the Federal Coal Mine Safety Act Amendments of 1963, shall expire July 15, 1967, and the term of office of the member appointed to fill the other vacancy resulting therefrom shall expire July 15, 1968, and

"(3) a vacancy caused by the death, resignation, or removal of a member prior to the expiration of the term for which he was appointed, shall be appointed only for the remainder of such unexpired term.

The members of the Board may be removed by the President for inefficiency, neglect of duty, or malfeasance in office.

"(c) Each member of the Board shall be compensated at the rate of $50 for each day of actual service (including each day he is traveling on official business) and shall, notwithstanding the Travel Expense Act of 1949 be fully reimbursed for traveling, subsistence, and other related expenses. The Board, at all times, shall consist of one person who by reason of previous training and experience may reasonably be said to represent the viewpoint of operators of coal mines employing fourteen or fewer employees underground (hereinafter referred to as 'small mine operators representative'), one person who by reason of previous training and experience may reasonably be said to represent the viewpoint of operators of coal mines employing fifteen or more employees underground (hereinafter referred to as the 'large mine operators representative'), one person who by reason of previous training and experience may reasonably be said to represent the viewpoint of coal mine workers in mines employing fourteen or fewer employees underground (hereinafter referred to as the 'small mine workers representative'), one person who by reason of previous training and experience may reasonably be said to represent the viewpoint of coal mine workers in mines employing fifteen or more employees underground (hereinafter referred to as the 'large mine workers representative'), and one person who shall be chairman of the Board, who shall be a graduate engineer with experience in the coal mining industry or shall have had at least five years' experience as a practical mining engineer in the coal mining industry, and who shall not, within one year of his appointment as a member of the Board, have had a pecuniary interest in, or have been regularly employed or engaged in, the mining of coal, or have regularly represented either coal mine operators or coal mine workers, or have been an officer or employee of the Department of the Interior assigned to duty in the Bureau.

"(d) The principal office of the Board shall be in the District of Columbia. Whenever the convenience of the public or of the parties may be promoted, or delay or expense may be minimized, the Board may hold hearings or conduct other proceedings at any other place. At the request of an operator of a mine the Board shall hold hearings or conduct other proceedings at the county seat of the county in which the mine is located or at any place mutually agreed to by the chairman of the Board and the operator of the mine involved in the appeal or proceeding. The Board shall have an official seal which shall be judicially noticed and which shall be preserved in the custody of the secretary of the Board."

(d) Subsection (f) of section 205 of such Act is amended to read as follows:

"(f) Three members of the Board shall constitute a quorum, and official action can be taken only on the affirmative vote of at least three members, except that in any official action involving mines in which no more than fourteen individuals are regularly employed underground the participation of the small mine operators' representative and small mine workers' representative shall be required, and in any official action involving mines in which more than fourteen individuals are regularly employed underground the participation of the large mine operators' representative and large mine workers' representative shall be required; but a special panel composed of one or more members, upon order of the Board, shall conduct any hearing provided for in section 207 of this title and submit the transcript of such hearing to the entire Board of its action thereon. Such transcript shall be made available to the parties prior to any final action of the Board. An opportunity to appear before the Board shall be afforded the parties prior to any final action and the Board may afford the parties an opportunity to submit additional evidence as may be required for a full and true disclosure of the facts. Every official act of the Board shall be entered of record, and its hearings and records thereof shall be open to the public."

(e) Section 206 of the Federal Coal Mine Safety Act (66 Stat. 699; 30 U.S.C. 476) is amended as follows:

(1) Subsection (a) is amended by striking out the reference to "section 203(e)(4)" and inserting in lieu thereof "section 203(g)(4)".

(2) Subsection (b) is amended by striking out the reference to "section 203(e)(4)" and inserting in lieu thereof "section 203(g)(4)".

(3) A new subsection (c), reading as follows, is added and present subsections (c), (d), (e), and (f) are redesignated as subsection (d), (e), (f), and (g), respectively, and are amended to read as follows:

"(c) Except as provided in section 203(g)(4), an operator notified of an order made pursuant to section 203(d) may apply to the Director for annulment or revision of such order. Upon receipt of such application the Director shall make a special inspection of the mine affected by such order, or cause three duly authorized representatives of the Bureau, other than the representative who made such order, to make such inspection of such time and report thereon to him. Upon making such special inspection himself, or upon receiving the report of such inspection made by such representatives, the Director shall find whether or not there was a violation of section 209 as described in such order, at the time of the making of such order. If he finds there was no such violation he shall make an order annulling the order under review. If he finds there was such a violation he shall also find whether or not such violation was totally abated at the time of the making of such special inspection. If he finds that such violation was totally abated at such time, he shall make an order annulling the order under review. If he finds that such violation was not totally abated at such time, he shall find the extent of the area of such mine which was affected by such violation at the time such special inspection was made, and he shall then make an order, consistent with his findings, affirming or revising the order under review.

"(d) An operator notified of an order made pursuant to section 203(f) may apply, not later than twenty days after the receipt of notice of such order, to the Director for annulment of such order. Upon receipt of such application the Director shall make or cause to be made such investigation as he deems necessary. Upon concluding his investigation or upon receiving the report of such investigation made at his direction, the Director shall find whether or not methane has been ignited in such mine, or whether or not methane was found in such mine in an amount of 0.25 per centum or more in any open workings of such mine, when tested at a point not less than twelve inches from the roof, face, or rib, at the time of the making of such order. If he finds

that methane has not been ignited in such mine and was not found in such mine as set out in such order, he shall make an order annulling the order under review. If he finds that methane has been ignited in such mine or was found in such mine as set out in the order under review, he shall make an order denying such application.

"(e) The Director shall cause notice of each finding and order made under this section to be given promptly to the operator of the mine to which it pertains.

"(f) Except as provided in section 203(g)(4), at any time while an order made pursuant to section 203 or this section is in effect, or at any time during the pendency of a proceeding under section 207 or section 208 seeking annulment or revision of such order, the operator of the mine affected by such order may apply to the Director for annulment or revision of such order. The Director shall thereupon proceed to act upon such application in the manner provided in subsections (a), (b), (c) or (d) of this section.

"(g) In view of the urgent need for prompt decision of matters submitted to the Director under this section, all actions which the Director or his representatives are required to take under this section shall be taken as rapidly as practicable, consistent with adequate consideration of the issues involved."

(f) Section 207 of the Federal Coal Mine Safety Act (66 Stat. 700; as amended 74 Stat. 201; 30 U.S.C. 477) is amended as follows:

(1) Subsection (a) is amended by striking out the reference to "subsection (a), (c) or (d)" and inserting in lieu thereof "subsection (a), (c), (d) or (f)"; by striking out the reference to "subsection (d)" and inserting in lieu thereof "subsection (f)"; and by striking out the reference to "subsection (c)" and inserting in lieu thereof "subsection (d)".

(2) A new subsection (h), reading as follows, is inserted and present subsections (h), (i) and (j) are redesignated as subsections (i), (j), and (k), respectively, and are amended to read as follows:

"(h) If the proceeding is one in which an operator seeks annulment or revision of an order made pursuant to section 203(d), the Board, upon conclusion of the hearing, shall find whether or not there was a violation of section 209, as described in such order, at the time of the making of such order. If the Board finds there was no such violation, the Board shall make an order annulling the order under review. If the Board finds there was such a violation, the Board shall also find whether or not such violation was totally abated at the time of the filing of the operator's application. If the Board finds that such violation was totally abated at such time, the Board shall make an order annulling the order under review. If the Board finds that such violation was not totally abated at such time, the Board shall find the extent of the area of such mine which was affected by such violation at such time, and shall make an order, consistent with its findings, affirming or revising the order under review.

"(i) If the proceeding is one in which an operator seeks annulment of an order made pursuant to section 203(f) or 206(d), the Board, upon conclusion of the hearing, shall find whether or not methane has been ignited in such mine or was found in such mine in an amount of 0.25 per centum or more in any open workings of such mine when tested at a point not less than twelve inches from the roof, face, or rib, as set out in such order. If the Board finds that methane has not been ignited in such mine and was not found in such mine as set out in such order, the Board shall make an order annulling the order under review. If the Board finds that methane has been ignited in such mine or was found in such mine as set out in the order under review, the Board shall make an order denying such application.

"(j) Each finding and order made by the Board shall be in writing. It shall show the date on which it is made, and shall bear the signatures of the members of the Board who concur therein. Upon making a finding and order the Board shall cause a true copy thereof to be sent by registered mail or by certified mail to all parties or their attorneys of record. The Board shall cause each such finding and order to be entered on its official record, together with any written opinion prepared by any members in support of, or dissenting from, any such finding or order.

"(k) In view of the urgent need for prompt decision of matters submitted to the Board under this section, all actions which the Board is required to take under this section shall be taken as rapidly as practicable, consistent with adequate consideration of the issues involved."

SEC. 4. Subsection (d) of section 210 of the Federal Coal Mine Safety Act (66 Stat. 708; 30 U.S.C. 480(d)) is amended by striking out the reference to "section 203(e)(3)" and inserting in lieu thereof "section 203(g)(3)".

SEC. 5. Section 212 of the Federal Coal Mine Safety Act (66 Stat. 709; 30 U.S.C. 482) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsections:

"(d) For the promotion of sound and effective coordination of Federal and State activities within the field covered by this Act, to eliminate duplication of effort and expense, and to secure effective enforcement of the coal mine safety requirements established by this title, the Director shall affirmatively and diligently seek to cooperate with the mine inspection or safety agencies of the several States, through formal agreement or otherwise, in the enforcement of the provisions of this title.

"(e) The Secretary of the Interior shall enlarge and intensify the educational programs of the Bureau of Mines with respect to the advancement of health and safety in coal mines, and shall, to the fullest extent practicable, seek the cooperation and assistance of the appropriate State agencies in the planning and implementation of such programs. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated not to exceed $750,000 for carrying out such programs."

SEC. 6. The Secretary of the Interior shall conduct a special study to determine the sufficiency of the present safety requirements of the Federal Coal Mine Safety Act, with particular emphasis upon the requirements relative to roof support, ventilation, and electrical equipment. The Secretary of the Interior shall make a report to the Congress on the results of such study, together with his recommendations, within one year after the enactment of this Act.

The SPEAKER. Is a second demanded?

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Speaker, I demand a second.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, a second will be considered as ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may use.

Mr. Speaker, the purpose of this bill is to insure the safety of those persons that mine coal which passes through interstate commerce. It seeks to extend legislation enacted in July 1962—The Federal Coal Mine Safety Act, Public Law 552. Its objective is to prevent catastrophes which have recently engaged national attention—catastrophes which could have been avoided if the measures which we are recommending had been enacted into law.

The reason for the extension of the title II mandatory provisions to title I is because the recommendations of the Federal mine inspectors to the title I mine operators have not been acted upon. Mine disasters have increased since the enactment of this legislation.

Title I has become an ineffective provision. The testimony before the General Subcommittee on Labor disclosed repeated violations in the same mines. The present legislation guarantees the abatement of particular hazards discovered by the Federal inspectors while they are in the mines.

There is no incentive for the abatement of hazards before they are discovered in these mines. It is, furthermore, impossible to inspect often enough to take account of all hazards. In order to cause the mine to comply with a reasonable standard of safety, there must be some authority in the inspector to bring about that compliance. What is needed is continuous compliance and that is not forthcoming without the mandatory provisions of title II.

The provisions of this act are in no case more burdensome than the provisions of the State acts which have mining laws, because in every case they are identical. Precautionary measures contained in this bill come out of our experience which indicates that the preventive measures are needed.

There have been 250 separate mine disasters between 1940 and 1962 in the title I mines—that is those that employ 14 men or less. In these disasters, 94 men were killed and 184 men were injured. In eight of the mine disasters all of the men underground were killed.

Any opposition to this measure must be based on doctrine, on abstract principles, unrelated to the matter before us. Our support for this measure is based on the simple principle that human life is important no matter what the size of the mine; that those who enter such hazardous duty in this basic industry ought to be protected, and experience has shown us that title I is not adequate; that we need not sacrifice these lives to the treacherous stomachs of the mines; that costs cannot be too great when they are for human safety; that misfortune ought to be avoided when it is easily foreseeable.

Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from California [Mr. ROOSEVELT], chairman of the subcommittee handling this matter.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, the chairman of the full Committee on Education and Labor has stated the basic purposes of this bill which are, of course, to insure the safety of those who work underground in the mining fields of our country.

In order to make it very clear that we have not just indiscriminately gone into the business of taking what are known as the small mines employing 14 individuals or less, as they have become known, we have made certain provisions in this bill to make sure their interest will be fully taken care of.

We have in the first instance revised the Federal Coal Mine Safety Board of Review and reconstituted it with five

members serving staggered 5-year terms. Of these new positions 1 must be a worker with experience in a small mine of 14 or less, and 1 must be an employer or owner of such a type of mine.

We are also very much interested in promoting the coordination of safety enforcement between States and the Federal Government to eliminate duplication of effort, and to secure effective enforcement of Federal safety standards. Therefore we have directed the Director to affirmatively and diligently seek to cooperate with the States, through formal agreement or otherwise, in the enforcement of this act.

We have also provided $750,000 of an appropriation which is authorized in the bill for enlargement and intensification of coal mine safety educational programs, again in cooperation with the States.

I want to emphasize that as to title II, the small mines, this bill does not basically change what is now going on. The Bureau of Mines today inspects the small mines, but today they have no power of enforcement. We can see no logical reason why this should be. We treat titles I and II mines in exactly the same manner. After all, human life is the same whether you are working with 14 or less men or you are working with 50 or 100 men.

I believe that this measure, Mr. Speaker, is thoroughly justified, that it will work in harmony with the States just as the regulations for the larger mines have worked in harmony with the States. I believe it will in the long run save many, many lives, although I want to emphasize it is no panacea, it does not mean there will be no mine disasters. It means, however, that where there is a mining danger that might mean disaster the Federal and State inspectors can have the power to go in to stop it before it actually happens.

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN].

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, I do not believe that the House should suspend the rules and pass H.R. 9000. This is a controversial bill and it should be thoroughly discussed before any vote is taken. Furthermore, I do not believe this bill should be enacted. Certainly the recent safety record of small mines does not demonstrate the need for Federal control.

Currently, the Federal Coal Mine Safety Act comprises two titles: Title I of this act confers the power upon Federal inspectors to make recommendations concerning health and safety conditions in all coal mines; title II of the act confers upon Federal inspectors the power to close mines employing 15 or more underground workers for failure to comply with mine safety provisions of the Federal Coal Mine Safety Act. The proposed bill would confer upon Federal inspectors an additional power which they do not now possess, to close mines employing 14 men or less.

The impelling reason behind consideration of this bill at this time was a directive from President Kennedy to Secretary Udall, instructing the Secretary to investigate the causes of two mine disasters which claimed 59 lives. These disasters occurred in title II mines—mines employing 15 men or more. Despite the occurrence of these disasters in large mines, the Secretary's response to the President's directive was to recommend that the small title I mines be subjected to Federal control.

There are three basic reasons why a number of the Members of the House Education and Labor Committee oppose the pending legislation.

First, the States are doing a constantly improving job with respect to mine safety in the small mines.

Second, the safety record of the title I mines does not demonstrate a need for Federal control, but indicates, rather, that safety in these mines is at least as good as that in the federally inspected mines.

Third, this legislation would have a devastating economic impact on these small mines.

The proponents of this legislation have demonstrated a complete and inexplicable impatience with admittedly successful and improving State mine safety programs. The State inspectors make much more frequent inspections of mines than do Federal inspectors, averaging approximately one inspection per month. For example, through a combination of inspection and educational efforts, the State of Kentucky, during the past several years, has brought about a 55 percent reduction in roof-fall fatalities in the coal mines within its borders. Similar concrete and heartening results in mine safety are being achieved through the continuing efforts of other State administrations.

Yet, the proponents of this legislation appear to be solely concerned with subjecting the small mines of the Nation to Federal control, and with endowing Federal inspectors with authority to close down the mines. If this legislation is not basically concerned with coal mine safety, what is its import? A Pulitzer Prizewinner, Mr. Nat Caldwell, of the Nashville Tennessean, who received the award for his work regarding this matter, had the following to say on the matter before the committee:

> I am strongly convinced that the principal proponents of this measure are far more interested in its utilization for forwarding an economic purpose, that is, closing down the small thin seam coal mines of the Appalachian area, than they are in assuring the union and nonunion miners of a safe place in which to earn their livings.

Mr. Speaker, this is not safety legislation; it can only result in harassment and economic injury to the small mineowners of the Nation, and it should be defeated.

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. BELL].

Mr. BELL. Mr. Speaker, I might say at the outset that there are no coal mines in my district and there are very few coal mines in the State of California, so when the testimony started on this bill I instinctively had a completely open mind on it and perhaps you might say even intended to vote in favor of the bill rather than be against it, because who wants to be against mine safety? It is like being against motherhood.

However, as the testimony proceeded the more it became evident that this bill was not a mine safety act at all but an attempt at control of competition on the part of certain large groups and interests, an attempt actually to stifle competition.

Title I mines, the small mines, today produce a substantial portion of the Nation's coal. In 1948 the small coal mines employed 8 percent of the coal miners. They employ 40 percent of all the coal miners today. This is brought about fundamentally by two things: The automation that occurred in the late 1940's caused an employment drop from 343,700 in 1950 to 139,400 in 1960. Second, the development of techniques which have made it possible to mine thin seam coal, which was impossible to mine 15 years ago.

The result of the unemployment caused the ex-employees of the large mines to establish their own small businesses in mining coal, with their savings. The efforts of these miners established a program of mining the small mines in areas in West Virginia, Virginia, Pennsylvania, and so on throughout the area known generally as Appalachia.

Considerable question of the Bureau's figures has come out in the testimony. There the small miners can claim just as often and frequently and as accurately that there is more safety in title I mines than there is in the title II mines. The material and information of the Bureau of Mines is highly fragmentary, admitted by their own statement. The trend has been toward increased safety for the title I mines, and decreased safety for larger or title II mines.

I should like to cover one other point. This mine safety law would have an adverse effect on unemployment in the Appalachian area, because it could quite possibly throw out of business a number of these small mines. A tremendous number of them could perhaps go completely out of business as the result of this mine safety act. The result would be that our unemployment problem in Appalachia could increase substantially.

We are spending here millions of dollars a year to aid Appalachia and to aid the unemployment problem in Appalachia with the one hand and by passing this act could, with the other hand, deter the very effect that we want to bring about through aid to the unemployed and poverty-stricken people in this area.

One of the most frequently heard arguments of those who support the pending legislation is that Congress erred in granting small mine exemption—that "there is no magic in the number 14." Congress did not err when it excluded small mines from compulsory features of the Federal law. The reasons are that there are a number of fundamental distinctions between the small and large mines which fully justify the exemption granted by Congress.

While all mines have a number of basic similarities and common problems there are a number of significant areas

in which the small mine and the large mine are vastly different. They differ in:

First. The type of equipment used.

Second. The conditions of work environment.

Third. The methods of operation.

Fourth. The types of hazards encountered.

These differences are substantial and they are marked.

Because of these inherent differences between the so-called small mines—title I—and the so-called large mines—title II—statistical comparisons as a basis for proving one contention or another leave much to be desired.

Parenthetically, it might be observed that much of the data on title I mines submitted by the Bureau of Mines to the subcommittee was, by the Bureau's own admission, either incomplete or fragmentary. This is particularly true with respect to the number of title I mines, the number of persons employed in such mines, and the total tonnage of coal produced by such mines.

I would refer at this point to the hearings before a Senate subcommittee of Labor and Public Welfare dated July 24, 1959. In the testimony of Mr. Ankeny, Director of Bureau of Mines, he revealed that the Bureau's figures were incomplete in regard to title I mines.

This was reiterated by testimony of Mr. O'Leary on September 18, 1963, of the Department of the Interior.

If this is true one can easily comprehend what a distorted viewpoint one might gain regarding the safety statistics of both title I and title II mines.

The recommendation of the Department's Bureau of Mines regarding the safety of title I mines as compared to title II mines—and thus recommending that title I mines be subjected to the Federal Mine Safety Act—was entirely based upon the Bureau's statistical studies concerning fatalities in title I mines per man-hour of exposure. According to the Bureau, fatalities in such title I mines were greater per man-hour of exposure than fatalities in title II mines.

Very important.

The Bureau states that there were only 1,588 title I underground mines in Kentucky in 1961. The Kentucky State Yearbook shows that the State of Kentucky licensed 2,379 title I mines in 1961. A discrepancy on someone's part of 791 title I mines.

For 1961 the Bureau states that 8,415 men were employed in Kentucky underground title I mines; Kentucky figures state that there were 17,190 men employed in those mines in 1961. A difference of 8,775 men employed.

The Bureau states that there were 1,111 title I mines in operation in Virginia in 1961. Virginia states that the number of title I mines was 1,586. This is a difference of 475 title I mines.

The Bureau states that there were 6,405 men employed in those Virginia mines; the State of Virginia figures show that 8,247 men were employed in these mines in 1961. A difference of 1,842 men employed.

These are just some of the figures that show the large discrepancy that exists between the figures of the Bureau and the figures of two of the States.

But the important point is this: The increase in the man-hours of exposure which these figures would indicate would drastically lower the fatality rate for title I mines.

I am certainly not inferring that these figures are intentionally tailored to fit an argument, but only that this would drastically alter the picture insofar as the relative mine safety of title I and title II mines are concerned.

The opponents of the application of the Federal Mines Safety Act to title I mines maintain that the safety record of title I mines is much better than that of title II mines. They also have produced figures to prove it.

I ask you, Mr. Speaker, if the sole justification for the proposed legislation is the record of safety of title I mines, and if title I mines are safer than title II mines—who are now under the Federal Mine Safety Act—it would seem to me that there must be some other reason than safety for this legislation.

However, until there can be some reconciliation between the figures of the Bureau of Mines and the various State figures, it does not seem to me that any legislation is justified.

However, let me just read from the report showing the accident comparison from the Bureau's own figures—page 41 of the report:

> For the year 1961 the 940 large mines had 61 disaster-type accidents accounting for 46 injuries and 57 deaths; whereas for the same year the 6,914 small mines had only 12 such accidents, accounting for 8 injuries and no deaths. For the period 1948 through 1961, the so-called large mines were the scene of 699 such accidents, accounting for 339 deaths and 430 injuries; whereas the so-called small mines were the scene of 131 such accidents, accounting for 54 deaths and 87 injuries.

If the small miners are correct, and judging from the discrepancy of figures on mine safety they certainly appear to be, this act could easily be a punitive measure on the part of some large interests to eliminate the competition of the small mines. If we were to pass this Federal Mine Safety Act without further study and more reliable accurate statistics, we could find ourselves adding to the problems of unemployment and poverty that now exists in the areas sometimes referred to as Appalachia.

It is my opinion that any of my colleagues who represent these areas should think long and hard before they allow this crown of thorns to be thrust upon the heads of the poor and unemployed in Appalachia.

On the one hand we here vote for the expenditure of millions of dollars each year in programs to help this depressed area. Such programs as the Poverty Act which recently passed, ARA, SBA, farm home loan programs, vocational education, manpower development and training, et cetera, then on the other hand we rapidly pass an act such as mine safety—under suspension—which may have the effect of nullifying much of our financial efforts to help the people of Appalachia.

In 1958 this matter first came before the Congress in the form of S. 3290. There was an attempt made to rush the bill through the Senate without notice to, or hearing from, title I mine operators. This attempt failed, largely because of the action of the late President John F. Kennedy, then chairman of the Senate Subcommittee on Labor. After reopening hearings and receiving testimony from title I interests, Mr. Kennedy submitted Senate Report No. 1963 on July 25, 1958, and at the end of this report said as follows:

> In the light of the inconclusive character of the testimony in support of the proposal to repeal completely the present exemption, the committee preferred to take the steps safeguarding against dangers of imminent disaster while simultaneously providing a method to secure the data necessary for the Congress to legislate intelligently in the near future.

The same conditions continue to prevail today. It would still be advisable for Congress to get the facts before it legislates.

Virtually every witness who appeared before this committee, whether he appeared in favor of or in opposition to the pending legislation, made one consistent observation: Human failure is the basic cause of the overwhelming majority of accidents in mines. This is true for all types of mines, large and small.

With respect to this matter of mine safety, almost everyone who has studied this problem agrees that effective education is the most fruitful safety measure yet devised. Most States are doing a creditable job in this area. Nevertheless, if one is really seeking to make an effective Federal contribution to mine safety, particularly mine safety in small mines, serious consideration should be given to encouraging the expansion and strengthening of State education and training programs in mine safety. Such an undertaking would, we feel confident, be enthusiastically endorsed by the States involved.

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BOLAND). The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman 1 minute.

Mr. BELL. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. DENT. On what authority do you tell this House that the passage of this legislation which is in line practically with the legislation now standing on the books in Pennsylvania will destroy jobs in the State of Pennsylvania?

Mr. BELL. I am not saying it will positively, because nobody knows positively that such would occur, I am saying it very possibly may destroy jobs because the passage of these laws may force small mines into introducing types of machinery and equipment that they cannot well afford, in order to live up to the various requirements that may be forced on them by the Federal mine safety officials of the Bureau of Mines. Various States already have State laws to protect the small miners with regard to safety regulations.

Mr. DENT. If it is true that the States have laws like this and this does not add anything to the State laws, then how can you tell the House that this law will take jobs away from the miners?

Mr. BELL. The gentleman very well knows that it may cause and require some additional amounts perhaps of machinery, material, and inspection programs that they today might not need under present State laws, causing undue strain expenses to the small miner. Further, not all States include the exact same requirements in their State laws that the Federal Mine Safety Act may require.

Congressman ROOSEVELT states that he would like to have this statement stricken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has again expired.

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. JENNINGS].

Mr. JENNINGS. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to H.R. 9000, the bill to amend the Federal Coal Mine Safety Act as it would pertain to the small, or title I, mines.

It is only fair that I, before commenting on the bill's provisions and its effects, explain some of the reasons for my opposition.

I represent the major coal-producing district of Virginia, where we have both large and small mines. We have both union and nonunion mines. We need the continued operation of every mine to provide jobs for our people—and I emphasize we want safe jobs for them. We must have continued market expansion for our coal, if we are to see our economy expand.

I am not an opponent of safety. I have never opposed an appropriation for the Bureau of Mines' work in safety. I have encouraged my State to provide an adequate program of safety education and inspection. I do not condone the unsafe operation of any mine. I have sponsored alternate legislation to take care of any threat of a major disaster in the small mines. I have carefully explored the need for this bill through personal contacts within my district. I invited the general Subcommittee on Labor to visit in my district and inspect the coal mines, believing the information they would gain there would be helpful in their deliberations. And, if I were convinced—and I have given deep and serious thought to this proposal—that H.R. 9000 was needed to enhance safety in the small mines, I would be speaking in its behalf.

I do not appear in the role of an advocate of complete State or Federal control in this field of mine safety. I seek to follow a rule of reason and realism where elements of any program involve both State and Federal jurisdiction. I do not blindly support action by the State or Federal Government, but believe that we can have a safety program for our small and large mines where each can play a needed role. I have to the best of my ability judged the facts presented in several hearings, and I contend that H.R. 9000 would unnecessarily involve the Federal Bureau of Mines in an area that is being adequately handled by the States.

It is difficult to place this bill in a proper perspective so that you can easily judge the situation with accuracy. Since I oppose the bill, I commend to your serious consideration the final pages of the Committee on Education and Labor's report.

It would be erroneous to assume that H.R. 9000 is simply a piece of "safety" legislation. The plain fact that hearings and consideration of this bill—in one form or another—have gone on since 1958. If the bill had been fully merited for safety reasons, I feel confident it would have passed long ago. This fact alone should cause this body to carefully consider this proposal.

When the Federal Coal Mine Safety Act was approved in 1952, it was to prevent major disasters in mines, a major disaster being one in which five or more lives are lost. The Committee on Education and Labor defined the scope of the act in its 1952 report, pointing out that the bill was not designed to prevent the "day-to-day" accidents which occur in the mine industry. The act has two titles, the first conferring power on the Federal inspectors to make recommendations concerning health and safety conditions in all coal mines; the second title gives these inspectors the power to close mines employing 15 or more workers for failure to comply with the mine safety provisions of the act. The small mines with less than 15 employees are generally referred to as "title I" mines.

The reason behind the consideration of this bill at this time was a directive from the late President Kennedy to the Secretary of Interior instructing him to investigate the causes of two mine disasters which claimed 59 lives. These disasters occurred in title II mines—mines employing 15 men or more. Despite the occurrence of these disasters in large mines, the Secretary's response to the President's directive was to recommend that the small title I mines be subjected to Federal control.

Title I mines are now regularly inspected by State and Federal mine inspectors.

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SAYLOR].

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, those of us who were in the House when the original mine safety bill was passed objected to the elimination of the small mines. We did so because if safety is good it does not matter whether a man works in a mine which has 1 miner or whether he works in a mine which has 100 or more miners. The human life of the miner is just as dear, whether he works in a small mine or in a large mine.

The RECORD has shown with indisputable facts from the day we passed the mine safety bill that a large portion of the fatalities occur in the small mines.

What the House is faced with today is this question: Shall we continue to give the operators of the small mines a license to kill? If a person operates a large mine, he cannot do it.

Let me demonstrate what is being done in some of these small mines. They are using black powder. We have in this House today one Member, JOE SKUBITZ, whose father was killed in a small mine. How did that occur? There was an explosion of black powder which picked up the dust, and JOE SKUBITZ' father lost his life.

I do not doubt that there are other Members here who have lost members of their families in small mines.

What we are faced with today is the question of determining whether we want safety or do not want safety. Do we want to protect the lives of people, or do we want to give people the license to kill? It is that simple.

What has happened? The large mines today have Federal inspectors go into them, and if the inspectors find anything which violates any rule or regulation which Congress has provided, and the mine does not comply, the inspector can close the mine down. Thereby he protects the lives of the men who work in the mine.

But if it happens that a man is working in a mine which has only 14 people, if the same inspector goes in and he finds the same shortcomings, he cannot close the mine. All he can do is to walk out and put a notice on the front board, "Very sorry, boys, but the conditions under which you are working violate the following provisions of the Federal Mine Safety Code, and I cannot do anything about it."

Do we want to continue that, or not? If we pass this bill today we will give the Federal mine inspector the right to say to the operators of the small mines, "Your safety provisions are required to be the same, either in small mines or in large mines."

Human life is what is involved in this issue today and whether or not you are going to protect the lives of human beings.

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute more to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SAYLOR]. He is making a very fine contribution, and the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. EDMONDSON], would like to ask him a question.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. SAYLOR. I yield to my colleague from Oklahoma.

Mr. EDMONDSON. I thank the gentleman for yielding and congratulate him on the splendid statement he has just made. I think there is no question about the fact that methane gas is no respecter of size where mines are concerned. The problem of safety is often much more serious in a small mine than it is in a large mine. Some of the small mine operators are employing an increasingly large percentage of the labor which is in the coal mining industry. So I think the gentleman has made very good arguments for the adoption of this bill, and I hope it will be agreed to.

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SAYLOR. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I rise to compliment the gentleman on an excellent statement. I am likewise in favor of the bill.

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BRAY].

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Speaker, this year the Congress has been taken up with consideration of big problems—big budgets, big taxes, big defense, big foreign aid, big threats to national security, big programs for a variety of domestic problems.

I rise to support a bill concerning a problem which is very big to the people involved, but the scope of which is admittedly small. In H.R. 9000 what we are trying to do is extend the coverage of Federal mine safety legislation to small mines—those employing less than 14 men underground—which presently are exempt.

We again hear the cry that imposing this Federal safety regulation will mean the end of the coal industry—or at least that segment represented by the operators which would be affected under this bill.

May I point out that similar dire predictions were made concerning the ultimate effects of the legislation passed in 1952. That has not been the case; the legislation has worked well. I have kept close observation of the operation of this law for I was quite active in working for the passage of this legislation.

How many accidents have been avoided, how many lives have been saved under this legislation, no one can say. It is true that we still have accidents, even in the mines which are regularly inspected.

Mining admittedly is a hazardous occupation. If a man expects guaranteed safety in his job then he had better look elsewhere than to the mines for his livelihood.

Miners understand this, and they do not expect the impossible. What they do expect—and what we here today can grant—is reasonable protection against those things which can be safeguarded against.

A substantial number of the coal mines located in Indiana are located in my district and I have some knowledge of the needs, dangers, and problems in mining, and I strongly support this legislation.

The regulation of safety in many commercial areas has long been an accepted responsibility of the Federal Government. In the mining field, when the Bureau of Mines was established in 1910, one of its chief functions was the promotion of health and safety in the mining industry.

The present Mine Safety Act authorizes Federal inspectors to close mines in which there is imminent danger of explosion, fire, flood, or transportation accidents. It permits the inspection of roof supports, ventilation, permissible explosives, and equipment.

Since the present act excludes from coverage those mines employing less than 14 men underground this bill seeks to remove that exemption. It would provide greater flexibility in the enforcement provisions, and many and various avenues of appeal are open to allow each operator every chance to refute an untrue finding.

It is very unfortunate that because of the lateness in the congressional year, we must seek enactment of this measure through a suspension of the rules. There has been extensive testimony taken on it in previous years. And the suspension route was provided to allow quick action when necessary. Rather than delay this legislation further, I believe the time for quick action is here.

Unfortunately the same anvil chorus of detractors that fought the 1952 act has returned to bitterly attack this one. They say it will destroy the coal industry, as they said in 1952. It was not true then and it is not true today.

Safety does cost money; in any line of work some necessary expense is involved in trying to safeguard against accidents. But in counting the cost we must never forget that lives are valuable, too; in fact, they are priceless.

Most mine owners do follow proper safety procedures. It costs him money. It is not fair or sensible to allow him to have to compete with other mine owners who refuse to follow safety rules for pinchpenny reasons.

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. QUIE].

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to this bill. It has just been pointed out to me that the recent action of the NLRB is undoubtedly one of the reasons why this bill is up today. I want to bring to the attention of my colleagues an article which appeared in the Saturday, August 8, issue of the Washington Post.

NLRB REJECTS UNION BID FOR PENALTY PAY

The National Labor Relations Board ruled yesterday that the United Mine Workers cannot collect an 80-cents-a-ton penalty royalty on nonunion coal purchased by union operators.

With member Howard Jenkins the dissenter in a 4-to-1 vote, the Board said the contract between those operators and the union has the effect of preventing the operators from doing business with nonunion firms.

The National Independent Coal Operators Association had charged that the double royalty payment might drive some small operators out of business.

Under terms of their contract with the UMW, union operators pay a 40-cent royalty to the union welfare fund for each ton of coal they mine.

Some of the operators do not mine enough coal to meet their needs and must buy from other mines.

The UMW contract with the Bituminous Coal Operators Association, signed last March, provides that the union operator must pay a double royalty—80 cents a ton—for all coal purchased from nonunion producers.

If this were truly a mine safety bill, I would be in favor of it, but from all I can see from listening to and reading the testimony of the last few years, and talking to my colleagues, it is an effort to eliminate the competition of the small miners. As the newspaper account indicates, the NLRB ruled that the 80-cents-a-ton penalty royalty to nonunion coal purchased by union operators was not permissible and, therefore, they could not place this penalty royalty against the nonunion operators. Had they just been charging 40 cents a ton paid into the welfare fund, which the union operators have to pay themselves, it would not have come up, but they want to put a penalty against mining and operating of nonunion 14-man or less mines.

There ought to be enough freedom in this country for a person to run a small coal mine operation, if he wants to. He now gets both State and Federal inspection but we should not permit the Federal Government to close him down as this bill provides.

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MORGAN].

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to join with my other colleagues who support legislation to amend the Mine Safety Act. I want to thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DENT] for permitting me to cosponsor this bill.

I have cosponsored this legislation every Congress beginning with the 85th Congress. My bill is identified as H.R. 1666. It amends Public Law 552, 82d Congress, known as the mine safety bill. The purpose of the bill is to remove the present exemption in section 201(b) for coal mines in which no more than 14 men are regularly employed underground.

My reason for introducing this bill is very simple. I feel that every man who goes down into the bowels of the earth to mine coal is entitled to equal and every possible protection that can be provided through the practice of modern safety precautions.

I have never regretted my activity in support of the present safety laws. It is a matter of public record that the coal industry in the days before enactment of effective mine safety legislation counted its injuries in five figures and its fatalities at more than 2,500 in a single year. By the year 1959, however, the fatalities had dropped to less than 300, or to be exact to 251: 274 in 1960, 256 in 1961, 243 in 1962, and 284 in 1963. This is indeed a mark of which the 82d Congress can be proud. It is my hope that the 88th Congress will give the figures a further reduction by amending Public Law 552, to make every mine in America subject to the penalties prescribed by Public Law 552 for title II mines.

As you know, mines employing less than 15 men underground are known as title I mines. Title II mines are those which employ more than 15 men underground.

Recent statistics indicate that since 1952 the number of title I underground mines increased from 5,281 to 6,879 whereas the number of title II underground mines decreased from 2,233 to 1,045.

It is evident from these figures that limiting the enforcement powers of the act has resulted in an increase in hazardous conditions in hundreds of mines since many coal operators have slipped behind the "14 men curtain" by maintaining their work force under 15 persons. By this means they avoid the mandatory provisions of title II.

More alarming is the information that many new mines are being opened and operated as title I mines. The act

should not provide such an inviting loophole to escape compliance with reasonable safety precautions.

My own State of Pennsylvania ranks second in the number of title I mines—a total of 1,635.

I hope the Congress will support the provisions of H.R. 9000 without any crippling amendments. I want the safety provisions of Public Law 552 to apply to every coal mine in this country. The Federal Bureau of Mines should have the authority to close down any mine in America where they find a dangerous, uncorrected condition to exist. This means equal protection to every coal miner regardless of whether he is employed in a title I or II mine. Each miner has a right to this protection. Life is just as dear to a title I miner and his dependents as is the life of any miner employed in a title II mine. I believe that any man who mines coal for a living should be protected to the full extent that practice of modern safety precautions can provide.

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 3 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, there has been a lot of talk here about safety. Let me say right off the bat, I am sorry that this bill is brought to the House under suspension. This is complicated legislation. It should be discussed at great length on the floor. But this is not a safety bill. This is a bill based upon economics. It is a bill that arrays the big mines against the little mines.

We have had extensive testimony from very reputable people telling us that the Bureau of Mines downtown should be investigated. This came from among others, a Pulitzer Prize winner who said that the United Mine Workers are in effect running the Bureau of Mines downtown. At any rate, there is good suspicion that they have a great deal of influence.

The small mines have been growing steadily. They are the backbone of the economy in many parts of this country. They have a good safety record. As a matter of fact, they appear to have a better safety record than the big mines. The fatality rate in the small mines has been going down steadily for the last 10 years while the fatality rate of the big mines has been going up. Small mines have a different type of operation than big mines. We went through these small mines. The gentleman from California [Mr. BELL] and I went there with the idea that we were, of course, for mine safety. Of course, if the extension of this act would help miners, would do some good, we would be for it. When we got down there and looked at the situation we found that the chief causes of accidents in the small mines was entirely different from that in the big mines.

Roof fall is the chief cause, and secondly the negligent use of equipment in the small mines. These are the two things that can be cured only by education. We have said over and over again that in the States they have improved their inspection systems and are doing a better job in many instances than the Federal inspection system. The States also do much, much better in mine safety education. Obviously, these operations can, and should, be improved.

It has been said that the only opposition you could have to this legislation was based on doctrine or abstract principle. The precise opposite is true. I say to the membership, read our minority views. We lay out at great length there the true facts as we see them with reference to this legislation. Please do not vote for this bill simply because it carries the label, "mine safety." This is an economics bill.

Its origin was two big explosions in large title II mines. President Kennedy asked for a study to extend safety regulations. They had such a study. How did it come out? Instead of improving their safety regulations, with reference to large title II mines, they turned to title I mines and they offer a bill here which would restrict title I mines and do nothing to improve safety in the title II mines. We need to update and improve the present Federal Mine Safety Act. This bill not only fails to accomplish any improvement in present mine safety law, it does great harm to small mines and those depending upon those mines for their livelihood.

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH].

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I have no coal mines in my district. I had no particular interest in this matter, but this is an old controversy which has been before the Committee on Rules for the last 8 or 10 years. There is serious opposition to it on the part of the people who are directly affected.

It has never gotten enough steam up in the Rules Committee to get out of the committee.

Mr. Speaker, in Congress after Congress we held hearings on it. The people who opposed it, who were the people directly interested, came in and testified that they had around somewhere between 30,000 and 40,000 people engaged in these so-called wagon mines and they did not want this bill. They did not want to be saved by the Government. They did not want to be ruined by the Government. They needed their jobs. They just do not have enough prosperity out there to withstand the force of this legislation, which will put them out of business.

Now, you know it is a funny thing. We are engaged in a great antipoverty program. We have just authorized the appropriation of $1 billion to cure poverty and cure unemployment and put people to work.

Then, out here in Appalachia where these mines are located we are going to hold hearings tomorrow in the Rules Committee to give them $1.5 billion with which to kill poverty in the Appalachia region where these men work.

Well, Mr. Speaker, maybe we have got too much money and probably we have—and I think we have—and maybe we have just got to put all of them out of work again so we can kill their poverty with Government money. That is just about what you will be doing if you pass this bill. These people are going to be put out of work. They just cannot take on this inspection by the Federal agents when they already have ample inspection by the State inspectors in every State. They are inspected regularly and constantly, and the State authority is sufficient.

If you want to get some more people on the poverty list so you can carry on more antipoverty work, why the thing to do is to pass this bill and put these 35,000 people out of work in the Appalachia region.

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. JENNINGS].

Mr. JENNINGS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to clarify, if I may, some of the things that have been said pertaining to this bill.

There are three basic reasons why the small mines oppose this legislation. First, the States are doing an excellent job with respect to mine safety in small mines. Second, the safety record of the title I mines does not demonstrate a need for more Federal control, but indicates, rather, that these mines are essentially safer than the Federally inspected mines. Third, the small operators have contended the Bureau of Mines, which would be empowered to carry out this legislation, has been in the past unduly deferential to the wishes of the United Mine Workers and the larger coal operators who have strongly supported this legislation, because of the devastating economic impact which it will have on these small mines.

In the course of hearings upon the proposed legislation, the Bureau of Mines submitted statistical data in support of this legislation, but the Bureau itself has admitted that its fatality figures for title I mines were based on fragmentary information. I have secured the State of Virginia's fatality figures for 1963. They show that title I mines produced 12,578,362 tons of coal; 6,885 men were engaged in this production. There were 12 fatalities; 7,270,560 man-hours of exposure. This is a fatality rate of 1.65 per million man-hours worked.

In title II mines, 12,321,521 tons of coal were produced by 3,555 men. There were 13 fatalities; 4,920,120 man-hours of exposure. This was a fatality rate of 2.64.

In small mines, which differ tremendously from the larger mines in coal mining techniques, 80 percent of all fatalities in 1962 were caused by roof-fall accidents. It is conceded by the Bureau of Mines that roof-fall accidents are the result of human failure and that education of the miners themselves is the only truly effective means of combating these accidents. All competent observers agree that Federal inspection of the small mines twice a year, as the Bureau proposes, will have no impact on this type of accident. Indeed, 60 percent of all roof-fall accidents in 1962 occurred either while the mine supervisor himself was on the spot, or within one-half hour after the supervisor had inspected the area where the accident occurred. Approximately 90 percent of all roof-fall fatalities occur at the working face which, of course, changes daily.

In 1962, and as far as I can determine from preliminary statistics on 1963, title I mines had no fatalities due to mine ex-

plosions, mine fires, mine inundations, or man-hoist or man-trip accidents—the only accidents which the proposed legislation is designed to prevent. This is due to fundamental differences between the small and large mines which fully justify the exemption granted by Congress to the title I mines. The mechanization of the large mines presents far greater hazards to safety than ever before. Indeed, since 1952, the date of the enactment of the Federal Coal Mine Safety Act, through 1962, the Bureau's own statistics show the rate of fatalities per manhour of exposure in Federally inspected title II mines has gone up by 50 percent and the rate of fatalities in non-Federally inspected title I mines has gone down by 19 percent. It is important to note that 63 percent of all accidents in title II mines were due to accidents other than roof-falls. As is conceded by the Bureau of Mines, roof-fall accidents, which comprise 80 percent of the fatalities in title I mines, fall within the category of day-to-day accidents which neither the existing nor the proposed legislation is designed to prevent.

The proponents of this legislation have demonstrated impatience with admittedly successful State mine safety programs. The State inspectors make much more frequent inspections of mines than do Federal inspectors, averaging approximately one inspection per month. Through a combination of inspection and educational efforts, the State of Kentucky during 1962 brought about a 55-percent reduction in roof-fall fatalities in the coal mines within its borders. In 1963, this State effected another 20-percent reduction in fatalities. Similiar concrete and heartening results in mine safety are being achieved through the continuing efforts of other State administrations.

Virginia has expanded its program of safety education. The Virginia commissioner of labor and industry recently summarized this enlarged effort to provide safety programs, and he declared that it has been proven beyond a shadow of a doubt that "education and cooperation" are the answers to our accident problems and not new laws.

Nevertheless, it is now being proposed that State mine inspectors, who have demonstrated their efficiency in both inspection and educational efforts be required to spend their time in conference proceedings with Federal mine inspectors when the Federal inspector wishes to close a small mine. Many of these Federal inspectors have demonstrated an intent to close down the small mines, but have failed to demonstrate their ability to make safer those mines which are now under their jurisdiction. The net effect of this proposal would be a disruption of the State programs now being administered, with the attendant risks of such disruption being felt through an increase in coal mine accidents.

It would be tragic indeed if any State curtailed its own mine safety programs through the mistaken belief that H.R. 9000 would result in Federal actions that would enhance the safety of their miners in the small operations.

If this legislation is not intended to promote safety, what is its purpose? I frankly cannot answer that question. The proponents contend it is for safety; the opponents contend it would put them out of business. Conclusive testimony has been given to the effect that the cost of complying with the Federal act would be prohibitive for the small mine—might range from hundreds to $10,000. Therefore, I would have to agree with the opponents. Especially, when the 400 pages of testimony collected again last year reinforces the contention that compulsory enforcement of the act is not required to prevent disasters in small mines and would have little effect on the day-to-day type accidents—including roof falls which account for most of the accidents.

Let us talk for a minute about the figure of 14 employees underground that separates the title I and title II mines. There does seem to be, as stated in the hearings, some "magic" in this figure.

The Congress did not make a mistake in establishing this dividing line back in 1952. There are many differences between the small and large mines that justify the exemption, and the disaster record is clear. The smaller mines have a much better record.

The Congress, I believe, felt it was dealing with a question of small business. We often see the same distinction made in other legislation. There are provisions in the Fair Labor Standards Act that exempt small firms, or those with particular problems, from coverage of the act. The civil rights bill that has been passed by the Congress exempts the 6-room boarding house from the public accommodations section and the employer with less than 25 employees from the fair employment provisions.

All this does is carry out that same principle, because it exempts mines with 14 people or less from this Federal act. It does not prevent them from inspecting the mines.

If the mineowner wants to appeal, what does he have to do? He has to come to Washington in order to appeal his case.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JENNINGS. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. I think the gentleman should read the bill. It says any appeal must have hearings held in the county where the accident occurred.

Mr. JENNINGS. The gentleman is correct. It does that. It was not in the original bill. It is something that the gentleman has changed, and I am glad he did so.

I also want to take this opportunity to thank the gentleman for going down and actually going into mines in my district, along with some other members of the subcommittee, to look into the situation. I think he was rather impressed with the situation in poverty areas in my district.

We must consider the small businessmen who are providing thousands of jobs for workers in the Appalachian region, under State safety programs. The impact of closing these small mines through arbitrary and unnecessary legislation would be disastrous.

Congress has before it legislation aimed at economic improvements, such as the ARA extension bill and the Appalachian program. The "war on poverty" proposal has been approved. Yet, we are considering a proposal that can and will have a very adverse economic effect by curtailing the small industry in several Appalachian States where it serves a vital need. Thin seams of coal are being mined that would be ignored by the large automated operations and, as this valuable natural resource is recovered, the employment generated is tremendous in terms of overall effects in the several States.

Let me reiterate to you that these small mines as a group are operating relatively safely when contrasted to the larger mines. A broader program of safety instruction and education would have help, I am sure. Virginia is engaged in expanding such training, and I would certainly favor the appropriation of any needed Federal funds to promote it. This is the key to reduced accidents of any kind.

Finally, let me say this. If there is a need for new legislation to prevent major disasters—such as the two in title II mines that prompted this renewed action on the small mines—then I have sponsored a bill to accomplish this objective. It would place all slope, shaft, or gassy mines under the act. This would include drift mines classified as gassy. It is in these categories that a disaster-type accident might occur. I testified for this bill and I regret it did not receive approval of the Committee on Education and Labor.

I would make this suggestion. If there is any demonstrated need to increase Federal activities in preventing major disasters in the larger mines, then have the existing Federal inspection force concentrate on such mines for a specified period to eliminate any hazards that are found. Maintain a second group of inspectors to work closely with the States in broadened programs of safety instruction and education for all mines—large and small. I believe we would get results and not encounter the economic problems I have mentioned.

Mr. Speaker, I oppose H.R. 9000 as it is before the House and urge my colleagues to vote against suspending the rules.

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the author of this bill, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DENT], such time as he may require.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DENT. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, I have, of course, been supporting this kind of legislation for some time. I regret that I cannot make more extensive remarks at this time. I have found an interest in this from Members on both sides of the aisle who have supported this bill, especially from those Members who represent people who work in the mines.

From what I have heard in the last 10 minutes this debate could best be called "They jest at scars that never felt a wound."

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, again I come before the House with an appeal for passage of the title I mine safety inspection law.

I regret we cannot break the barrier set up by the Rules Committee for a normal vote requiring a simple majority but must always be referred to a two-thirds vote procedure in our efforts to pass the life-saving proposal.

It appears to me that if the Members of the House would give consideration to those of us from areas where the men who toil in the bowels of the earth work in everyday jeopardy we could pass this legislation forthwith.

Suppose all Members who are not members of the Cotton Belt would ignore the pleas of the cotton industry, what would happen to the cotton relief legislation?

The same can be said for all regional legislation.

We need a new Federal Coal Mine Safety Act. Back in 1952 the Congress after 10 years of operating on a voluntary basis in the matter of coal mine safety regulation and inspection, passed a Federal mandatory act.

The Congress at that time in its wisdom and deliberations decided that all mines employing 14 or less employees would not be covered by the mandatory law. In 1952 after many major disasters in the coal mines of the Nation which shocked and alerted the Congress urging passage of a strong Federal mandatory safety inspection law, Congress passed this act. The mines of the United States were divided into two categories: Title I mines, with 14 or less employees, and those with over 14 employees.

As this act became operable there was a notable reduction in the number of major coal mine disasters. There was one in 1953, there was one in 1954, none at all in 1955 and 1956. We thought that this was really paying off.

Then a laxity crept into the mine operations regarding safety features and in 1957 the number of coal mine disasters began creeping upward again. It took two recent large coal mine disasters to bring this situation before the public in a dramatic and appalling way. This, of course, called to the attention of the Congress and the people the inherent dangers that always obtain to coal mines. However, these disasters were in the large mines covered by the act. It is assumed they might have been averted by a closer inspection on the part of Federal and State officials. However, the Nation was shocked recently by a disaster that occurred without the benefit of any kind of inspection.

The only inspections made in the No. 1 mines of the United States, the small mines by the Federal Government, is in reality not an inspection but an observation. They go into a mine about twice a year. Then they notify the mine operator and the miners, if there are any representatives of the miners who have that duty, of the conditions they find; but they have no jurisdiction or authority to enforce any of the safety features of the Coal Mine Safety Act of the United States.

There has been a terrific increase in the number of so-called small mines. It is becoming apparent there is an advantage to operating without the so-called restriction covenants of the mine safety law. Therefore in many areas there has been a great increase in the number of mines that are exempted because of their size.

I think this latest disaster up in the hard coal regions of Pennsylvania, the Sheppton mine disaster, has called to the attention of the people again that whether it is 1 life lost or 150 lives lost, the loss is just as tragic and, therefore, we have a duty, I believe, as Members of this Congress, to put whatever blanket coverage of protection we can around all mine operations in the United States.

In the Sheppton case, for instance, the Federal mine inspector made an inspection but only as a matter of routine, and here is his official report. His findings and the language he uses in making the report available to the mine operator and also to the State of Pennsylvania clearly show the need for Federal legislation. I quote from the official report of the Oneida No. 2 slope mine known as the Fellon Mining Co. up in Schuylkill County at the town of Sheppton. I quote from the report:

> The partial and continuing collapse of the main slope pillars presents imminent hazards in this mine. Therefore persons other than those necessary to correct this hazardous condition should not enter the mine.

If that mine was under Federal inspection, the word "should" would have been "must." It would not have said "should not enter the mine" but "must not enter the mine." In all probability Lou Bovas life might have been saved.

Last year through the efforts of the Committee on Education and Labor a bill I sponsored was presented to the Committee on Rules. One simple feature of this bill might have averted this loss of life and a tremendous outpouring of time, money, and effort to save two men whose lives under any other circumstances in the mining industry would have been lost.

It would have been demanded and provided that in any mine operation, regardless of the number of men employed in that mine, there would have to be two entries, one known as the escape-hatch entry. Every mine in the United States employing 15 or more men must have 2 entries, 2 holes down into the ground in order that there is an opportunity to escape in case of an explosion or fire or inundation or collapse of the roof structure. Somehow or other we have come to believe that it is perfectly all right to allow men unfortunate enough to have to dig coal for a living in a small mine to work in a hazardous condition but that it is our duty to protect those who work in large mines. To me it has no sense, and it lacks the human element of concern for our fellow men.

It is a well-known fact that no one works in a coal mine unless he has to. I ought to know. I was born in a coal-mining town.

President Kennedy took cognizance of this fact after the Robena disaster and the situation that developed up in the anthracite region.

This was in a news dispatch carried in all the large papers in the United States:

> He ordered an intensive review of mine safety practices today in an attempt to prevent mishaps such as the recent 2 that cost the lives of 59 coal miners. He sent the order to Secretary of the Interior Stewart Udall.
>
> I also request your views promptly—
>
> The President said—
>
> on the need for further or improved legislation which would enable us to prevent such accidents in the future.

We have held extensive hearings on the new mine safety proposal sponsored by the Department of the Interior at the request of the President. This proposal would include mines of the category of title I. But it goes further and attempts to prevent by future safeguards some types of disaster accidents that occur because of an insufficiency of fresh air entering the mine.

Now I believe that first things must come first. I admit, and I have sponsored this bill to show I admit the need for further refinements in mine safety law. But I say that at this time the first duty of this Congress is to cover title I mines under the present law otherwise we will enter into a situation where the opponents of safety laws for title I mines, all the small mines, will receive the help of the opponents of reform in the title II mine law.

I believe that many lives can be saved in the mining industry by passing legislation to put the No. 1 mines under the same act as the No. 2 mines; and then work toward a reform in the total mine safety law.

Mining is a peculiar industry. It has had many ups and downs. In the early days when I was a young man the mining industry was one of the major employers in the United States, but of recent years the mining industry has, because of the competition from cheap imported fuel, because of the cheapness of natural gas and the convenience of natural gas, because of the very serious matter of the proportionate labor cost to a ton of coal—there has been a great mechanization taking place in the coal mines and so although we are still producing a sizable tonnage of coal in the United States, we are employing far less men. The automated concept of production has reached its highest form in the production of coal. Now, because of the nature of coal mining and because of the hazardous occupation that it is, the largest organization representing miners, the United Mine Workers of America, accepted automation—accepted mechanization—knowing full well that that meant less men in the mines but that it also meant less men exposed to the hazards of mining coal. But when the big mines, and they had to be big mines in order to mechanize and have sufficient capacity to produce under this new method of mining—when they left and abandoned large areas of coal holdings, a new concept of mining came into being and we are in a situation where we have hundreds of coal mines in

the United States employing 2 men, 1 man, 5 men, 7 men, mostly under 14 men.

Now, this new process of mining coal or, rather, this new innovation in the industry has brought on with it the added catastrophes and fatalities that have made mining again a very serious hazard in the United States.

The air of House bill 9000 which I have had the privilege of sponsoring is to remove as much of the element of risk as we can from mining in these particular types of mines. For instance I have here a list of cataloged coal mines in the anthracite region of Pennsylvania, in the area where the Fellin mine is situated. There are 207 single, separate mine operations that have only 1 hole for entry. There is no escape whatsoever if the situation which occurred in the Fellin mine recurs in any of these 207 mines. Under this bill, the first and primary purpose is to force the construction or the excavation of another escape way. There is no question but that if the Committee on Rules in its deliberations and in its wisdom would have seen fit to have given us an opportunity to vote last year on this bill, the situation in the Fellin mine might not have ended in disaster, because these operators go in and they are shoestring operators in the main.

It is an economic situation. This area has been underemployed since 1927. The anthracite region, composed of five counties in the heart of Pennsylvania, has been a depressed area longer than any other State, or other section of the State, or community within a section in the entire United States. The influx of oil from the South American countries and the Asiatic-oil-producing nations hit the eastern seaboard and the great market for anthracite which was the New England manufacturers and utilities. Of course, they went to oil because of the price structure. The anthracite industry practically died there back in the early thirties. It has been revived mainly by these small operators. In the Fellin disaster, for instance, Mr. Fellin himself was the only miner in the mine. Mr. Thorne and Mr. Bova are known as laborers. Here you have an operation with only three men in it producing something like 40 to 60 tons a day. They cannot produce that much coal except—except by going into this mine, which was an old working abandoned many years ago, and taking out of that mine the pillar structures that were left in there for safety purposes. When that mine was a title II mine, the mine inspectors made sure they left the pillars to protect the overburden and the roof. By going into the mine and stealing out the pillars, they caused the disaster which occurred.

Now, we understand the problem in the anthracite region. Nobody wants to destroy the opportunity for these men to make a living. No one wants to destroy them economically. However, in this day and age we no can longer allow conditions such as these to exist in this industry. I believe many Members of this Congress who have had experience in the areas that mine coal have long ago recognized the necessity for legislation to cover all of the coal mines in the Nation and to break away from the idea in law that lives are worth more if there are more of them and that lives are worth nothing if there are less of them. In that concept of government I refuse to participate.

Not long after Sheppton another death notice was pinned on the wall of despair and neglect:

MINE GAS KILLS TWIN BROTHERS

POTTSVILLE, PA., November 7, 1963.—Carbon monoxide gas killed twin brothers today in an abandoned mine on Sharp Mountain, about 10 miles from this Schuylkill County community.

The bodies of Ralph Studlack, of Millersville, Dauphin County, and his brother, George, of Elizabethville, also Dauphin County, were found this morning. They were 28.

The brothers were trying to pump out the abandoned mine before attempting to dig out coal. Gordon Smith, deputy secretary of mines, said they were using a gasoline motor that created gas fumes in the pumping operation.

Mr. Speaker, some opponents complained about being forced to preshift examine their mines. If obeying their State laws, they are required to preshift examine their mines under such laws. Therefore, it will not cost them anything to comply with this new safety law.

Some oppose the need to hire mine foremen because they must pay them salaries. All of these States require mine foremen of coal mines. They have also protested the right of the Bureau to close mines down under Public Law 552. All States, mentioned heretofore, give to the department of mines and minerals in each State the right to close down mines. In fact, they are more stringent than the Federal Coal Mine Safety Act, because Congress, recognizing the possibility of arbitrary action by a Federal inspector, provided for an appeal to the Federal Coal Mine Safety Board of Review, which is tripartite in nature and composed of three members—one representing the viewpoints of the mineworkers, one representing the viewpoints of the coal operators, and one representing the viewpoints of the public who serves as Chairman of the Board.

This Board is empowered to modify or annul any closure orders issued by the U.S. Bureau of Mines and to give temporary relief to an operator who believes he has been illegally cited by a Federal inspector. Opponents of this legislation might say that the cost of such an appeal to the Board might be prohibitive. Actually, the only thing they need to do to get an appeal before the Board is to send a telegram or letter setting forth their complaint, and the Board is then required to act promptly on questions involved. Further, the Federal Coal Mine Safety Act provides that, while the main office of the Board is in Washington, the Board is required to hold hearings in local areas where the best interest of all parties will be served.

It might be well at this point to clear up any misunderstanding about the difference between the Federal Mine Safety Code and the Federal Coal Mine Safety Act. The Federal Mine Safety Code is an integral part of the contract, presently in force between the coal mine operators and the United Mine Workers of America. It was promulgated by the U.S. Bureau of Mines in cooperation with the industry and the union, and is a comprehensive document setting forth minimum requirements for all phases of coal mine safety in and around the mines. Only in those cases where the provisions of the code are synonymous with the requirements of the act does the Federal inspector have the right to enforce the provisions of the code.

The United Mine Workers are increasingly alarmed at the continuing injuries and deaths in these so-called title I mines. There are literally thousands of these mines. The latest figures available indicate that there are over 7,000. If the average employment runs between 5 and 10 men per mine, we have 10,000 men working in these mines today, and probably more because many of these mines are not a matter of record.

It is impossible to describe to anyone, who is unfamiliar with the coal mining industry, the conditions that exist in some of these operations. It is a matter of common knowledge that in literally hundreds of these mines, there are mine explosion, mine fire, inundation, and mantrap potentials in existence. They remain uncorrected because of the failure of the States to enforce their own laws, and because the continued failure of Congress to pass this legislation prevents the U.S. Bureau of Mines, through its Federal inspectors to correct this situation.

Let us now turn to the economic phase of this situation. While it is true that the cost of compliance with the Federal statutes is almost nil, it is still in my opinion having an adverse effect on coal mine safety. Competition in the coal-mining industry being what it is, the continued exemption of these small mines from their legal and moral responsibility is forcing the larger operators to use every means possible to meet this competition. They are only able to do so by operating at the absolute minimum of cost production and, as a result of situations of this kind, the employees of the industry are paying the price with blood.

Another phase of this situation in the coal-mining industry is brought about by the human element in charge. For instance, an operator who is forced to comply with provisions of the act in looking about him finds that the operators across the street, because they have reduced their force to 14 men, are not obligated in anyway to comply. This leads to attempts by the so-called large operators to evade their responsibilities. As a result, many large operators are breaking their properties down into smaller units by reorganization, subleasing and otherwise so that they, too, may enjoy freedom from Federal regulations. This in turn leads to greater injury potentials throughout the coal-mining industry.

I could go on ad infinitum quoting specific cases wherein the so-called small operators by their lack of responsibility have caused the injury and death of hundreds and thousands of people.

Previous records are replete with such information. The situation has not changed materially since my previous attempts to pass the necessary regulation.

We find the grim statistics on every page of the historical records of the coal mining industry. An example follows:

TWENTY-SEVEN MINERS KILLED IN AUGUST 1963

Twenty-seven coal miners were killed during the month of August, according to figures released by the U.S. Bureau of Mines. Total fatalities for the first 8 months of 1963 were 202, an increase of 40 over the same period in 1962.

Of the August deaths, 24 occurred in bituminous coal mines and 3 in Pennsylvania anthracite mines. Totals for the year show 179 fatalities in bituminous coal operations and 23 in anthracite accidents.

The August fatalities occurred at a frequency rate of 1.10 deaths per million manhours of exposure, 13 percent higher than the rate for July. Deaths in the bituminous coal industry for the first 8 months of 1963 occurred at a rate of 1.13 per million man-hours of exposure, an increase of 21 percent over the rate for the same period last year. Fatalities occurred in anthracite mines at the rate of 1.66 per million manhours of exposure, slightly higher than the rate for the first 8 months of last year.

Six coal-producing States reported the 27 August fatalities as follows: West Virginia, 10; Kentucky, 8; Pennsylvania (anthracite) 3; Illinois and Virginia, 2 each; Indiana and Utah, 1 each.

The roof-fall toll in August was particularly bad in the soft coal industry. In August there were 20 underground fatalities, 17 of which (85 percent) resulted from falls of roof, face, or rib.

There has been one major mine disaster this year (a single accident which results in the death of five or more men). An explosion on April 25 in the Compass No. 2 Mine, Clinchfield Coal Co., near Clarksburg, W. Va., killed 22 men.

Production of coal and number of fatalities during 1st 8 months of 1963 and 1962

	Bituminous		Pennsylvania anthracite		Total	
	Production (short tons)	Killed	Production (short tons)	Killed	Production (short tons)	Killed
January	36,870,000	15	1,611,000	5	38,481,000	20
February	34,100,000	14	1,345,000	1	35,445,000	15
March	33,640,000	15	1,595,000	3	35,235,000	18
April	37,920,000	52	1,492,000	5	39,412,000	57
May	40,800,000	24	1,682,000	4	42,482,000	28
June	38,970,000	20	1,783,000	1	40,753,000	21
July	28,000,000	15	1,326,000	1	29,326,000	16
August	41,995,000	24	1,959,000	3	43,954,000	27
Total	292,295,000	179	12,793,000	23	305,088,000	202
January-August 1962	277,825,000	141	10,994,000	21	288,819,000	162

Source: Branch of Accidents Analysis, U.S. Bureau of Mines.

There is some determined opposition here in the House of Representatives. I received a copy of a letter addressed to a Member whose name I will not mention which I believe shows the real issue in this debate.

The question is one of human tragedy, avoidable in many instances, as against the callous and determined search for profit without due regard to human lives.

Only the economic distress of many miners forces them into the many deathtraps in this industry.

I quote from the aforementioned letter:

HAYSI, VA.,
September 23, 1963.

It shocked me to read in the paper where you went before the Labor Committee and opposed the mine safety bill now being considered by Congress. I, for one, have worked in these little nonunion mines, and I am not a member of the United Mine Workers of America, and these mines are nothing short of a deathtrap. The only men who will possibly work in them at all are men who are in the same financial condition that I was in. They provide no safety, they pay substandard wages, they operate in violation of the wage and hour law, and in a lot of instances the companies will not pay social security on the employees or unemployment insurance which makes it impossible for the men to qualify for social security or unemployment insurance. They have no form of hospital or medical care, and it is a shame and disgrace on the State for the way the mine department allows them to continue operating in violation of the State mine laws of Virginia.

I hope and trust as Congressman from this district that you are better informed on all legislation pertaining to your constituents than you are on this mine safety bill. Let me urge you in the name of common decency to change your position and put up an all-out fight for this bill. If you take the position that you are for the underdog, the men who are compelled to go in these little mines are the underdog so to speak. If this were not true, the nonunion operators would not be daily running spot announcements on the local radio stations advertising for men, as they are doing today.

With kindest regards, I am,
Respectfully yours,

GEORGE HULL.

H.R. 9000

A bill to amend the Federal Coal Mine Safety Act so as to provide further for the prevention of accidents in coal mines

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the "Federal Coal Mine Safety Act Amendments of 1963".

SEC. 2. (a) Subsection (b) of section 201 of the Federal Coal Mine Safety Act (66 Stat. 693; 30 U.S.C. 471(b)) is repealed.

(b) For a period of six months following the month during which this Act becomes effective, the amendments made by section 3 of this Act to the Federal Coal Mine Safety Act shall not apply to any mine in which on the effective date of this Act no more than fourteen individuals are regularly employed underground, except that the amendments made by subsections (c) and (d) of such section shall become effective on the date of enactment of this Act.

(c) For a period of six months following the month during which this Act becomes effective, paragraph (5) of subsection (h) of section 209 of the Federal Coal Mine Safety Act shall not apply to any mine in which on the effective date of this Act (1) no more than fourteen individuals are regularly employed underground and (2) the storage, handling, or use of black powder is expressly permitted by a statute of the State in which such mine is located.

SEC. 3. (a) Section 203 of the Federal Coal Mine Safety Act (66 Stat. 694; 30 U.S.C. 473) is amended by adding a new subsection (d) and a new subsection (e), reading as follows, and by redesignating present subsections (d), (e), and (f) as subsections (f), (g), and (h), respectively, and by amending those subsections to read as follows:

"(d)(1) If a duly authorized representative of the Bureau, upon making an inspection of a mine as authorized in section 202, finds that any provision of section 209 is being violated, and if he also finds that, while the conditions created by such violation do not cause danger that a mine explosion, mine fire, mine inundation, or mantrip or man-hoist accident will occur in such mine immediately or before the imminence of such danger can be eliminated, such violation is of such nature as could significantly and substantially contribute to the cause or effect of a mine explosion, mine fire, mine inundation, or man-trip or man-hoist accident, and if he finds such violation to be caused by an unwarrantable failure of such operator to comply with the provisions of section 209, he shall include such finding in the notice given to the operator under subsection (b) of this section. Within ninety days of the time such notice was given to such operator, the Bureau shall cause such mine to be reinspected to determine if any similar such violation exists in such mine. Such reinspection shall be in addition to any special inspection required under section 203 or section 206. If, during any special inspection relating to such violation or during such reinspection, a representative of the Bureau finds such similar violation does exist, and if he finds such violation to be caused by an unwarrantable failure of such operator to comply with the provisions of section 209, he shall forthwith issue an order requiring the operator to cause all persons in the area affected by such violation, except those persons referred to in paragraph (3) of this subsection, to be withdrawn from, and to be debarred from entering, such area. Such finding and order shall state the provision or provisions of section 209 which have been violated and shall contain a detailed description of the conditions which such representative finds cause and constitute such violation, and a description of the area from which persons must be withdrawn and debarred. The representative of the Bureau shall promptly thereafter advise the Director in writing of his findings and his action.

"(2) If a withdrawal order with respect to any area in a mine has been issued pursuant to paragraph (1) of this subsection, thereafter a withdrawal order shall promptly be issued by a duly authorized representative of the Bureau who finds upon any following inspection the existence in such mine of violations similar to those that resulted in the issuance of the withdrawal order under paragraph (1) of this subsection until such time as an inspection of such mine discloses no similar violations. Following an inspection of such mine which discloses no similar violations, the provisions of paragraph (1) of this subsection shall again be applicable to that mine.

"(3) No order issued under paragraphs (1) or (2) of this subsection shall require any of the following persons to be withdrawn from, or to be debarred from entering, the area described in the order: (A) Any person whose presence in such area is necessary, in the judgment of the operator of the mine, to abate the violation described

in the order; (B) any public official whose official duties require him to enter such area; or (C) any legal or technical consultant or any representative of the employees of the mine, who is a certified person qualified to make mine examinations, or is accompanied by such a person, and whose presence in such area is necessary, in the judgment of the operator of the mine, for the proper investigation of the conditions described in the order.

"(e) Except as provided in subsection (g) of this section an order issued under subsection (c) or (d) of this section may be annulled, canceled, or revised by the duly authorized representative of the Bureau who issued such order or any other duly authorized representative of the Bureau.

"(f) If a duly authorized representative of the Bureau, upon making an inspection of a mine, as authorized in section 202, finds that methane has been ignited in such mine or finds methane by use of a permissible flame safety lamp or by air analysis in an amount of 0.25 per centum or more in any open workings of such mine when tested at a point not less than twelve inches from the roof, face, or rib, he shall make an order requiring the operator of such mine to comply with the provisions of section 209 of this title which pertain to gassy mines, in the operation of such mine.

"(g)(1) If an order is made pursuant to subsection (a) of this section with respect to a mine in a State in which a State plan approved under section 202(b) is in effect, and a State inspector did not participate in the inspection on which such order is based, the operator of the mine may request the agency designated in the State plan to assign a State inspector to inspect the mine. The State inspector assigned in accordance with such request shall inspect such mine promptly after the request is made.

"(2) No order shall be made pursuant to subsection (c) or (d) of this section with respect to a mine in a State in which a State plan approved under section 202(b) is in effect unless a State inspector participated in the inspection on which such order is based and concurs in such order, or an independent inspector appointed under paragraph (3) of this subsection concurs in such order. If the State inspector does not concur in such order, the operator of the mine, the duly authorized representative of the Bureau who proposes to make such order, or the State inspector may apply, within twenty-four hours after the completion of the inspection involved, for the appointment of an independent inspector under paragraph (3). Within five days after the date of his appointment, the independent inspector shall inspect the mine. The representative of the Bureau and the State inspector shall be given the opportunity to accompany the independent inspector during such inspection. If, after such inspection is completed, either the independent inspector or the State inspector concurs in the order, it shall be issued.

"(3) Within five days after the date of receipt of an application under paragraph (2) of this subsection, the chief judge of the United States district court for the district in which the mine involved is located (or in his absence, the clerk of such court) shall appoint a graduate engineer with experience in the coal-mining industry to serve as an independent inspector under this subsection. Each independent inspector so appointed shall be compensated at the rate of $50 for each day of actual service (including each day he is traveling on official business) and shall, notwithstanding the Travel Expense Act of 1949, be fully reimbursed for traveling, subsistence, and related expenses.

"(4) An order made pursuant to subsection (a) or (c) or (d) of this section with respect to a mine in a State in which a State plan approved under section 202(b) is in effect shall not be subject to review under section 206, but shall be subject to review under section 207.

"(h) Notice of each finding and order made under this section shall promptly be given to the operator of the mine to which it pertains, by the person making such finding or order."

(b) Section 202 of the Federal Coal Mine Safety Act (66 Stat. 693; 30 U.S.C. 472) is amended as follows:

(1) Subsection (a) is amended by striking out the reference to "section 203(d)" and inserting in lieu thereof "section 203(f)"; and by striking out the reference to "section 203(c)" and inserting in lieu thereof "section 203(c) and (d)".

(2) Subsection (b)(2)(C) is amended by striking out the reference to "section 203(e)(1)" and inserting in lieu thereof "section 203(g)(1)".

(3) Subsection (c) is amended by striking out the reference to "section 203(e)(3)" and inserting in lieu thereof "section 203(g)(3)".

(c) Subsections (a), (b), (c), and (d) of section 205 of the Federal Coal Mine Safety Act (66 Stat. 697; 30 U.S.C. 475) are amended to read as follows:

"(a) The Federal Coal Mine Safety Board of Review is hereby continued as an agency of the United States, except that the Board shall consist of five members, instead of three members, who shall be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate.

"(b) The terms of office of members of the Board shall be five years, except that—

"(1) the terms of office of members in office on the date of enactment of the Federal Coal Mine Safety Act Amendments of 1963, shall expire on the date originally fixed for their expiration,

"(2) the term of office of one of the members appointed to fill a vacancy resulting from the enactment of the Federal Coal Mine Safety Act Amendments of 1963, shall expire July 15, 1967, and the term of office of the member appointed to fill the other vacancy resulting therefrom shall expire July 15, 1968, and

"(3) a vacancy caused by the death, resignation, or removal of a member prior to the expiration of the term for which he was appointed, shall be appointed only for the remainder of such unexpired term.

The members of the Board may be removed by the President for inefficiency, neglect of duty, or malfeasance in office.

"(c) Each member of the Board shall be compensated at the rate of $50 for each day of actual service (including each day he is traveling on official business) and shall, notwithstanding the Travel Expense Act of 1949 be fully reimbursed for traveling, subsistence, and other related expenses. The Board, at all times, shall consist of one person who by reason of previous training and experience may reasonably be said to represent the viewpoint of operators of coal mines employing fourteen or fewer employees underground (hereinafter referred to as 'small mine operators representative'), one person who by reason of previous training and experience may reasonably be said to represent the veiwpoint of operators of coal mines employing fifteen or more employees underground (hereinafter referred to as the 'large mine operators representative'), one person who by reason of previous training and experience may reasonably be said to represent the viewpoint of coal mine workers in mines employing fourteen or fewer employees underground (hereinafter referred to as the 'small mine workers representative'), one person who by reason of previous training and experience may reasonably be said to represent the viewpoint of coal mine workers in mines employing fifteen or more employees underground (hereinafter referred to as the 'large mine workers representative'), and one person who shall be chairman of the Board, who shall be a graduate engineer with experience in the coal mining industry or shall have had at least five years' experience as a practical mining engineer in the coal mining industry, and who shall not, within one year of his appointment as a member of the Board have had a pecuniary interest in, or have been regularly employed or engaged in, the mining of coal, or have regularly represented either coal mine operators or coal mine workers, or have been an officer or employee of the Department of the Interior assigned to duty in the Bureau.

"(d) The principal office of the Board shall be in the District of Columbia. Whenever the convenience of the public or of the parties may be promoted, or delay or expense may be minimized, the Board may hold hearings or conduct other proceedings at any other place. At the request of an operator of a mine the Board shall hold hearings or conduct other proceedings at the county seat of the county in which the mine is located or at any place mutually agreed to by the chairman of the Board and the operator of the mine involved in the appeal or proceeding. The Board shall have an official seal which shall be judicially noticed and which shall be preserved in the custody of the secretary of the Board."

(d) Subsection (f) of section 205 of such Act is amended to read as follows:

"(f) Three members of the Board shall constitute a quorum, and official action can be taken only on the affirmative vote of at least three members, except that in any official action involving mines in which no more than fourteen individuals are regularly employed underground the participation of the small mine operators' representative and small mine workers' representative shall be required, and in any official action involving mines in which more than fourteen individuals are regularly employed underground the participation of the large mine operators' representative and large mine workers' representative shall be required; but a special panel composed of one or more members, upon order of the Board, shall conduct any hearing provided for in section 207 of this title and submit the transcript of such hearing to the entire Board of its action thereon. Such transcript shall be made available to the parties prior to any final action of the Board. An opportunity to appear before the Board shall be afforded the parties prior to any final action and the Board may afford the parties an opportunity to submit additional evidence as may be required for a full and true disclosure of the facts. Every official act of the Board shall be entered of record, and its hearings and records thereof shall be open to the public."

(e) Section 206 of the Federal Coal Mine Safety Act (66 Stat. 699; 30 U.S.C. 476) is amended as follows:

(1) Subsection (a) is amending by striking out the reference to "section 203(e)(4)" and inserting in lieu thereof "section 203(g)(4)".

(2) Subsection (b) is amended by striking out the reference to "section 203(e)(4)" and inserting in lieu thereof "section 203(g)(4)".

(3) A new subsection (c), reading as follows, is added and present subsections (c), (d), (e), and (f) are redesignated as subsection (d), (e), (f), and (g), respectively, and are amended to read as follows:

"(c) Except as provided in section 203(g)(4), an operator notified of an order made pursuant to section 203(d) may apply to the Director for annulment or revision of such order. Upon receipt of such application the Director shall make a special inspection of the mine affected by such order, or cause three duly authorized representatives of the Bureau, other than the representative who made such order, to make such inspection of such mine and report thereon to him. Upon making such special inspection himself, or

upon receiving the report of such inspection made by such representatives, the Director shall find whether or not there was a violation of section 209 as described in such order, at the time of the making of such order. If he finds there was no such violation he shall make an order annulling the order under review. If he finds there was such a violation he shall also find whether or not such violation was totally abated at the time of the making of such special inspection. If he finds that such violation was totally abated at such time, he shall make an order annulling the order under review. If he finds that such violation was not totally abated at such time, he shall find the extent of the area of such mine which was affected by such violation at the time such special inspection was made, and he shall then make an order, consistent with his findings, affirming or revising the order under review.

"(d) An operator notified of an order made pursuant to section 203(f) may apply, not later than twenty days after the receipt of notice of such order, to the Director for annulment of such order. Upon receipt of such application the Director shall make or cause to be made such investigation as he deems necessary. Upon concluding his investigation or upon receiving the report of such investigation made at his direction, the Director shall find whether or not methane has been ignited in such mine, or whether or not methane was found in such mine in an amount of 0.25 per centum or more in any open workings of such mine, when tested at a point not less than twelve inches from the roof, face, or rib, at the time of the making of such order. If he finds that methane has not been ignited in such mine and was not found in such mine as set out in such order, he shall make an order annulling the order under review. If he finds that methane has been ignited in such mine or was found in such mine as set out in the order under review, he shall make an order denying such application.

"(e) The Director shall cause notice of each finding and order made under this section to be given promptly to the operator of the mine to which it pertains.

"(f) Except as provided in section 203(g)(4), at any time while an order made pursuant to section 203 or this section is in effect, or at any time during the pendency of a proceeding under section 207 or section 208 seeking annulment or revision of such order, the operator of the mine affected by such order may apply to the Director for annulment or revision of such order. The Director shall thereupon proceed to act upon such application in the manner provided in subsections (a), (b), (c) or (d) of this section.

"(g) In view of the urgent need for prompt decision of matters submitted to the Director under this section, all actions which the Director or his representatives are required to take under this section shall be taken as rapidly as practicable, consistent with adequate consideration of the issues involved."

(f) Section 207 of the Federal Coal Mine Safety Act (66 Stat. 700; as amended 74 Stat. 201; 30 U.S.C. 477) is amended as follows:

(1) Subsection (a) is amended by striking out the reference to "subsection (a), (c) or (d)" and inserting in lieu thereof "subsection (a), (c), (d) or (f)"; by striking out the reference to "subsection (d)" and inserting in lieu thereof "subsection (f)"; and by striking out the reference to "subsection (c)" and inserting in lieu thereof "subsection (d)".

(2) A new subsection (h), reading as follows, is inserted and present subsections (h), (i) and (j) are redesignated as subsections (i), (j), and (k), respectively, and are amended to read as follows:

"(h) If the proceeding is one in which an operator seeks annulment or revision of an order made pursuant to section 203(d), the Board, upon conclusion of the hearing, shall find whether or not there was a violation of section 209, as described in such order, at the time of making of such order. If the Board finds there was no such violation, the Board shall make an order annulling the order under review. If the Board finds there was such a violation, the Board shall also find whether or not such violation was totally abated at the time of the filing of the operator's application. If the Board finds that such violation was totally abated at such time, the Board shall make an order annulling the order under review. If the Board finds that such violation was not totally abated at such time, the Board shall find the extent of the area of such mine which was affected by such violation at such time, and shall make an order, consistent with its findings, affirming or revising the order under review.

"(i) If the proceeding is one in which an operator seeks annulment of an order made pursuant to section 203(f) or 206(d), the Board, upon conclusion of the hearing, shall find whether or not methane has been ignited in such mine or was found in such mine in an amount of 0.25 per centum or more in any open workings of such mine when tested at a point not less than twelve inches from the roof, face, or rib, as set out in such order. If the Board finds that methane has not been ignited in such mine and was not found in such mine as set out in such order, the Board shall make an order annulling the order under review. If the Board finds that methane has been ignited in such mine or was found in such mine as set out in the order under review, the Board shall make an order denying such application.

"(j) Each finding and order made by the Board shall be in writing. It shall show the date on which it is made, and shall bear the signatures of the members of the Board who concur therein. Upon making a finding and order the Board shall cause a true copy thereof to be sent by registered mail or by certified mail to all parties or their attorneys of record. The Board shall cause each such finding and order to be entered on its official record, together with any written opinion prepared by any members in support of, or dissenting from, any such finding or order.

"(k) In view of the urgent need for prompt decision of matters submitted to the Board under this section, all actions which the Board is required to take under this section shall be taken as rapidly as practicable, consistent with adequate consideration of the issues involved."

SEC. 4. Subsection (d) of section 210 of the Federal Coal Mine Safety Act (66 Stat. 708; 30 U.S.C. 480(d)) is amended by striking out the reference to "section 203(e)(3)" and inserting in lieu thereof "section 203(g)(3)".

SEC. 5. Section 212 of the Federal Coal Mine Safety Act (66 Stat. 709; 30 U.S.C. 482) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsections:

"(d) For the promotion of sound and effective coordination of Federal and State activities within the field covered by this Act, to eliminate duplication of effort and expense, and to secure effective enforcement of the coal mine safety requirements established by this title, the director shall affirmatively and diligently seek to cooperate with the mine inspection or safety agencies of the several States, through formal agreement or otherwise, in the enforcement of the provisions of this title.

"(e) The Secretary of the Interior shall enlarge and intensify the educational programs of the Bureau of Mines with respect to the advancement of health and safety in coal mines, and shall, to the fullest extent practicable, seek the cooperation and assistance of the appropriate State agencies in the planning and implementation of such programs. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated not to exceed $750,000 for carrying out such programs."

SEC. 6. The Secretary of the Interior shall conduct a special study to determine the sufficiency of the present safety requirements of the Federal Coal Mine Safety Act, with particular emphasis upon the requirements relative to roof support, ventilation, and electrical equipment. The Secretary of the Interior shall make a report to the Congress on the results of such study, together with his recommendations, within one year after the enactment of this Act.

TITLE I.—*Bituminous and anthracite mines, 1961*

	Underground	Strip	Auger	Total
Number of men employed	31,882	24,941	1,809	58,632
Man-hours	39,051,363	43,038,045	1,879,406	83,968,814
Fatalities	86	17	1	104
Number of mines	6,914	1,744	327	8,985

Frequency rate for all coal title I mines	1.24
Frequency rate for all title I underground mines (bituminous and anthracite)	2.20

TITLE II.—*Mines—Underground*

Number men employed	76,686
Man-hours	124,054,832
Fatalities	170
Frequency rate	1.37
Number of mines	940

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,
Washington, D.C., November 8, 1963.

MR. JAY H. FOREMAN,
Counsel, General Subcommittee on Labor, House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. FOREMAN: This responds to your request of November 4, 1963, for our opinion on the statistical information forwarded to you by the counsel for the Independent Coal Operators Association.

It appears from a comparison with Bureau of Mines records that, basically, the statistics presented are based on the total title I mines, including strip and auger mines, instead of only title I underground mines, which are the only mines involved in the present legislation. It is believed that the enclosed tabulation of Bureau of Mines records substantiates this opinion. These records have been broken down for Kentucky and Virginia and for Tennessee, Alabama, West Virginia, and Pennsylvania for comparative purposes.

You will note that the figure for all title I mines, including strip and auger mines, in Tennessee, Alabama, West Virginia, and Pennsylvania (3,701) compares favorably with the association's figure (3,732). The figures quoted for total employment in title I underground mines (31,882) and number of title I underground mines (6,914) are correct, but the association's figure for the employment in title I mines in Kentucky and Virginia (33,797) is at wide variance with the Bureau's figure, even if strip and auger mines are included (18,105). You will note also that the Bureau's fatality-frequency rate for all title I mines, including strip and auger mines (1.24) compares favorably with the association's figure (1.16). The association's fatality-frequency rates of 2.32 and 1.35 for title I and title II mines, respectively, are for bituminous-coal mines only. The rates for all underground mines were 2.20 and 1.37 for title I and title II mines, respectively.

It is believed that the foregoing and the enclosed statistical data substantiate that the association's conclusions have been based on all title I mines, rather than underground mines only.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN F. O'LEARY,
Deputy Assistant Secretary of the Interior.

EMPLOYMENT IN TITLE I MINES, 1961

	Underground	Strip	Auger	Total
Kentucky	8,415	2,253	685	11,353
Virginia	6,405	228	119	6,752
Total	14,820	2,481	804	18,105

NUMBER OF TITLE I MINES

Tennessee	443	71	13	527
Alabama	129	44	4	177
West Virginia	1,216	141	74	1,431
Pennsylvania (bituminous)	929	584	53	1,566
Total	2,717	840	144	3,701
Pennsylvania (anthracite)	1,015	176	-------	1,191
Total	3,732	1,016	144	4,892
Kentucky	1,558	112	95	1,765
Virginia	1,111	36	35	1,182
Total	2,669	148	130	2,947

Bureau of Mines figures of employment in the entire United States	[1] 31,882
Kentucky and Virginia figures of employment in title I mines	33,797
Total number of mines in United States	6,914
Total number of mines in Tennessee, Alabama, West Virginia, and Pennsylvania	3,732

[1] All figures are for the year 1961.

Mr. Speaker, since there are 33,797 men employed in title I mines in Kentucky and Virginia and since there are 3,732 mines in States other than Kentucky and Virginia, more than 50 percent of the labor force in title I mines is employed outside Kentucky and Virginia. Assuming that in the States other than Kentucky and Virginia there are as many men employed per mine on an average, as are employed in the Kentucky and Virginia title I mines, it becomes clear that instead of 31,882 title I miners there are approximately 65,000–70,000 title I miners in the United States, or more than twice the Bureau total. This means that there were, in title I mines, more than twice the number of man-hours of exposure than the number of hours used by the Bureau.

Thus, in 1961, the Bureau shows that the fatality rate in title I mines was 2.32 and the fatality rate in title II mines was 1.35. The correct fatality rate figure for title I mines would be less than half of 2.32 or approximately 1.16, a figure lower than the fatality rate for title II mines.

Mr. JENNINGS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DENT. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. JENNINGS. First, would the gentleman not agree that the bill I introduced rectifies the situation which he has just described, and second, will he tell the House how many times Federal inspectors under the bill will inspect each title I mine?

Mr. DENT. Exactly, I will be happy to, because it makes an absolute lie out of the charge that this measure is intended to drive the small mines out of business, because the Federal inspector will inspect only twice a year, but the difference is that he has authority to put into effect a demand for enforcement.

Mr. POWELL. If the gentleman will yield, on the authority of the subcommittee of my committee which visited the area represented by the gentleman from Virginia, the miners were white men, were they not?

Mr. DENT. I do not know about the men, but the mines were small mines. I was not on that trip but perhaps the gentleman from California could answer that.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. If the gentleman will yield, when I got out of the mine I was black, but I was white when I went in.

Mr. POWELL. It is a question of human rights today. A vote by this body today is a vote in favor of machinery over the lives of white men.

Mr. ROUDEBUSH. Mr. Speaker, I too, rise in support of H.R. 9000, the legislation that we have before us to extend safety regulations to our smaller mines. Heretofore, mines employing 14 or less men underground have been exempted from such regulations. The district that I represent in Indiana is a large producer of coal, and I think that it is long past time that we should extend safety coverage to the smaller operators. I also have been told that such legislation would be detrimental to coal production, but I recall the large number of accidents that have occurred in some of these smaller mines. The fact that a mine employs more or less than 14 persons underground, to me, is incidental. I, too, am aware that such safety procedures will not, in itself, make our small mines absolutely safe; however, such procedures will save many lives and crippled limbs by requiring compliance with some standards of safety, and regular inspection. I have long been a foe of Federal control but in this field it would seem to me that the national interest in safety of American citizens is at stake. I certainly hope that the bill will be favorably considered.

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I strongly favor safety in the coal mines of the United States and always have. We in Congress have the obligation in occupations of high hazard to make sure that there are uniform health and safety rules. We must protect the worker in these industries as human beings and provide their families and dependents that measure of security and guarantee of life and limb itself that every American feels he holds as his birthright.

For I believe that there can be no difference in the protection we give to the individual workers so that there are two standards of mine safety in our country today. It is intolerable, both to the worker and to his family, that one man, who works in a mine regularly employing 15 or more individuals underground, therefore receives Federal protection and power of enforcement; while a second mineworker and his family, through no fault of his own but simply because he works in a mine regularly employing less than 15 men underground, receives for himself and his family less safety precautions and protection.

Our United States of America is strong enough economically to provide the basic needs of the safety provisions to eliminate needless hazards in all hazardous occupations and particularly in the coal mining industry where a double standard of safety precautions and requirements has been permitted to exist.

My hearty congratulations to the United Mine Workers for their officers' and members' organized and persistent work over the years to provide adequate safety precautions, good wages, and fringe benefits with adequate health protections guaranteed by contract. We in Congress must see that the Federal Government has adequate authority and power to enforce mine safety for all mineworkers. This is a must. Therefore, it is a pleasure to support the Federal Coal Mine Safety Act amendments and recommend their passage.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is, Will the House suspend the rules and pass the bill H.R. 9000?

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 202, nays 151, answered "Present" 1, not voting 76, as follows:

[Roll No. 233]

YEAS—202

Abele	Fraser	Moorhead
Addabbo	Friedel	Morgan
Anderson	Fulton, Pa.	Morris
Andrews, N. Dak.	Gallagher	Morton
	Garmatz	Mosher
Aspinall	Giaimo	Multer
Baldwin	Gibbons	Murphy, Ill.
Barrett	Gilbert	Murphy, N.Y.
Barry	Gill	Murray
Battin	Gonzalez	Natcher
Beckworth	Gray	Nix
Bennett, Fla.	Green, Oreg.	O'Brien, N.Y.
Blatnik	Green, Pa.	O'Hara, Ill.
Boggs	Griffin	O'Hara, Mich.
Boland	Griffiths	O'Konski
Bolling	Grover	Olsen, Mont.
Bolton, Oliver P.	Hagen, Calif.	Olson, Minn.
	Halpern	O'Neill
Bow	Hansen	Ostertag
Brademas	Harding	Patman
Bray	Harrison	Patten
Brooks	Harsha	Perkins
Broomfield	Harvey, Ind.	Philbin
Brotzman	Hawkins	Powell
Brown, Ohio	Hays	Price
Bruce	Hechler	Reid, Ill.
Burke	Holland	Reid, N.Y.
Burton, Calif.	Jensen	Reifel
Burton, Utah	Joelson	Reuss
Byrne, Pa.	Johnson, Calif.	Rhodes, Pa.
Carey	Karsten	Rich
Cederberg	Karth	Riehlman
Chelf	Kastenmeier	Rivers, Alaska
Clancy	Kelly	Rodino
Clark	Keogh	Rogers, Colo.
Cleveland	King, Calif.	Rogers, Fla.
Cohelan	Kirwan	Rooney, N.Y.
Conte	Knox	Rooney, Pa.
Corbett	Kunkel	Roosevelt
Corman	Leggett	Rosenthal
Cramer	Libonati	Rostenkowski
Cunningham	Lloyd	Roudebush
Curtin	Long, La.	Roush
Dague	Long, Md.	Rumsfeld
Daniels	McCulloch	Ryan, N.Y.
Davis, Tenn.	McDade	St Germain
Delaney	McFall	St. Onge
Dent	McLoskey	Saylor
Denton	Macdonald	Schenck
Donohue	Mahon	Schweiker
Dulski	Mailliard	Schwengel
Duncan	Martin, Calif.	Secrest
Dwyer	Martin, Mass.	Senner
Edmondson	Mathias	Sickles
Edwards	Matsunaga	Sisk
Fallon	May	Skubitz
Farbstein	Meader	Slack
Fascell	Michel	Staggers
Feighan	Milliken	Stratton
Fino	Minish	Stubblefield
Flood	Minshall	Sullivan
Fogarty	Moore	Thomas

Thompson, La.	Vanik	Willis
Thompson, N.J.	Weaver	Wilson, Ind.
Tupper	Weltner	Wright
Udall	Wharton	Wydler
Ullman	White	Young
Van Deerlin	Wickersham	Zablocki

NAYS—151

Abbitt	Gary	Pelly
Abernethy	Gathings	Pickle
Andrews, Ala.	Glenn	Pike
Arends	Goodell	Pillion
Ashbrook	Goodling	Poage
Ashmore	Grant	Poff
Ayres	Gross	Pool
Baker	Gubser	Purcell
Bates	Hagan, Ga.	Quie
Becker	Haley	Quillen
Beermann	Hall	Rhodes, Ariz.
Belcher	Halleck	Rivers, S.C.
Bell	Hardy	Roberts, Ala.
Berry	Harris	Roberts, Tex.
Betts	Hébert	Robison
Bonner	Henderson	Rogers, Tex.
Brock	Herlong	Schadeberg
Broyhill, N.C.	Holifield	Schneebeli
Broyhill, Va.	Horan	Selden
Burkhalter	Hosmer	Short
Burleson	Huddleston	Shriver
Byrnes, Wis.	Hull	Sikes
Cahill	Hutchinson	Siler
Casey	Ichord	Smith, Iowa
Chamberlain	Jarman	Smith, Va.
Chenoweth	Jennings	Snyder
Clausen, Don H.	Johansen	Springer
	Johnson, Pa.	Stafford
Clawson, Del	Johnson, Wis.	Steed
Collier	Jonas	Stephens
Colmer	Keith	Stinson
Cooley	Kilburn	Taft
Curtis	Kilgore	Talcott
Davis, Ga.	King, N.Y.	Taylor
Derounian	Kornegay	Teague, Calif.
Derwinski	Laird	Teague, Tex.
Devine	Langen	Thompson, Tex.
Dole	Latta	Thomson, Wis.
Dorn	Lennon	Trimble
Dowdy	Lindsay	Tuck
Downing	Lipscomb	Utt
Ellsworth	McIntire	Van Pelt
Everett	Marsh	Vinson
Findley	Martin, Nebr.	Watson
Fisher	Matthews	Watts
Flynt	Mills	Westland
Ford	Monagan	Whitener
Foreman	Morse	Whitten
Fountain	Nelsen	Widnall
Frelinghuysen	Norblad	Younger
Fuqua	Passman	

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—1

Waggonner

NOT VOTING—76

Adair	Hanna	Pepper
Albert	Harvey, Mich.	Pilcher
Alger	Healey	Pirnie
Ashley	Hoeven	Pucinski
Auchincloss	Hoffman	Rains
Avery	Horton	Randall
Baring	Jones, Ala.	Roybal
Bass	Jones, Mo.	Ryan, Mich.
Bolton, Frances P.	Kee	St. George
	Kluczynski	Scott
Bromwell	Kyl	Sheppard
Brown, Calif.	Landrum	Shipley
Buckley	Lankford	Sibal
Cameron	Lesinski	Smith, Calif.
Celler	McClory	Staebler
Daddario	McDowell	Toll
Dawson	McMillan	Tollefson
Diggs	MacGregor	Tuten
Dingell	Madden	Wallhauser
Elliott	Miller, Calif.	Whalley
Evins	Miller, N.Y.	Williams
Finnegan	Montoya	Wilson, Bob
Forrester	Morrison	Wilson, Charles H.
Fulton, Tenn.	Moss	
Grabowski	Nedzi	Winstead
Gurney	Osmers	Wyman

So (two-thirds not having voted in favor thereof) the motion was rejected.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Albert and Mr. Daddario for, with Mr. Waggonner against.

Mr. Horton and Mr. Grabowski for, with Mr. Alger against.

Mr. Shipley and Mr. Miller of California for, with Mr. Scott against.

Mr. Toll and Mrs. Frances P. Bolton for, with Mr. Auchincloss against.

Mr. Gurney and Mr. Pirnie for, with Mr. Adair against.

Mr. Whalley for, with Mr. Smith of California against.

Mr. Madden and Mr. Moss for, with Mr. Bob Wilson against.

Mr. Morrison and Mr. Ashley for, with Mrs. St. George against.

Mr. Dingell and Mr. Ryan of Michigan for, with Mr. Hoeven against.

Mr. Nedzi and Mr. Lesinski for, with Mr. Osmers against.

Mr. Kluczynski and Mr. Charles H. Wilson for, with Mr. Wallhauser against.

Mr. Brown of California and Mr. Cameron for, with Mr. Williams against.

Mr. Hanna and Mr. Roybal for, with Mr. Winstead against.

Mr. Finnegan and Mr. Montoya for, with Mr. McMillan against.

Mr. McDowell and Mr. Celler for, with Mr. Sibal against.

Mr. Diggs and Mr. Pucinski for, with Mr. Tollefson against.

Mr. Randall and Mr. Dawson for, with Mr. MacGregor against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Evins with Mrs. Kee.

Mr. Fulton of Tennessee with Mr. Buckley.

Mr. Pepper with Mr. Staebler.

Mr. Rains with Mr. Healey.

Mr. Elliott with Mr. Sheppard.

Mr. Baring with Mr. Lankford.

Mr. Landrum with Mr. Bass.

Mr. Jones of Alabama with Mr. Forrester.

Mr. Tuten with Mr. Pilcher.

Mr. WAGGONNER. Mr. Speaker, I have a live pair with the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. ALBERT] and the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. DADDARIO]. Had they been present they would have voted "yea." I voted "nay." I withdraw my vote and vote "present."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members be permitted to extend their remarks prior to the vote on the bill H.R. 9000.

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

There was no objection.

CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS FOR MONTH OF SEPTEMBER TO BE TAKEN UP ON TUESDAY, AUGUST 18

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that it be in order tomorrow to consider the resolution making continuing appropriations for the month of September.

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

There was no objection.

CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 1839

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the conferees on the part of the House may have until midnight tonight to file a conference report to accompany the bill, H.R. 1839.

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

There was no objection.

TARIFF SCHEDULES TECHNICAL AMENDMENTS ACT OF 1964

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 12253) to correct certain errors in the Tariff Schedules of the United States, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE, ETC.

(a) SHORT TITLE.—This Act may be cited as the "Tariff Schedules Technical Amendments Act of 1964".

(b) AMENDMENT OF SCHEDULES.—Whenever in this Act an amendment or repeal is expressed in terms of an amendment to, or repeal of, an item or other provision, the reference shall be considered to be made to an item or other provision of the Tariff Schedules of the United States (28 F.R., part II, Aug. 17, 1963; 77A Stat.; 19 U.S.C., sec. 1202). Each page reference "(p. —)" in this Act refers to the page on which the item or provision referred to appears both in part II of the Federal Register for August 17, 1963, and in volume 77A of the United States Statutes at Large.

(c) CITATION OF SCHEDULES.—Title I of the Tariff Act of 1930, as in effect on or after August 31, 1963, may be cited as the "Tariff Schedules of the United States".

SEC. 2. EFFECTIVE DATE.

(a) The amendments and repeals made by this Act shall apply with respect to articles entered, or withdrawn from warehouse, for consumption after the 60th day after the date of the enactment of this Act.

(b) Upon request therefor filed with the collector of customs concerned on or before the 120th day after the date of the enactment of this Act, the entry or withdrawal of any article—

(1) which was made after August 30, 1963, and before the 61st day after the date of the enactment of this Act, and

(2) with respect to which the amount of duty would be smaller if the amendments and repeals made by this Act applied to such entry or withdrawal,

shall, notwithstanding the provisions of section 514 of the Tariff Act of 1930 or any other provision of law, be liquidated or reliquidated as though such entry or withdrawal had been made on the 61st day after the date of the enactment of this Act.

SEC. 3. APPLICATION OF TARIFF CLASSIFICATION ACT OF 1962

In applying the Tariff Classification Act of 1962 (19 U.S.C., sec. 1202 note) after the date of the enactment of this Act—

(1) The changes in the Tariff Schedules of the United States made by this Act shall be treated for the purposes of section 203 of such Act as having been included in such tariff schedules on August 31, 1963.

(2) The rates of duty in rate column numbered 1 of the Tariff Schedules of the United States set forth in this Act which are lower than the rates of duty in rate column numbered 2 of such schedules for the corresponding items shall, for the purposes of section 103 of such Act of 1962, be treated as having been proclaimed by the President pursuant to paragraph (1) of section 102 of such Act.

(3) The changes in part 3 of the appendix of the Tariff Schedules of the United States made by section 69 of this Act shall, for the purposes of section 103 of such Act of 1962, be treated as having been proclaimed by the

President pursuant to paragraph (3) of section 102 of such Act.

SEC. 4. CONTAINERS NOT IMPORTED EMPTY.

The first sentence of subparagraph (1) of general headnote 6(b) (p. 12) is amended to read as follows: "The usual or ordinary types of shipping or transportation containers or holders, if not designed for, or capable of, reuse, and containers of usual types ordinarily sold at retail with their contents, are not subject to treatment as imported articles."

SEC. 5. GRAPE JUICE.

Item 165.40 (p. 64) is amended by striking out "9¢ per gal." and inserting in lieu thereof "50¢ per gal.", and by striking out "70¢ per gal." and inserting in lieu thereof "$1 per gal.".

SEC. 6. FLORIST ARTICLES.

Item 192.20 (p. 84) is amended to read as follows:

"	192.20	Cut flowers, fresh; bouquets, wreaths, sprays, or similar articles made from such flowers or other fresh plant parts	10% ad val.	40% ad val. "

SEC. 7. AGRICULTURAL BINS AND SPRAYERS.

(a) HARVESTING BINS.—Schedule 2, part 1, subpart D is amended by inserting after item 204.25 (p. 91) the following:

"	204.27	Bins designed for use in the harvesting of fruits and vegetables	Free	Free	"

(b) SPRAYERS.—The article description for item 662.45 (p. 312) is amended by striking out ", self-contained, having a capacity over 5 gallons," and inserting in lieu thereof ("except sprayers, self-contained, having a capacity not over 5 gallons)".

SEC. 8. CERTAIN BOXES AND CASES COVERED OR LINED WITH TEXTILE FABRICS.

(a) JEWELRY BOXES, ETC., OF WOOD.—Item 204.50 (p. 91) is amended by striking out "8.5% ad val." and inserting in lieu thereof "5% ad val.".

(b) BOXES OF PAPER, ETC.—Item 256.50 (p. 106) is repealed and item 256.48 is amended—

(1) by striking out "but not" and inserting in lieu thereof "or", and

(2) by striking out "4% ad val." and inserting in lieu thereof "5% ad val.".

SEC. 9. GASKETING MATERIALS OF GROUND OR PULVERIZED CORK.

Schedule 2, part 2, subpart A is amended by inserting after item 220.20 (p. 93) the following new item:

"	220.25	Slabs and sheets comprised primarily of ground or pulverized cork bonded with rubber or plastics	10% ad val.	25% ad val.	"

SEC. 10. WOOD PARTICLES BOARD.

Item 245.50 (p. 98) is amended by striking out "12% ad val." and inserting in lieu thereof "20% ad val.".

SEC. 11. SHOEBOARD.

Item 251.49 (p. 103) is amended by striking out "Leatherboard" and inserting in lieu thereof "Shoeboard".

SEC. 12. TEXTILE FABRICS, COATED OR FILLED, OR LAMINATED, WITH RUBBER OR PLASTICS; ARTICLES MADE FROM SUCH FABRICS.

(a) CLASSIFICATION OF CERTAIN ARTICLES WHOLLY OR IN PART OF FABRICS COATED OR FILLED, OR LAMINATED, WITH RUBBER OR PLASTICS.—The headnotes for schedule 3 are amended—

(1) by inserting "except as provided by headnote 5," before "articles" at the beginning of subparagraph (vi) of headnote 2(a) (p. 114), and

(2) by adding after headnote 4 (p. 115) the following new headnote:

"5. For the purposes of parts 5, 6, and 7 of this schedule and parts 1 (except subpart A), 4 and 12 of schedule 7, in determining the classification of any article which is wholly or in part of a fabric coated or filled, or laminated, with nontransparent rubber or plastics (which fabric is provided for in part 4C of this schedule), the fabric shall be regarded not as a textile material but as being wholly of rubber or plastics to the extent that (as used in the article) the nontransparent rubber or plastics forms either the outer surface of such article or the only exposed surface of such fabric."

(b) DETERMINATION OF COMPONENT FIBERS OF CHIEF VALUE IN COATED OR FILLED FABRICS, ETC.—Headnote 3 for schedule 3, part 4, subpart C (p. 145) is repealed, and headnote 4 for schedule 3 (p. 115) is amended to read as follows:

"4. For the purposes of the tariff schedules—

"(a) Except as specifically provided otherwise, in determining the yarn count of fabrics, the warp and filling yarns, whether plied or not, shall be counted as they occur in the fabric.

"(b) In determining the component fibers of chief value in coated or filled, or laminated, fabrics and articles wholly or in part thereof, the coating or filling, or the nontextile laminating substances, shall be disregarded in the absence of context to the contrary."

(c) WOVEN OR NET FABRICS COATED OR FILLED.—

(1) Schedule 3, part 4, subpart C, headnote 2 (p. 145) is amended by striking out "and" at the end of paragraph (a), by striking out the period at the end of paragraph (b) and inserting in lieu thereof "; and", and by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

"(c) the provisions in this subpart for fabrics, coated or filled with rubber or plastics material, or laminated with sheet rubber or plastics (items 355.65–.85), cover products weighing not over 44 ounces per square yard unless they contain more than 50 percent by weight of textile fibers."

(2) The article description preceding item 355.65 (p. 146) is amended by striking out ", except foam or sponge sheet".

(3) Item 355.80 (p. 146) is repealed and there is inserted in lieu thereof the following:

"		Of man-made fibers:			
	355.81	Over 70 percent by weight of rubber or plastics	12.5% ad val.	25% ad val.	
	355.82	Other	25¢ per lb. + 30% ad val.	45¢ per lb. + 65% ad val.	"

(d) RAINWEAR AND SIMILAR GARMENTS.—Items 376.50, 376.54, and 376.58, and the article description preceding item 376.50 (p. 159) are repealed and there is inserted in lieu thereof the following:

"		Garments designed for rainwear, hunting, fishing, or similar uses, wholly or almost wholly of fabrics which are coated or filled, or laminated, with rubber or plastics, which (after applying headnote 5 of schedule 3) are regarded as textile materials:			
	376.54	Of cotton	15% ad val.	37.5% ad val.	
	376.56	Other	30% ad val.	65% ad val.	",

(e) CERTAIN UNSUPPORTED FILM.—The article description preceding item 771.40 (p. 393) is amended by striking out "and unsupported".

(f) CERTAIN INFLATABLE ARTICLES.—Item 772.75 (p. 394) is repealed, and schedule 7, part 13, subpart A is amended by inserting after item 790.37 (p. 397) the following new item:

"	790.39	Pneumatic mattresses and other inflatable articles not specially provided for	12.5% ad val.	25% ad val.	",

SEC. 13. MEASURE OF CERTAIN YARNS; CERTAIN WOVEN FABRICS CONTAINING MANMADE FIBERS.

(a) MEASURE OF CERTAIN YARNS.—The article description for item 305.14 (p. 121) is amended to read as follows: "Measuring over 270 yards but not over 18,000 yards per pound".

(b) CERTAIN WOVEN FABRICS CONTAINING MANMADE FIBERS.—Schedule 3, part 3, subpart B is amended by inserting after item 335.50 (p. 138) the following new item:

"	335.60	Over 50 percent by weight of yarns which yarns are composed of fibers not exceeding 5 inches in length and contain not less than 50 percent by weight of manmade fibers	25¢ per lb.+ 22.5% ad val.	45¢ per lb. + 70% ad val.	"

SEC. 14. ORNAMENTED FABRICS; FABRICS WITH TUCKS.

(a) ORNAMENTED FABRICS.—Item 353.50 (p. 144) is amended—

(1) by striking out "42.5% ad val." and inserting in lieu thereof "42.5% ad val., but in the case of ornamented fabrics not less than the rate which would apply to such fabrics if not ornamented"; and

(2) by striking out "90% ad val." and inserting in lieu thereof "90% ad val., but in the case of ornamented fabrics not less than the rate which would apply to such fabrics if not ornamented".

(b) TEXTILE FABRICS WITH TUCKS.—Item 357.60 (p. 147) is amended—

(1) by striking out "42.5% ad val." and inserting in lieu thereof "42.5% ad val., but not less than the rate which would apply to such fabrics without tucks"; and

(2) by striking out "90% ad val." and inserting in lieu thereof "90% ad val., but not less than the rate which would apply to such fabrics without tucks".

SEC. 15. BELTING AND BELTS FOR MACHINERY.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Items 358.05 and 358.10 (p. 147) and the article descriptions preceding such items are repealed and there is inserted in lieu thereof the following:

"		Belting and belts, for machinery, of textile fibers or of such fibers and rubber or plastics:		
	358.02	V-belts	8.5% ad val.	25% ad val.
		Other: Of vegetable fibers, or of such fibers and rubber or plastics:		
	358.05	Not in part of rubber or plastics	12% ad val.	30% ad val.
	358.06	In part of rubber or plastics	16% ad val.	30% ad val.
		Of wool:		
	358.08	Woven	37.5¢ per lb.+ 15% ad val.	50¢ per lb.+ 60% ad val.

358.09	Other	32% ad val.	50% ad val.
358.11	Of silk	27.5% ad val.	65% ad val.
358.14	Of man-made fibers	25¢ per lb.+ 30% ad val.	45¢ per lb.+ 65% ad val.
358.16	Other	12.5% ad val.	25% ad val.

(b) MACHINERY BELTS NOT CONTAINING TEXTILE FIBERS.—Item 773.35 (p. 395) is amended by striking out "vegetable fibers" and inserting in lieu thereof "textile fibers".

SEC. 16. SWISS-TYPE CURTAINS AND DRAPES.

Schedule 3, part 5, subpart C is amended—

(1) by striking out items 365.55, 365.60, and 365.65 and the article descriptions preceding item 365.55 (p. 152), and

(2) by striking out item 365.78 and the article description preceding such item (p. 153) and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

	Net furnishings made on a lace, net, or knitting machine, whether or not ornamented; and other furnishings, ornamented:		
	Of cotton:		
365.77	Curtains and drapes, including panels and valances, all the foregoing if machine-embroidered but not otherwise ornamented	30% ad val.	90% ad val.
365.78	Other	50% ad val.	90% ad val.

SEC. 17. LABELS OF MAN-MADE FIBERS.

Item 385.61 (p. 163) is amended by striking out "30% ad val." and inserting in lieu thereof "19% ad val.".

SEC. 18. LACTIC ACID.

Item 425.82 (p. 186) is amended by striknig out "12.5% ad val." and inserting in lieu thereof "16% ad val.", and by striking out "25% ad val." and inserting in lieu thereof "35% ad val.".

SEC. 19. ESTERS OF MONOHYDRIC ALCOHOLS.

The article description preceding item 428.50 (p. 188) is amended to read as follows: "Esters of monohydric alcohols and organic or inorganic acids (except hydrogen sulfide and hydrogen halide acids):".

SEC. 20. CELLULOSE COMPOUNDS; SURFACE-ACTIVE AGENTS.

(a) CELLULOSE COMPOUNDS.—Item 429.80 (p. 189) is repealed.

(b) CARBOXYMETHYL CELLULOSE SALTS.—Schedule 4, part 8, subpart A is amended by inserting after item 465.85 (p. 204) the following new item:

465.87	Carboxymethyl cellulose salts	16¢ per lb.	45¢ per lb.

(c) LIGNIN SULFONIC ACID AND ITS SALTS.—Schedule 4, part 8, subpart A is amended by inserting after item 465.90 (p. 204) the following new item:

465.92	Lignin sulfonic acid and its salts [1]	10% ad val.	20% ad val.

(d) CELLULOSE COMPOUNDS, NOT SPECIALLY PROVIDED FOR.—Schedule 4, part 13, subpart B is amended by inserting after item 493.16 (p. 221) the following new item:

493.18	Cellulose compounds, not specially provided for	16¢ per lb.	45¢ per lb.

(e) SURFACE ACTIVE AGENTS.—The headnote for part 8 of schedule 4 (p. 203) is amended by inserting after the first sentence a new sentence as follows: "This part also covers certain specified products which may or may not be surface-active agents."

SEC. 21. SYNTHETIC RESINS AND PLASTICS MATERIALS.

The headnotes for schedule 4, part 4, subpart A (p. 195) are amended—

(1) by striking out in headnote 1 "a plasticizer, filler, color, or extender" and inserting in lieu thereof "an antioxidant, color, dispersing agent, emulsifier, extender, filler, pesticide, plasticizer, or stabilizer"; and

(2) by striking out in headnote 2 "plasticizers, fillers, colors, or extenders" and inserting in lieu thereof "an antioxidant, color, dispersing agent, emulsifier, extender, filler, pesticide, plasticizer, or stabilizer".

SEC. 22. CONCRETE.

Schedule 5, part 1, subpart A, headnote 1 (p. 225) is amended by striking out paragraph (b) and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

"(b) the term 'concrete' means a composite of cementing materials of mineral origin with added mineral aggregate such as sand, crushed stone, or gravel; and".

SEC. 23. SUBPORCELAIN REFRACTORY ARTICLES.

Item 531.37 (p. 236) is amended by striking out "Porcelain refractory articles" and inserting in lieu thereof "Porcelain and subporcelain refractory articles".

SEC. 24. CERTAIN COLORED OR SPECIAL GLASS.

Items 542.75 and 542.77 (p. 246) and items 923.75 and 923.77 (p. 437) are each amended by striking out "90 united inches" and inserting in each place in lieu thereof "100 united inches".

SEC. 25. CERTAIN SEMIMANUFACTURED PLATINUM.

Item 605.07 (p. 261) is amended by striking out "Bars, plates, and sheets, all the foregoing not under 0.125 inch in thickness," and inserting in lieu thereof "Products having no dimension under 0.125 inch,".

SEC. 26. ROUND WIRE.

Schedule 6, part 2 is amended by striking out items 609.40 and 609.42 and the article descriptions preceding item 609.40 (p. 271) and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

	Round wire:		
	Other than alloy iron or steel:		
609.40	Under 0.060 inch in diameter	8.5% ad val.	25% ad val.
	0.060 inch or more in diameter:		
609.41	Containing not over 0.25 percent by weight of carbon	0.3¢ per lb.	1.25¢ per lb.
609.43	Containing over 0.25 percent by weight of carbon	8.5% ad val.	25% ad val.

SEC. 27. TABLEWARE AND OTHER HOUSEHOLD UTENSILS.

The headnotes for schedule 6, part 3, subpart E (p. 299) are amended by striking out headnote 4 and by redesignating headnotes 5 and 6 as headnotes 4 and 5, respectively; and the headnotes for schedule 6, part 3 (p. 291) are amended by adding at the end thereof the following new headnote:

"2. The provisions in this part which specifically refer to kitchen or tableware, or to table, kitchen, or household utensils and articles, include articles of types which are used outdoors as well as those which are used indoors."

SEC. 28. CERTAIN GALVANIZED WIRE.

(a) FENCING.—Item 642.35 (p. 293) is amended by striking out "not under 0.08 inch in diameter" and inserting in lieu thereof "not under 0.075 inch in diameter".

(b) CERTAIN WOVEN WIRE.—The article description preceding item 642.45 (p. 293) is amended by striking out "under 0.08 inch" and inserting in lieu thereof "under 0.075 inch".

(c) MILLINERS' WIRE.—Item 642.96 (p. 294) is amended by striking out "not under 0.08 inch in diameter" and inserting in lieu thereof "not under 0.075 inch in diameter".

SEC. 29. AUTOMOBILE, ETC., PARTS.

(a) HINGES AND FITTINGS, ETC.—Item 647.00 (p. 298) is repealed and there is inserted in lieu thereof the following:

	Of iron or steel, of aluminum, or of zinc:		
647.01	Hinges, fittings, and mountings, designed for motor vehicles	8.5% ad val.	25% ad val.
647.02	Other	19% ad val.	45% ad val.

(b) HAIRSPRINGS.—Schedule 6, part 3, subpart F is amended by inserting after item 652.85 (p. 306) the following new item:

652.86	Hairsprings	10% ad val.	65% ad val.

(c) LIGHTING EQUIPMENT DESIGNED FOR MOTOR VEHICLES.—Schedule 6, part 3, subpart F is amended by inserting after item 653.35 (p. 307) the following new item:

653.37	Lighting equipment designed for motor vehicles, and parts thereof	8.5% ad val.	25% ad val.

(d) PUMPS FOR LIQUIDS.—Item 660.90 (p. 310) is repealed and there is inserted in lieu thereof the following:

	Pumps for liquids, whether or not fitted with measuring devices; liquid elevators of bucket, chain, screw, band, and similar types; all the foregoing whether operated by hand or by any kind of power unit, and parts thereof:		
660.92	Fuel injection pumps for compression-ignition engines, and parts thereof	6% ad val.	35% ad val.
660.94	Other	10% ad val.	35% ad val.

(e) BALL BEARINGS WITH INTEGRAL SHAFTS.—Item 680.35 (p. 319) is repealed and there is inserted in lieu thereof the following:

	Ball or roller bearings, including such bearings with integral shafts, and parts thereof:		
680.34	Ball bearings with integral shafts.	12% ad val.	35% ad val.
680.35	Other	3.4¢ per lb.+ 15% ad val.	10¢ per lb.+ 45% ad val.

(f) REPAIR KITS.—Schedule 6, part 4, subpart J is amended by inserting after item 680.57 (p. 319) the following:

680.59	Kits, each containing three or more replacement parts however provided for elsewhere in the schedules, put up and packaged for the repair of hydraulic-brake master or wheel cylinders or for the repair of internal-combustion engine pumps or carburetors	10% ad val.	35% ad val.

(g) PARTS OF ELECTRICAL ARTICLES.—

(1) Subparagraph (vi) of headnote 1 (p. 321) for schedule 6, part 5, is amended to read as follows:

"(vi) electrical instruments and apparatus provided for in schedule 7.".

(2) The article description preceding item 682.70 (p. 321) is amended by inserting "; all the foregoing and parts thereof" after "electro-magnetic lifting heads".

(3) The article description for item 682.80 (p. 321) is amended by inserting "and parts thereof" after "holders".

(h) PERMANENT MAGNETS.—Item 682.70 (p. 321) is amended by striking out "18% ad val." and inserting in lieu thereof "16% ad val.".

(i) AUTOMATIC VOLTAGE-CURRENT REGULATORS.—Item 686.20 (p. 323) is repealed and there is inserted in lieu thereof the following:

	Automatic voltage and voltage-current regulators, with or without cut-out relays, and parts thereof:		
686.22	Designed for use in a 6-volt or 12-volt system	8.5% ad val.	25% ad val.
686.24	Other	15% ad val.	35% ad val.

(j) IGNITION WIRING SETS, ETC.—Schedule 6, part 5 is amended by inserting after item 688.10 (p. 324) the following:

688.12	Ignition wiring sets and wiring sets designed for use in motor vehicles and craft provided for in part 6 of schedule 6	10% ad val.	30% ad val.

(k) SPEEDOMETERS AND TACHOMETERS.—

(1) The headnotes for schedule 7, part 2, subpart D. (p. 344) are amended by striking out "711.99" in headnote 1 and inserting in lieu thereof "711.88", and by striking out "711.99, inclusive (except magnetic speedometers)," in headnote 2(a) and inserting in lieu thereof "711.88, inclusive,".

(2) Schedule 7, part 2, subpart D is amended by striking out items 711.90 to 711.98, inclusive, and the article descriptions for such items (p. 346) and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

	Revolution counters, production counters, taximeters, odometers, pedometers, counters similar to the foregoing articles, speedometers and tachometers, all the foregoing not provided for in subpart C of this part; parts of the foregoing:		
711.90	Taximeters and parts	42.5% ad val.	85% ad val.
711.91	Bicycle speedometers and parts thereof	55% ad val.	110% ad val.
711.98	Other	10% ad val.	35% ad val.

(3) Item 712.25 (p. 346) and the article description preceding such item are each amended by striking out "Tachometers and anemometers" and inserting in lieu thereof "Anemometers".

(l) FURNITURE DESIGNED FOR MOTOR VEHICLE USE.—Schedule 7, part 4, subpart A is amended by inserting after item 727.04 (p. 364) the following:

727.06	Furniture designed for motor-vehicle use, and parts thereof	8.5% ad val.	25% ad val.

SEC. 30. PICKS AND MATTOCKS.

Item 648.53 (p. 300) is amended by striking out "19% ad val." and inserting in lieu thereof "7.5% ad val.".

SEC. 31. FILES AND RASPS.

Items 649.05 and 649.07 (p. 300) are each amended by striking out "7 inches" and inserting in lieu thereof "6.75 inches".

SEC. 32. PENCIL SHARPENERS AND LEAD AND CRAYON POINTERS.

Schedule 6, part 3, subpart E, is amended by inserting after item 651.31 (p. 304) the following:

651.33	Pencil sharpeners and lead and crayon pointers, and parts thereof	17% ad val.	40% ad val.

SEC. 33. TREATMENT OF CERTAIN SETS.

(a) CERTAIN CAMPING AND PICNIC SETS.—Schedule 6, part 3, subpart E is amended by inserting after item 651.13 (p. 304) the following new item:

651.15	Camping and picnic sets each comprised of a knife, fork, and spoon, wholly of metal, and with each of the three pieces specially designed so as to permit their being compactly joined and held together when not in use	25% ad val.	60% ad val.

(b) DISSECTING TOOLS FITTED INTO CASES CONTAINING MICROSCOPES.—The headnotes for schedule 7, part 2, subpart A are amended by adding at the end thereof (p. 340) the following new headnote:

"4. Sets comprised of tools, implements, and other articles fitted into and imported with cases containing microscopes provided for in item 708.71, and ordinarily sold at retail, and used, in conjunction with such microscopes, are classifiable therewith."

(c) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—The article description for item 651.75 (p. 304) is amended by striking out "(except sewing sets, pedicure or manicure sets, and combinations thereof)" and inserting in lieu thereof "(except sets specially provided for)".

SEC. 34. HAND TOOLS.

The article description preceding item 651.39 (p. 304) is amended by inserting ", and parts thereof" after "Other hand tools".

SEC. 35. CHAIN AND CHAINS, AND PARTS THEREOF.

Schedule 6, part 3, subpart F (p. 305) is amended—

(1) by striking out "Chains used for the transmission of power" in the article descriptions preceding item 652.12 and inserting in lieu thereof "Chain or chains used for the transmission of power",

(2) by inserting "or chains" after "chain" in the article description for item 652.21, and

(3) by striking out the article description preceding item 652.24 and inserting in lieu thereof "Chain or chains (except the foregoing) the links of which are of stock essentially round in cross section, and parts thereof:", and by inserting after item 652.33 the following new item:

652.35	Other, including parts	19% ad val.	45% ad val.

SEC. 36. HORSE SHOES.

Schedule 6, part 3, subpart F is amended by striking out item 652.40 (p. 305) and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

	Horse and mule shoes of base metal:		
652.41	Of iron or steel	0.25¢ per lb.	0.25¢ per lb.
652.42	Other	19% ad val.	45% ad val.

SEC. 37. MISCELLANEOUS METAL PRODUCTS.

The article description preceding item 653.85 (p. 307) is amended by striking out "Not enameled:" and inserting in lieu thereof "Not enameled or glazed with vitreous glasses:", and item 653.97 is amended by striking out "Enameled" and inserting in lieu thereof "Enameled or glazed with vitreous glasses".

SEC. 38. JACQUARD CARDS; PARTS OF TAPS, VALVES, ETC.

(a) JACQUARD CARDS.—Schedule 6, part 4, headnote 1 (p. 309) is amended by striking out "(iv) jacquard cards;" and by redesignating subparagraphs (v) and (vi) as subparagraphs (iv) and (v), respectively.

(b) PARTS OF TAPS, VALVES, ETC.—The article description preceding item 680.20 (p. 319) is amended by striking out "check:" and inserting in lieu thereof "check, and parts thereof:".

SEC. 39. SYNCHRONOUS MOTORS; COMMUTATORS.

(a) SYNCHRONOUS MOTORS.—The article description for item 682.20 (p. 321) is amended by inserting ", valued not over $4 each" after "Synchronous".

(b) COMMUTATORS.—Schedule 6, part 5 is amended by inserting after item 682.50 (p. 321) the following:

682.52	Commutators	12.5% ad val.	35% ad val.

SEC. 40. TELEVISION PICTURE TUBES.

Items 687.50 and 687.60 (p. 324) and the article description preceding such items are amended to read as follows:

	Electronic tubes (except X-ray tubes); photocells; transistors and other related electronic crystal components; mounted piezoelectric crystals; all the foregoing and parts thereof:		
687.50	Television picture tubes	30% ad val.	60% ad val.
687.60	Other	12.5% ad val.	35% ad val.

SEC. 41. INSULATED CONDUCTORS WITHOUT FITTINGS.

Item 688.05 (p. 324) is repealed and there is inserted in lieu thereof the following:

	Without fittings:		
688.04	Containing (exclusive of insulation and sheathing) over 10 percent by weight of the metal copper	17% ad val.	40% ad val.
688.06	Other	15% ad val.	35% ad val.

SEC. 42. BRAKE REGULATORS.

Item 690.35 (p. 325) is amended by inserting ", except brake regulators" after "provided for in item 690.15".

SEC. 43. HEADWEAR OF PANDAN.

Item 702.35 (p. 333) is amended by inserting "or of pandan" after "Of palm leaf".

SEC. 44. HEADWEAR OF FUR NOT ON THE SKIN.

The article description preceding item 703.20 (p. 334) is amended by striking out "of fur felt" and inserting in lieu thereof "of fur not on the skin".

SEC. 45. ANESTHETIC APPARATUS; STETHOSCOPES.

(a) ANESTHETIC APPARATUS.—Schedule 7, part 2, subpart B is amended by inserting between item 709.07 and the article description preceding it (p. 342) the following new item:

709.06	Anesthetic apparatus and instruments (except syringes)	19% ad val.	45% ad val.

(b) STETHOSCOPES.—Item 709.10 (p. 342) is amended by inserting "and stethoscopes" after "Percussion hammers".

SEC. 46. SURVEYING COMPASSES AND PARTS THEREOF.

Item 710.12 (p. 343) is amended by striking out "11.5% ad val." and inserting in lieu thereof "28% ad val.".

SEC. 47. COMPARATORS.

Item 710.88 (p. 344) is amended by striking out "Comparators, comparator benches" and inserting in lieu thereof "Comparator benches".

SEC. 48. COMBINATION ARTICLES CONTAINING WATCH OR CLOCK MOVEMENTS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Schedule 7, part 2, subpart E is amended by inserting after headnote 4 (p. 349) the following new headnote:

"5. COMBINATION ARTICLES CONTAINING WATCH OR CLOCK MOVEMENTS.—A watch or clock movement (and its dial, if any) in a combination article is classifiable under the provision applicable to such combination article, but, in determining the duties on the combination article, the movement (and its dial, if any) shall be constructively separated therefrom and assessed with the same rate as would have applied if it had been imported separately. In such circumstances, the movement and its dial shall also be subject to the same marking requirements provided for in headnote 4 of this subpart. However, such separate assessment and special marking shall not be applicable to movements which, when imported, are installed as the usual equipment of vehicles or craft provided for in part 6 of schedule 6 or as integral and essential parts of laboratory, industrial, or commercial apparatus or equipment."

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Items 711.65 and 711.70 and the article description preceding such items (p. 345) are repealed and there is inserted in lieu thereof the following new item:

"	711.67	Other	14% ad val.	50% ad val.	"

SEC. 49. EDITORS, AND COMBINATION EDITOR-SPLICERS, FOR MOTION-PICTURE FILMS.

Item 722.52 (p. 356) is amended—

(1) by striking out "11.5% ad val." and inserting in lieu thereof "35% ad val.", and

(2) by striking out "35% ad val." and inserting in lieu thereof "45% ad val.".

SEC. 50. HALF-TONE SCREENS MADE PHOTOGRAPHICALLY ON PLASTICS MATERIAL.

Schedule 7, part 2, subpart F is amended by striking out item 722.84 (p. 357) and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

"		Half-tone screens designed for use in engraving or photographic processes:			
	722.83	Made photographically on plastics material	8.5% ad val.	25% ad val.	
	722.85	Other	27.5% ad val.	55% ad val.	"

SEC. 51. HEAT-SENSITIVE PAPERS

Item 723.35 (p. 357) is amended by striking out "15% ad val." and inserting in lieu thereof "7.5% ad val.".

SEC. 52. RECORDINGS ON MAGNETIC TAPE, ETC.

Item 724.40 (p. 358) is amended—

(1) by striking out "0.25¢ per sq. in." and inserting in lieu thereof "2¢ per sq. ft.", and

(2) by striking out "1¢ per sq. in." and inserting in lieu thereof "8¢ per sq. ft.".

SEC. 53. ELECTRONIC MUSICAL INSTRUMENTS.

Schedule 7, part 3, subpart A is amended by striking out item 725.45 (p. 360) and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

"		Electronic musical instruments:			
	725.46	Fretted stringed instruments	34% ad val.	40% ad val.	
	725.47	Other	17% ad val.	40% ad val.	"

SEC. 54. PLAYING CARDS.

Item 734.25 (p. 371) is amended by striking out "5% ad val." and inserting in lieu thereof "4% ad val.".

SEC. 55. COSTUME JEWELRY; JEWELRY MATERIALS.

(a) COSTUME JEWELRY.—Schedule 7, part 6, subpart A is amended by striking out items 740.35 and 740.37 (p. 376) and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

"		Valued over 20 cents per dozen pieces or parts:			
	740.35	Watch bracelets valued over $5 per dozen	35% ad val.	110% ad val.	
	740.37	Other	55% ad val.	110% ad val.	"

(b) JEWELRY MATERIALS.—The article description preceding item 740.70 (p. 376) is amended by striking out "not over 0.5 inch in any cross-sectional dimension,".

SEC. 56. BUCKLES AND BUCKLE SLIDES.

Schedule 7, part 7, subpart A is amended by striking out items 745.45 and 745.47 and the article description preceding item 745.45 (p. 380) and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

"	745.45	Buckles and buckle slides	19% ad val.	45% ad val.	"

SEC. 57. JEWELRY CLASPS.

Item 745.67 (p. 380) is repealed and there is inserted in lieu thereof the following:

"		Valued over 20 cents per dozen pieces or parts:			
	745.66	Of precious metal except silver (including rolled precious metal except silver)	24% ad val.	80% ad val.	
	745.68	Other	55% ad val.	110% ad val.	"

SEC. 58. SLIDE FASTENER PARTS.

The article description preceding item 745.70 (p. 380) is amended by striking out "Slide fasteners, and parts thereof:" and inserting in lieu thereof "Slide fasteners, and parts thereof including tapes in continuous lengths but not including tapes wholly of textile fibers:".

SEC. 59. DRIED WREATHS, ETC.

Schedule 7, part 7, subpart B is amended by striking out item 748.35 (p. 381) and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

"		Bouquets, boutonnieres, corsages, wreaths, and similar ornamental articles, all the foregoing made of articles described in item 748.30 or item 748.32:			
	748.34	Wholly or almost wholly of articles described in item 748.30	10% ad val.	20% ad val.	
	748.36	Other	25.5% ad val.	75% ad val.	"

SEC. 60. ELECTRIC TOOTHBRUSHES.

Subparagraph (1) of headnote 1 for schedule 7, part 8, subpart A (p. 383) is amended to read as follows:

"(1) mechanical combs, brooms, or brushes (other than combs or brushes which are toilet articles), or combs, brooms, or brushes which are parts of articles (other than toilet articles);".

SEC. 61. FIREWORKS.

Item 755.15 (p. 385) is amended by striking out "32% ad val." in column 1 and "42% ad val." in column 2 and by inserting in lieu thereof in each column "12¢ per lb., including the weight of all coverings, packing material, and wrappings".

SEC. 62. RUBBER AND PLASTICS FILM, STRIPS, SHEETS, AND PLATES.

The headnotes for schedule 7, part 12, subpart B (p. 392) are amended—

(1) by striking out "21 inches" in headnotes 1(b) and 2(iv)(B) and inserting in lieu thereof "15 inches", and

(2) by striking out "51 inches" in headnotes 1(b) and 2(iv)(C) and inserting in lieu thereof "18 inches".

SEC. 63. COLOSTOMY BAGS.

Item 772.42 (p. 394) is amended by inserting "colostomy bags," after "enema bags,".

SEC. 64. FLY RIBBONS.

Schedule 7, part 13, subpart A is amended by inserting after item 790.10 (p. 397) the following new item:

"	790.15	Fly ribbons (ribbon fly catchers)	14% ad val.	35% ad val.	"

SEC. 65. SAUSAGE CASINGS.

Item 790.45 (p. 397) is amended by striking out "16% ad val." and inserting in lieu thereof "12.5% ad val.".

SEC. 66. ARTICLES OF HAIR NOT SPECIALLY PROVIDED FOR.

Schedule 7, part 13, subpart C is amended by adding after item 792.70 (p. 399) the following new item:

"	792.75	Of hair	14% ad val.	35% ad val.	"

SEC. 67. ARTICLES ASSEMBLED ABROAD.

The article descripton for item 807.00 (p. 408) is amended to read as follows: "Articles assembled abroad in whole or in part of fabricated components, the product of the United States, which (a) were exported, in condition ready for assembly without further fabrication, for the purpose of such assembly and return to the United States, (b) have not lost their physical identity in such articles by change in form, shape, or otherwise, and (c) have not been advanced in value or improved in condition abroad except by being assembled and except by operations incidental to the assembly process such as cleaning, lubricating, and painting."

SEC. 68. COCONUT, PALM-KERNEL, AND PALM OILS, SULFONATED OR SULFATED.

Item 907.77 (p. 433) is amended by striking out "17.5% ad val." and inserting in lieu thereof "14% ad val.".

SEC. 69. IMPORT RESTRICTIONS PROCLAIMED PURSUANT TO SECTION 22 OF AGRICULTURAL ADJUSTMENT ACT.

Headnote 2 (p. 441) for part 3 of the appendix to the Tariff Schedules is amended—

(1) by striking out "or for the personal use of the importer;" at the end of paragraph (b) and inserting in lieu thereof "for the personal use of the importer, or for research;", and

(2) by striking out "articles not exceeding 100 pounds in aggregate weight in any shipment, if entered for exhibition, display, or sampling at a Trade Fair, or for research, and if" at the beginning of paragraph (c) and inserting in lieu thereof "articles entered for exhibition, display, or sampling at a Trade Fair or for research, but only if".

The SPEAKER. Is a second demanded?

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, I demand a second.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that a second be considered as ordered.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 10 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, the purpose of H.R. 12253, which was unanimously reported by the Committee on Ways and Means, is to provide clarifying language and to correct certain errors and inadvertencies in the tariff schedules of the United States—TSUS—which were put into effect August 31, 1963, by Presidential proclamation, which was issued under the authority of the Tariff Classification Act of 1962.

As Members will recall, the new tariff schedules which are now in effect constitute a comprehensive revision and consolidation of prior provisions of the customs laws under which imported articles were classified for tariff purposes. These schedules were prepared by the Tariff Commission under title I of the Customs Simplification Act of 1954, which directed the Commission to make a comprehensive study of prior tariff laws and to compile a revision and consolidation which would be logical, adapted to the changes which had occurred since 1930 an import trade, eliminate anomalies, and simplify tariff classifications.

In the course of making its comprehensive study, the Tariff Commission conducted numerous public hearings, and its staff held countless informal conferences with interested parties. In November 1960 the Commission transmitted to the Congress the results of its study. The report and the new tariff schedules were published by the Committee on Ways and Means.

In August 1961 our committee invited interested parties to submit comments on the provisions of the proposed new schedules and also on proposed implementing legislation. Suggestions made in response to this invitation were carefully considered by the committee prior to reporting the bill which became the Tariff Classification Act of 1962.

The Tariff Commission, acting under authority contained in the Tariff Classification Act of 1962, continued the tariff study and conducted further public hearings in connection with changes in the revised tariff schedules, which were included in supplemental reports to the Congress and to the President, as provided for in the 1962 act.

Even though the new tariff schedules have been in effect for less than 1 year, it is already apparent that they represent a substantial improvement over the disorganized and unsystematic structure which they superseded. The new schedules have already proved helpful in facilitating the work of Government agencies with responsibilities related to tariff matters, of the Congress, and of the interested public. As further experience is gained in the use of the new schedules they will undoubtedly prove to be of additional benefit to all persons interested in the import trade of the United States.

The import trade of the United States is diversified and involves literally hundreds of thousands of different foreign products. Due to the enormity of the task of revision, the Committee on Ways and Means was aware of the fact that the actual administration of the new tariff schedules very probably would bring to light unintended rate changes and other inadvertencies or oversights which would require corrective legislation. Shortly after the new schedules were placed in effect on August 31, 1963, the committee's attention was directed to several such instances. In an effort to treat with such matters on a comprehensive basis, the Ways and Means Committee, on December 13, 1963, invited all interested parties to make suggestions limited to those provisions of the TSUS wherein it appears that through, first, oversight or inadvertencies or, second, lack of information, errors have been made or clarifying language may be necessary.

In this announcement, the committee expressly stated that it did not intend to entertain and consider matters that had been previously presented to the Tariff Commission or to the committee during the period of several years when the new schedules were being formulated, unless such matters came within the limited criteria of the announcement. In other words, the committee directed its attention only to the correction of provisions in the new tariff schedules which clearly involved errors arising from oversight, inadvertence or lack of information or which required clarification.

Interested parties submitted over 250 briefs with suggested changes in the provisions of the new schedules. Many of these submissions were cumulative in nature and involved the same subject matter. The Committee on Ways and Means carefully considered these submissions and, with the assistance of consultants from the Tariff Commission and other interested departments, has worked out the changes in the new tariff schedules set forth in the bill now before you.

As you will note from the report on the bill, the committee, however, was not able in the limited time available to evaluate and resolve all of the matters which were brought to its attention. Additional studies to further consider the remaining matters which appear to meet the criteria of the announcement of December 13, 1963, can be undertaken at a future date.

The amendments provided for in H.R. 12253 in some instances would increase the rates of duty on imported articles and in other instances would decrease the rates of duty. A number of the amendments are merely clarifying in nature and would involve no changes in rates of duty on imported products. It should be emphasized that generally speaking the rate changes provided for are for the purpose of restoring to the particular imported articles involved the actual or approximate tariff rate levels that had previously applied under the old tariff provisions in effect prior to August 31, 1963. In some cases this involved arriving at a weighted average of several different rates.

The amendments provided for in H.R. 12253 would become effective with respect to articles entered, or withdrawn from warehouse, for consumption after the 60th day after the date of enactment. Special provision is made, however, under which amendments resulting in smaller amounts of duty would be given retroactive effect with respect to entries and withdrawals made on or after August 31, 1963. No increase in the rate of duty would apply retroactively.

Mr. Speaker, the amendments to the bill are merely clerical in nature.

Mr. Speaker, following my remarks I will include a tabulation showing the section numbers of the bill, the articles involved, and the general nature of the changes made.

Mr. Speaker, I want to again state that the gentlemen who did the staff work on the Tariff Classification Act of 1962 and these revisions here today are deserving of the highest commendation. They have spent endless hours patiently and tirelessly reviewing material, holding conferences, meeting with the committees of the Congress, drafting legislation and so on. In particular, I wish to mention Mr. Russell Shewmaker, General Counsel of the Tariff Commission who has lived with this subject ever since 1954.

The executive departments having an interest in H.R. 12253 are unanimous in their support of the bill and recommend its prompt passage.

Tabulation showing nature of changes

Section	Article	Item	Nature of change					
			Purpose	+	−	±	0	Amount
4	Usual containers, filled		Clarify				X	
5	Grape juice	165.40	Rate	X				9 to 50 cents per gallon.
6	Florist articles	192.20	Clarify				X	
7(a)	Wooden harvesting bins	204.30	New provision (204.27)		X			16⅔ percent to free.
7(b)	Agricultural sprayers	662.45	Clarify rate		X			10 percent to free.
8	Wooden cases covered or lined with cloth	204.50; 256.48–256.50	do			X		8.5 to 5 percent; 4 to 5 percent.
9	Gasketing material of ground cork and rubber	Various	New provision (220.25)		X			17 percent and 12.5 to 10 percent.
10	Wood particle board	245.50	Rate	X				12 to 20 percent.
11	Shoeboard	251.49	Clarify rate	X				4.75 to 6.75 percent.

Tabulation showing nature of changes—Continued

Section	Article	Item	Nature of change				
			Purpose	+	−	±	0	Amount
12	Rubber or plastics covered fabrics; articles of such covered fabrics:	355.65-355.85	Clarify rate				X	
	Manmade fabrics	355.80	New provision (355.81)		X			25 cents per pound plus 30 to 12.5 percent.
	Headwear	703.72			X			Various to 12.5 percent.
	Gloves	705.84-705.86			X			Various.
	Luggage	706.24; 706.60			X			40 to 20 percent.
13(a)	Measure of yarns	305.14	Clarify				X	
13(b)	Vegetable fiber (except cotton) fabrics containing manmade fibers.	335.80-335.90; 338.30	Correct avoidance of higher rate.	X				6.5 and 10 percent to 25 cents per pound plus 22.5 percent.
14	Ornamented fabrics; fabrics with tucks	353.50; 357.60	Correct possible avoidance of higher rates.	X				Various to 42.5 percent.
15	Belting and belts for machinery:							
	V-belts	358.05-358.10	Clarify rate		X			16 to 8.5 percent.
	Other	358.30-358.60	Clarify				X	
16	Swiss-type curtains and drapes	365.55-365.65; 365.78	Clarify rate		X			50 to 30 percent.
17	Labels of manmade fibers	385.61	Recent court ruling		X			30 to 19 percent.
18	Lactic acid	425.82	Reaveraging rates	X				12.5 to 16 percent.
19	Esters of monohydric alcohols	428.50-428.72	Clarify				X	
20	Cellulose compounds; lignin	Various	Clarify rate	X				Various to 16 cents per pound.
	Sulfonic acid and its salts	do	Clarify				X	
21	Non-coal-tar synthetic resins and plastic materials	Pt. 4-A, schedule 4	do		X			Various.
22	Concrete	Pt. 1-A, schedule 5	do				X	
23	Subporcelain refractory articles	531.37	Rate	X				15 to 45 percent.
24	Certain colored or special glass	542.75-542.77; 923.75-923.77	Consistency with ordinary glass.		X			1.4 cents per pound to 1.1 cents per pound; 2.4 cents per pound to 1.9 cents per pound.
25	Certain manufactured platinum	605.07	Clarify rate		X			40 percent to free.
26	Round wire	609.42	New provision (609.43) to avoid rate decrease.	X				0.3 cents per pound to 8.5 percent.
27	Tableware and other household utensils	Pts. 3-E and 3-F, schedule 6	Clarify court ruling			X		Minimal changes.
28	Certain galvanized wire fencing and wire	642.35; 642.45-642.47; 642.96	Court ruling		X			Various.
29(a)	Motor vehicle hinges and fittings	647.00	Rate		X			19 to 8.5 percent.
29(b)	Hairsprings	652.87	New provision (652.86); rate		X			19 to 10 percent.
29(c)	Motor vehicle lighting equipment	653.40	New provision (653.37); rate		X			19 to 8.5 percent.
29(d)	Pumps for liquids	660.90	Reaveraged rates (subdivided).	X				12 to 6 percent. 12 to 10 percent.
29(e)	Ball bearings with integral	660.90; 680.35	Clarify				X	
29(f)	Repair kits	Various	Ease administration		X			Various to 10 percent.
29(g)	Parts of electrical articles	Pt. 5, schedule 6	Clarify rate			X		Various.
29(h)	Permanent magnets	682.70	Reaverage rate		X			18 to 16 percent.
29(i)	Motor vehicle automatic voltage-current regulators	686.20	Rate		X			15 to 8.5 percent.
29(j)	Ignition and certain other wiring sets	688.15	New provision (688.12); rate		X			17 to 10 percent.
29(k)	Speedometers and tachometers	711.90-.98	Rate		X			Various.
29(l)	Motor vehicle furniture	Pt. 4-A, schedule 7	do		X			Various to 8.5 percent.
30	Picks and mattocks	648.53	Reaverage rate		X			19 to 7.5 percent.
31	Files and rasps	649.05-649.07	Clarify 7-inch only		X			28 cents per dozen to 17.5 cents per dozen.
32	Pencil sharpeners and lead and crayon pointers	651.47; 651.55	Clarify				X	
33(a)	Knife-fork-spoon picnic set	Various	Clarify rate		X			Various to 25 percent.
33(b)	Microscope with dissecting kit	651.75	do		X			Do.
34	Handtool parts	651.39-651.55	Clarify			X		
35	Chain and chains	652.12-652.38	do				X	
36	Aluminum horseshoes	652.40	New provision (652.42); rate	X				0.25 cents per pound to 19 percent.
37	Miscellaneous metal products	653.85-653.97	Clarify				X	
38(a)	Jacquard cards	670.56	do				X	
	Parts of taps, valves, etc	680.20-680.22	Rate	X				Various.
39(a)	Synchronous motors valued over $4 each	682.20	do		X			50 to 12.5 percent.
39(b)	Commutators	682.60	do		X			15 to 12.5 percent.
40	Television picture tubes	687.50	do	X				12 to 30 percent.
41	Insulated conductors of copper	688.05	New provision (688.04); rate	X				15 to 17 percent.
42	Brake regulators for railway cars	690.35	Rate		X			18 to 11.5 percent.
43	Headwear of pandan	702.37	do		X			10 to 6.25 percent.
44	Headwear of fur not on the skin	703.20-703.55	Clarify				X	
45	Anesthetic apparatus; stethoscopes	709.27	Court rulings		X			36 to 19 percent.
46	Surveying compasses	710.12	Rate	X				11.5 to 28 percent.
47	Comparators	710.88	Clarify				X	
48	Combination articles containing watch or clock movements.	Various	Correct possible avoidance of higher rates.	X				Various.
49	Motion-picture editors	722.52	Bureau ruling	X				11.5 to 35 percent.
50	Halftone screens made photographically on plastics	722.84	New provision (722.83); rate		X			27.5 to 8.5 percent.
51	Heat-sensitive papers	723.35	Reaverage rates		X			15 to 7.5 percent.
52	Recordings on magnetic tape	724.40	do		X			0.25 cents per square inch to 2 cents per square foot.
53	Electronic musical instruments	725.45	New provision (725.46); rate	X				17 to 34 percent.
54	Playing cards	734.25	Rate		X			5 to 4 percent.
55(a)	Costume jewelry valued over $5 per dozen	740.35-740.37	Rate	X				35 to 55 percent.
55(b)	Jewelry chain, etc	740.70-740.80, various	Clarify			X		Various.
56	Buckles and buckle slides	745.45-745.47	Rate		X			55 to 19 percent.
57	Jewelry clasps	745.67	New provision (745.66); rate		X			55 to 24 percent.
58	Slide fastener parts	745.74	Clarify rate		X			50 to 20 percent.
59	Dried wreaths, etc	748.35	Rate		X			25.5 to 10 percent.
60	Electric toothbrushes	683.32; 750.40	do	X				12 to 0.8 cents each plus 17 percent.
61	Fireworks	755.15	do		X			32 to 12 cents per pound.
62	Rubber and plastic film, strips, sheets, and plates:							
	Acrylic plastics	Pts 12-B and 12-D, schedule 7.	Redefinition to avoid rate changes.	X				17 percent to 17 cents per pound.
	Other	do	do		X			Various.
63	Colostomy bags	772.42; 774.25; 744.60	Rate		X			17 to 12.5 percent.
64	Fly ribbons	256.90	New provisions (790.15); rate		X			17.5 to 14 percent.
65	Sausage casings	790.45	Reaverage rates; court ruling		X			16 to 12.5 percent.
66	Articles of hair not specially provided for	Pt. 14, schedule 7	Clarify			X		Various.
67	Articles assembled abroad	807.00	do				X	
68	Coconut, palm-kernel, and palm oils, sulfonated or sulfated.	907.77	Rate		X			17.5 to 14 percent.
69	Import restrictions under sec. 22 of Agricultural Adjustment Act, exceptions.	Pt. 3, appendix to TSUS	Eliminate administrative burdens.				X	

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLS. I yield.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. I, too, want to thank the gentlemen who have worked on this thankless task of correcting the errors made in this act. There are still some errors remaining, there are still some problems in connection with them that will need adjustment. It is the intention of the chairman and the rest of the committee, as I understand it, at our first opportunity to arrive at a solution of those problems. But this bill is before us because these items that are in this bill are items on which the committee came to an adjustment and a conclusion that we believe is equitable in the matter.

As to other items, because of the problems involved, we were not able to act on them at this time, primarily because of the time element. The passage of this bill does not mean that these other items will not be considered by the committee. This is spelled out in the committee report.

Mr. MILLS. I wanted to make that clear. I had intended to emphasize that. I concur fully in what the gentleman from Wisconsin said.

May I repeat: We have a few more mistakes that are not included in this bill but that appear to exist under the new tariff schedules. There will be other mistakes of which we are not now aware that will be called to the attention of the Bureau of Customs and the Tariff Commission as well and then to us. But certainly there are others we know about today that we have not been able to include because we have not been able to reach conclusions as to what we should do.

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLS. I yield to the gentleman from New York, my colleague on the committee.

Mr. KEOGH. In line with the statement of the gentleman from Wisconsin, and not intending it to be exclusive, would the distinguished gentleman from Arkansas agree with me that such things as the problem of these button blanks would fall into the category of the type of problem that remains before our committee.

Mr. MILLS. No; I cannot agree with my friend that the button blank problem is on all fours with the problems we have here, as to which I was referring.

Mr. KEOGH. No; I did not intend to say that it is the same as this matter before us. I mean to say that it would fall in the type of continuing problems coming before our committee. For example, flat silverware is another one.

Mr. MILLS. The button blank problem is not the problem to which the gentleman from Wisconsin is referring.

Mr. KEOGH. Would the gentleman from Arkansas concede with me that there is a problem as to the button blanks?

Mr. MILLS. Absolutely, it is a problem and I think it must be resolved, but I think it is not a problem that we can characterize as one of error, omission, or inadvertence.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLS. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. While the matter of button blanks is being discussed, I would like to say it is my belief, at least, and I think it is the belief of many others that what has happened here is that the importers of these button blanks or those who are sending imports into this country in that area have discovered a loophole whereby they are really avoiding the duty that is supposed to be paid. It does not arise out of the classification and it would be my hope, and I think it would be the hope of the chairman also, that at least that be considered in the committee at the earliest date possible and that possibly even during this session a bill to correct that and close that loophole that has developed.

Mr. MILLS. I would agree with the gentleman from Wisconsin; this is, I think, a situation that we could properly characterize as a loophole and that whenever we find loopholes in the tariff act, we should close it as rapidly as we possibly can.

Mr. BETTS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLS. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio, a member of the committee.

Mr. BETTS. Mr. Speaker, I support this bill. I want to thank the chairman for his efforts in getting this bill to the floor of the House for our consideration. As the gentleman knows, there are several provisions here included in the bill that I introduced along with the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCHNEEBELI], and the gentlewoman from Michigan [Mrs. GRIFFITHS]. I think these items and other items deserve the consideration of the committee and the consideration that the chairman has given to them. I associate myself with the remarks of the gentleman.

Mr. MILLS. Let me say to my friend, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BETTS] that here again he demonstrates the type of service that he and all members of the Committee on Ways and Means constantly render not only to the people of their individual districts but to the people of the United States because this matter came to our attention as it is presented by the members of the Committee on Ways and Means initially. This is the result of what they themselves were told to be the case with respect to the four items that have been mentioned.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLS. I yield.

Mr. GROSS. Would the gentleman say on balance that the errors that have been made through inadvertence or otherwise were in favor of higher duties or lower duties?

Mr. MILLS. I would say actually that some rates are raised, some lowered, and many are just clarified, but I would say frankly, it is my thought that there are probably more cases in total where there is really no change within the rate of duty itself—no change at all.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, the chairman of the committee has stated this matter very well. This is a technical bill that is before us which was reported out unanimously by the Committee on Ways and Means with the suggestion that this was an appropriate matter to bring up under suspension of the rules.

I do want to call the attention of my colleagues of the committee to the report accompanying the bill which is a very well written report. It spells out the 69 areas where these technical changes have been made. Other than that I would just like to emphasize the procedures that the Committee on Ways and Means followed in considering this matter because I thought that it was exemplary.

On page 2 I read the language:

> In the belief that there might be other such instances, your committee issued on December 13, 1963, an announcement inviting all interested parties and groups to submit written statements and briefs for suggested changes and revisions to your committee.
>
> Your committee's announcement expressly stated, however, that the consideration of such requests would be limited to those situations which came within the criteria explicitly set forth therein, i.e., those instances with respect to which a prima facie case could be made that through oversight or inadvertence or lack of information, errors were made in the new schedules or that clarifying language might be necessary.

To the chairman's credit, these criteria were followed throughout the hearings and executive sessions of the Ways and Means Committee.

Finally I would observe that there are other matters which did not fit within those criteria, as pointed up by the gentleman from Wisconsin, Congressman BYRNES, and by the chairman of the committee, which the committee will look into in the future.

I wholeheartedly recommend the passage of the bill.

Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. BYRNES].

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include a table.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, the chairman of our committee has given you the background leading up to our decision to consider any errors, omissions and inadvertences that may have resulted from the new tariff schedules which went into effect last August 31. Let me state, however, for the record that in our original press release, announcing that we would consider such matters, we narrowly defined the scope of our consideration. This was done at my suggestion.

I am sure that most of us have certain areas of the tariff schedules which we would like to see changed in some way, and that they are not contained in this bill. I know I do. Nonetheless, we on the committee faced a dilemma. Either

we confined ourselves to those matters resulting directly from the new schedules and pass a bill this year, or we opened up the whole of the tariff schedules and ran the risk of accomplishing nothing this year.

Events have proven, Mr. Speaker, that the former was the right decision. Here we are in the final days of the 88th Congress and we are just today acting on the bill.

Two categories of problem areas are not contained in this bill. First, there were those in which a prima facie case was made that an error resulted from the new tariff schedules, but further study on the part of the committee was required. In an effort to at least act on matters where we had full information and full committee agreement, these were passed over, but without prejudice to their merit. Second, we did not consider matters calling to our attention, or pending before the committee, which were outside the scope of our press release. These matters did not result directly from the new tariff schedules. In other words, in most cases they were problems that existed under the old schedules, were not remedied by the new schedules and, therefore, still exist. Of course, in not considering these many items we did, in no way, prejudice our later consideration of them. I offer for the RECORD a list of the articles included, and those not included in this bill.

Articles included in H.R. 12253 and those not included

Article	In bill (section number and page)	Not in bill
Agricultural bins and sprayers	7 (a) & (b), p. 5.	
Aluminum, continuous cast		X
Anesthetic apparatus; stethoscopes.	45, p. 24	
Articles assembled abroad	67, p. 31	
Automobile, etc., parts:		
Automatic voltage-current regulators.	29(i), p. 18	
Ball bearings with integral shafts.	29(e), p. 17	
Electrical articles, parts of	29(g), p. 18	
Furniture designed for motor vehicle use.	29(i), p. 20	
Hairsprings	29(a), p. 16	
Hinges and fittings, etc	29, p. 16	
Ignition wiring sets, etc	29(j), p. 19	
Lighting equipment designed for motor vehicles.	29(c), p. 17	
Permanent magnets	29(h), p. 18	
Pumps for liquids	29(d), p. 17	
Repair kits	29(f), p. 18	
Speedometers	29(k), p. 19	
Tachometers	29(k), p. 19	
Belting and belts for machinery	15, p. 11	
Boxes and cases, certain, covered or lined with textile fabrics.	8, p. 5	
Brake regulators	42, p. 24	
Buckles and buckle slides	56, p. 28	
Cadmium sticks, extruded		X
Camping and picnic sets, certain	33(a), p. 20	
Cane splits for musical reeds		X
Cellulose compounds	20(d), p. 13	
Colostomy bags	63, p. 30	
Commutators	39(b), p. 23	
Concrete	22, p. 14	
Conductors, insulated without fittings.	41, p. 24	
Containers not imported empty	4, p. 4	
Diffraction apparatus (X-ray)		X
Dissecting tools fitted into cases containing microscopes.	33(b), p. 21	
Editors and combination editor-splicers for motion picture films.	49, p. 26	
Electronic musical instruments	53, p. 28	
Esters of monohydric alcohols	19, p. 12	
Fabrics, ornamented	14(a), p. 10	
Fabrics with tucks	14(b), p. 10	
Files and rasps	31, p. 20	
Fireworks	61, p. 30	
Florist articles	6, p. 4	
Fly ribbons	64, p. 31	
Gasketing materials of ground or pulverized cork	9, p. 6	

Articles included in H.R. 12253 and those not included—Continued

Article	In bill (section number and page)	Not in bill
Grape juice	5, p. 4	
Halftone screens made photographically on plastics material.	50, p. 27	
Handkerchiefs, made in the Philippines		X
Handkerchiefs, ornamented		X
Hanging paper		X
Headwear of fur not on the skin	44, p. 24	
Horseshoes	36, p. 22	
Infants' knit footwear		X
Instantaneous water heaters		X
Insulated conductors without fittings.	41, p. 24	
Jewelry clasps	57, p. 29	
Jewelry, costume	55(a), p. 28	
Kerosene hurricane lamps		X
Labels of manmade fibers	17, p. 12	
Lactic acid	18, p. 12	
Magentic tape, recordings on, etc	52, p. 27	
Masks		X
Mattocks and picks	30, p. 20	
Musical instruments, electronic	53, p. 28	
Metal tanks		X
Methylene chloride		X
Mistblowers and dusters		X
Musical instruments, electronic	53, p. 28	
Newsprint cores		X
Paint boxes, children's metal		X
Paint rollers		X
Paper cut to size or shape		X
Papers, heat-sensitive	51, p. 27	
Pencil sharpeners and lead and crayon pointers.	32, p. 20	
Perfume atomizer bases		X
Picks and mattocks	30, p. 20	
Picnic and camping sets, certain	33(a), p. 20	
Plastics and rubber film, strips, sheets, and plates.	62, p. 30	
Platinum, certain semimanufactured.	25, p. 15	
Rasps and files	31, p. 20	
Recordings on magnetic tape, etc	52, p. 27	
Refractory articles, subporcelain	23, p. 14	
Round wire	26, p. 15	
Rubber and plastic film, strips, sheets, and plates.	62, p. 30	
Sausage casings	65, p. 31	
Sephadex		X
Shoeboard	11, p. 6	
Slide fastener parts	58, p. 29	
Steel conveyor belts		X
Stethoscopes; anesthetic apparatus.	45, p. 24	
Stone, ceramic, glass, and other artwork.		X
Subporcelain refractory articles	23, p. 14	
Surface active agents	20(e), p. 13	
Synchronous motors	39(a), p. 23	
Synthetic resins and plastic materials.	21, p. 14	
Swiss-type cheese		X
Swiss-type curtains and drapes	16, p. 11	
Textile fabrics, certain boxes and cases covered or lined with.	8, p. 5	
Textile fabrics, coated, filled, or laminated with rubber or plasties; articles made from such fabrics.	12, p. 6	
Textile (woven or not) fabrics, coated, filled, or laminated with rubber or plastics.	12(c), p. 8	
Television picture tubes	40, p. 23	
Toothbrushes, electric	60, p. 29	
Tripentaerythritol		X
Watch or clock movements, combination articles containing.	48(a), p. 25	
Wire, certain galvanized	28, p. 16	
Wire-drawing lubricants		X
Wire, round	26, p. 15	
Wood particleboard	10, p. 6	
Wreaths, dried	59, p. 29	
Yarns, measure of certain	13(a), p. 9	

Mr. Speaker, I would hope that we could pass this bill, H.R. 12253, under suspension of the rules and send it to the Senate for action before adjournment. Importers and domestic industry alike have had to live with these errors since the new schedules went into effect 12 months ago.

Some of the corrections in the bill represent increases in the rate of duty and, therefore, will benefit domestic industry. Others represent reductions in duty and benefit the importers. Moreover, in both cases the rates resulting from the new tariff schedules proved to be in error and, thus, necessitate our acting here today. With some exceptions, we are returning to the treatment accorded these items under the old schedules, or a similar treatment. In some cases, we have worked out a compromise between the old and new tariff schedule treatments. This occurred where neither treatment seemed to be just in light of more recent market information, innovations in product lines, or other developments.

Mr. Speaker, I would urge passage of this bill in hopes that early in the next Congress we will be able to complete our work on the more difficult problems that still remain.

Mr. KEITH. Mr. Speaker, the House should approve this bill today. Aside from the merits of each of the provisions of H.R. 12253, there are important reasons for prompt approval of this legislation by the Congress during this session.

At the direction of the Congress, the U.S. Tariff Commission spent a number of years in a study of the modernization of the tariff schedules in the 1930 Tariff Act. On the basis of the Commission's recommendations, the Congress enacted the Tariff Classification Act of 1962. The revised schedules were promulgated by the President and became effective on September 1, 1963. Considering that the tariff schedules contain many thousands of individual items, it was inevitable that some errors, oversights, and inadvertences would occur.

The Ways and Means Committee has given careful study to the various situations brought to its attention. In the report on the bill now before the House, the committee stated that the amendments to the tariff schedules "have been limited to those provisions in the schedules wherein it is clear that errors were made through oversight or lack of information at the time the schedules were formulated, or in which clarifying language is necessary." The committee has included in the bill at this time only those items which clearly should be adjusted on the basis of the committee's criteria. It is my understanding other requests are still under consideration by the committee and certainly future adjustments will be proposed on the merits of each case.

I firmly believe that the Congress should act immediately in order to remove the cloud that has arisen over certain of the classifications. Until we do so, these errors and oversights will stand uncorrected and, in some instances, there may be further damage done. I support the committee's recommendations and hope that the House will act with dispatch in order to permit action by the other body before the close of this Congress.

Mr. CHENOWETH. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the resolution to suspend the rules and pass H.R. 12253, a bill to correct certain errors in the Tariff Schedules of the United States. This bill should have the unanimous approval of the House, and I hope it will become a law at this session of Congress.

My immediate concern over the passage of this bill is the fact that it is necessary in order to correct errors made in fixing the import duties on certain types of unalloyed round wire of iron or steel. This error has worked to the det-

riment of the Colorado Fuel & Iron Corp., one of the largest manufacturers of steel and wire products in the United States. The main plant of this company is located in Pueblo, Colo., in my district. Other plants are located in south San Francisco, Calif., Roebling and Trenton, N.J., and Palmer, Mass.

Mr. Speaker, I want to do what I can to protect the jobs of the men and women working in our domestic steel plants. The plant at Pueblo in my district is of great importance to the economy of southern Colorado, and the entire State, and provides employment for thousands of workers. Imports of steel and iron products, including wire, have constituted a real threat to the welfare of this company, and its many employees. This bill is most important to our area, as it will provide protection to these workers, and will permit the Colorado Fuel & Iron Corp. to maintain its volume of sales.

Mr. Speaker, I received a wire from Mr. Leonard C. Rose, president of the Colorado Fuel & Iron Corp., as follows:

DENVER, COLO.,
August 11, 1964.

The Honorable J. EDGAR CHENOWETH,
House Office Building, Washington, D.C.:

The Colorado Fuel & Iron Corp. is vitally interested in the passage of H.R. 12253. This is a bill "to correct certain errors in the tariff schedules of the United States" which became effective August 31, 1963, and which constituted a reclassification of previous tariff schedules.

As a result of changes made in the reclassification the duties on certain categories of wire were reduced drastically, thus causing a great increase in the importation of this wire. H.R. 12253 would in effect reinstate the duties substantially to what they were prior to the reclassification but would maintain the new classification.

This bill is the result of months of work by the Tariff Commission and the House Ways and Means Committee. It has the support of the Commission and has been reported favorably by Ways and Means Committee. It should be a noncontroversial matter unless attempts are made to include additional items by amendment. This would jeopardize the final enactment of this bill at this session.

Because of the serious and continuing impact of the increased imports of wire on the business of the Colorado Fuel & Iron Corp., it is urgent that this bill be enacted into law during this session of Congress. We will appreciate any efforts you are able to make in this regard.

LEONARD C. ROSE,
President, the Colorado Fuel & Iron Corp.

I was amazed at the figures submitted by the Colorado Fuel & Iron Corp. in support of this measure, showing the comparison of imports and exports of wire and wire products in recent years. The statement follows:

U.S. imports and exports of wire and wire products

	Net tons	
	Imports	Exports
5-year period—		
1933–37	204,998	494,339
1938–42	69,510	1,201,508
1943–47	9,463	1,161,936
1948–52	260,191	728,101
1953–57	1,066,716	238,225
1958–62	2,899,899	162,913

I wish to call attention to the rapid increase in these imports of wire and wire products, and the corresponding decline in the exports over the same period of time. It is startling to observe that in the 1943–47 period we imported only 9,463 net tons of these products, and that this figure in the 1958–62 period jumped to 2,899,899 net tons. During this same period our exports of wire and wire products declined from 1,161,936 net tons in the 1943–47 period to 162,913 net tons in the 1958–62 period. Surely no one can read these figures without becoming seriously concerned and alarmed over the threat of these foreign imports to our domestic steel industry.

I wish also to call the attention of the House to the fact that the United States has the lowest average ad valorem steel tariff of any importing country. I have taken the following table from the statement submitted by the company to the Ways and Means Committee in support of this bill:

1961 average ad valorem steel tariff

Importing country:	*Percent*
Italy	11.5
France	9.3
West Germany	8.1
Belgium-Luxembourg	6.7
Netherlands	6.7
Canada	8.0
United Kingdom	11.7
Japan	14.2
United States	5.9

Mr. Speaker, American steelworkers receive the highest wages paid in any country producing steel and wire products. I am sure the House will be interested in the following table showing the hourly employment costs of steelworkers in the United States, as compared with the costs in other countries:

	1961
United States	$3.99
Luxembourg	1.47
Netherlands	1.40
West Germany	1.37
Belgium	1.26
United Kingdom (estimated)	1.11
France	1.11
Italy	1.04
Japan	.63

These figures indicate very plainly that our American steelworkers cannot compete with the cheap labor found in other countries. Our American workmen enjoy the highest standards of living to be found anywhere in the world. I am anxious to see these standards maintained and improved. This can only be done by giving our domestic steel companies the protection they deserve so that they can compete with these foreign imports.

Mr. Speaker, I want to commend the Ways and Means Committee on bringing this bill to the floor. The changes in tariff rates contained in this bill will correct the errors made in the tariff schedules made effective August 31, 1963. The passage of this bill is most important, not alone to the Colorado Fuel & Iron Corp. in Colorado, but to many other domestic industries in this country. I urge the rules be suspended and H.R. 12253 be passed.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Arkansas that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill H.R. 12253.

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that Members desiring to do so may include their remarks in the RECORD on the bill just passed.

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

There was no objection.

ADDITION TO PROGRAM

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I take this time to announce for the benefit of the House that on Wednesday next House Resolution 845 will be considered, making in order the immediate consideration of H.R. 11926, a bill to define jurisdiction of the U.S. Supreme Court or Federal courts inferior thereto in certain instances.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOGGS. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. ARENDS. Is this what is commonly known as the Tuck bill, reported out of the Rules Committee last week?

Mr. BOGGS. That is correct.

Mr. ARENDS. I thank the gentleman.

TARIFF TREATMENT OF CERTAIN ELECTRON MICROSCOPES

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 2874) to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 to provide that imported electron microscopes shall be subject to the regular customs duty regardless of the nature of the institution or organization importing them, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That item 854.10 of title I of the Tariff Act of 1930 (Tariff Schedules of the United States; 28 F.R., part II, page 420, Aug. 17, 1963; 77A Stat. 420; 19 U.S.C., sec. 1202) is amended by striking out "and electron microscopes,".

SEC. 2. The amendment made by the first section of this Act shall apply with respect to articles entered, or withdrawn from warehouse, for consumption after the date of the enactment of this Act; except that such amendment shall not apply to any article purchased under a written contract entered into before such date of enactment.

The SPEAKER. Is a second demanded?

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, I demand a second.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, a second will be considered as ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, the purpose of H.R. 2874 is to change from a free status to a dutiable status under the Tariff Schedules of the United States electron microscopes, and parts or accessories thereof, imported by, or on behalf of, certain nonprofit organizations.

It will be recalled that Public Law 87–95 established a new paragraph in the free list of the Tariff Act of 1930 which provided, in pertinent part, for the free importation of electron microscopes, and parts or accessories of such microscopes, imported for its own use and not for sale by, or on behalf of, any nonprofit society, institution, or organization, whether public or private, incorporated or established for educational, scientific, or therapeutic purposes. The Committee on Ways and Means, in recommending the passage of H.R. 3385—which was enacted as Public Law 87–95—based its recommendation on information then available which indicated that there was a substantial difference between imported electron microscopes and domestically produced electron microscopes. The committee's evaluation involved some rather complex factors and necessarily there had to be reliance upon extremely technical analysis of the capabilities of the microscopes in question.

Since that time further information which was brought to the attention of the Committee on Ways and Means, and which pointed to advancements in the technology of electron microscope production, has led the committee to reexamine this subject. The committee now has information which indicates that domestically produced electron microscopes are not essentially different in construction and capabilities from some of the electron microscopes which may be imported under the provisions of item 854.10 of the Tariff Schedules of the United States—derived from Public Law 87–95. This being the case, the committee believes that the action taken transferring these articles to the free list should be rescinded and that, with the exception of those microscopes and parts and accessories thereof which are purchased pursuant to contracts entered into before the date of enactment of H.R. 2874, future importations of such articles should be subject to duty.

The pending bill is identical to H.R. 9414 in the 87th Congress, as that bill was reported by the Committee on Ways and Means and unanimously passed by the House of Representatives. The Committee is unanimous in again recommending enactment of this legislation.

The amendment to the bill is a technical amendment required by the passage of time since the bill was acted on by the Committee on Ways and Means.

I call attention to the fact that this bill bears the name of one of our late beloved colleagues, highly admired by all of us in the House, a member of the Committee on Ways and Means, the gentleman from the State of Pennsylvania, the Honorable Billy Green, Jr. The legislation had his very strong support during his lifetime. I regret exceedingly that it was not possible for us to bring it to the House during his lifetime so that he could have been here to have spoken in behalf of the bill himself, but we do have his son, who, I am sure, has the same great interest that his father had in this bill.

Mr. Speaker, I now yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GREEN].

Mr. GREEN of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this bill. One would not normally choose for his initial remarks in this House a matter so uncolorful but rising to support this legislation (H.R. 2874) fills me with pride, because this bill bears the name of my late father. It was his conviction and is mine that this legislation is necessary. This bill is no more or less important than is the continued production of electron microscopes in this country. We are currently making it impossible for domestic producers to survive. When the existing law passed it eliminated the tax import duty on foreign electron microscopes which were sold to nonprofit and charitable organizations in this country. At that time there was thought to be a substantial difference between the domestic and foreign products in both construction and capability and, therefore, the American industry would not be in direct competition with the duty-free foreign import. It now appears that the domestic and foreign products are essentially the same and if the current law is continued it will ultimately force American manufacturers of this most important scientific item to discontinue production. We cannot allow this to happen. It is important to bear in mind that 65 to 85 percent of all electron microscopes sold in this country are purchased by nonprofit organizations and if domestic producers are in a poor competitive position in such a large part of the available market they cannot survive. If domestic production should discontinue, we would, I feel sure, see a sharp rise in the price of electron microscopes. The current law was obviously designed to assist American charitable research, but it has instead increased foreign profits. Only a portion of the duty exemption has been passed on to our nonprofit institutions. About 40 percent of the amount the current law saves the foreign companies is added to their profits rather than being reflected in the price paid by the charitable organizations. I understand, on occasion, this undesirable situation is compounded by the fact that Federal moneys received through grants are used by the charitable organizations purchasing electron microscopes. Last year the largest domestic producer lost 25 percent of its sales, and this year promises to be worse because foreign producers have discovered and are ever increasingly advertising their advantage with significant results. For these reasons, and more, I urge passage of this bill to reinstate the import duties on this item.

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. GREEN of Pennsylvania. I yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. KEOGH].

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, I should like very much to commend the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania for the assiduity with which he has pressed on the legislation bearing his name and the name of a great former colleague of ours with whom it was my privilege to serve, both on the Committee on Ways and Means and in the House for a number of years.

This, Mr. Speaker, is further evidence of the good fortune of the people residing in the district represented by the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania. Here again is further evidence that he is making a very valiant and obviously successful effort to follow in the footsteps of a great and good man, our late colleague, the distinguished father of the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. Speaker, so that the impression may not go abroad that I am confining my compliments to the Representative of the city of Philadelphia I must in truth and in justice add to that the name of the distinguished gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. CAHILL] without whose help this bill would not be pending today. I commend them both, and I extend to the young man from Philadelphia the hope for a long and what we know will be a distinguished career; and so long as he stays close to the philosophy of his father the people of his district will be enriched and the country the greater for his service.

Mr. GREEN of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I thank the distinguished gentleman from New York.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Arkansas has stated correctly that this is a bill that comes out of the committee unanimously.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. CAHILL].

Mr. CAHILL. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 2874. I join the gentleman from New York [Mr. KEOGH] in offering congratulations to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GREEN] on this the occasion of his first speech in the House of Representatives. I am delighted that his first statement on the floor of this House is in support of legislation originally introduced by his father, the late and beloved Member from Pennsylvania who is the sponsor of this legislation.

Bill Green and I first introduced identical bills in 1962 for the purpose of correcting an inequitable situation that developed by reason of inadequate information concerning the product of the manufacturer of a domestic electron microscope in the United States.

As the distinguished chairman of the Ways and Means Committee, the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. MILLS] has said, this information was not available to the committee when the original legislation exempting the importation of electron microscopes from the tariff was passed by the House.

Mr. Speaker, RCA is not only the sole domestic producer of the type of microscope we are discussing today but it is a pioneer in the field. It was the RCA microscope that first detected the polio

virus. It is the RCA microscope that is being used extensively in cancer research throughout the United States and it will, I hope, bring the cause of cancer to the attention of our scientists.

The removal of the import duty from electron microscopes removed RCA from a competitive position in the industry and would if continued have made it almost impossible for RCA or any other American manufacturer to invest research funds and manufacturing costs in the development of this type of instrument.

In the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD under date of August 13, 1964, on page 19365, I outlined in a special order all of the salient facts concerning the electron microscope and the great need for continued production by U.S. manufacturers.

I will not take the time of the House to detail all of these reasons because I believe they are completely understood by both sides of the aisle. I want, however, to express my appreciation to the gentleman from New York [Mr. KEOGH], the chairman of the Ways and Means Committee, the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. MILLS], as well as the distinguished gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. BYRNES], the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CURTIS] and all Members from both sides of the aisle on the Ways and Means Committee for bringing this needed remedial legislation to the floor of the House.

This legislation when enacted into law will again restore the domestic manufacture of electron microscopes to a competitive position in the industry and will insure continued production and the development of the necessary scientific know-how in American industry. Mr. Speaker, I urge the unanimous approval of this legislation.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CAHILL. I will be happy to yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. I get just a little satisfaction out of this legislation for the reason that when it was originally before the House—that is, the tariff exemption with respect to the importation of foreign microscopes—I asked a question as to whether there was no one in this country who could produce these microscopes.

At that time I was informed by the committee chairman that there was no one in this country who could produce them. Yet the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. CAHILL] very shortly thereafter informed me, and he informed the chairman that there was a manufacturer in this country and in his district who could make electronic microscopes.

So, Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to support this legislation. However, it should not have been made necessary for the reason that the duty should never have been eliminated.

Mr. CAHILL. I might say to the gentleman from Iowa that, frankly, I believe it was his remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, raising that very question, that brought the entire matter to the attention of the manufacturer of the electronic microscopes.

I feel that the gentleman deserves a great bit of credit for seeing to it that this inequity has now been adjusted.

I thank the gentleman from Iowa.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Arkansas that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill H.R. 2874.

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that Members desiring to do so may extend their remarks in the RECORD on the bill just passed.

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

There was no objection.

CONSERVATION OF THE NATION'S WILDLIFE RESOURCES ON THE PACIFIC FLYWAY

Mr. ROGERS of Texas submitted a conference report and statement on the bill (S. 793) to promote the conservation of the Nation's wildlife resources on the Pacific flyway in the Tule Lake, Lower Klamath, Upper Klamath, and Clear Lake National Wildlife Refuges in Oregon and California and to aid in the administration of the Klamath reclamation project.

FLOWAGE EASEMENT AND RIGHTS-OF-WAY OVER LANDS WITHIN THE ALLEGANY INDIAN RESERVATION IN NEW YORK

Mr. ASPINALL submitted a conference report and statement on the bill (H.R. 1794) to authorize the acquisition of and the payment for a flowage easement and rights-of-way over lands within the Allegany Indian Reservation in New York, required by the United States for the Allegheny River—Kinzua Dam—project, to provide for the relocation, rehabilitation, social and economic development of the members of the Seneca Nation, and for other purposes.

ELECTRIC CONSUMERS IN THE PACIFIC NORTHWEST

Mr. ASPINALL submitted a conference report and statement on the bill (S. 1007) to guarantee electric consumers in the Pacific Northwest first call on electric energy generated at Federal hydroelectric plants in that region and to guarantee electric consumers in other regions reciprocal priority, and for other purposes.

LOWER TETON DIVISION, TETON BASIN FEDERAL RECLAMATION PROJECT, IDAHO

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 2337) to provide for the construction of the lower Teton division of the Teton Basin Federal reclamation project, Idaho, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, in order to assist in the irrigation of arid and semiarid lands in the upper Snake River Valley, Idaho, to provide facilities for river power opportunities created thereby and, as incidents to the foregoing purposes, to enhance recreational opportunities and provide for the conservation and development of fish and wildlife, the Secretary of the Interior is authorized to construct, operate, and maintain the lower Teton division of the Teton Basin Federal reclamation project. The principal engineering features of the said project shall be a dam and reservoir at the Fremont site, a pumping plant, powerplant, canals and water distribution facilities, ground water development, and related facilities in the upper Snake River Valley, Idaho. In the construction, operation, and maintenance of the said project and project works the Secretary shall be governed by the Federal reclamation laws (Act of June 17, 1902, 32 Stat. 388), and Acts amendatory thereof and supplementary thereto). The project shall be operated consistent with the existing agreements as to storage rights in the Federal reclamation reservoirs in the upper Snake River Basin.

SEC. 2. The period provided in subsection (d) of section 9 of the Reclamation Project Act of 1939, as amended, for repayment of construction costs properly allocable to any block of lands and assigned to be repaid by the irrigators may be extended to fifty years, exclusive of a development period, from the time water is first delivered to that block, or as near that number of years as is consistent with the adoption and operation of a repayment formula as therein provided. Costs allocated to irrigation in excess of the amount determined by the Secretary to be within the ability of the irrigators to repay within a fifty-year period shall be returned to the reclamation fund from revenues derived by the Secretary from the disposition of power marketed through the Bonneville Power Administration.

SEC. 3. (a) The Secretary is authorized to construct, operate, and maintain or otherwise provide for basic public outdoor recreation facilities, to acquire or otherwise to include within the division area such adjacent lands or interests therein as are necessary for public recreation use, to allocate water and reservoir capacity to recreation, and to provide for the public use and enjoyment of division lands, facilities, and water areas in a manner coordinated with the other division functions. The Secretary is authorized to enter into agreements with Federal agencies or State or local public bodies for the operation, maintenance, or additional development of division lands or facilities, or to dispose of division lands or facilities to Federal agencies or State or local public bodies by lease, transfer, conveyance, or exchange upon such terms and conditions as will best promote the development and operation of such lands and facilities in the public interest for recreation purposes. The costs of the aforesaid undertakings, including costs of investigation, planning, Federal operation and maintenance, shall be nonreimbursable. Nothing herein shall limit the authority of the Secretary granted by existing provisions of law relating to recreation development of water resource projects or to disposition of public lands for recreation purposes.

(b) Costs of means and measures to prevent loss of and damage to fish and wildlife resources shall be considered as project costs and allocated as may be appropriate among other division functions.

(a) The Secretary is authorized to amend contracts heretofore made under the Acts of September 30, 1950 (64 Stat. 1083), and

of August 31, 1954 (68 Stat. 1026), whereby the water users assumed an obligation for winter power replacement based on the winter water savings program at the Minidoka powerplant to relieve the contractors ratably by one-third of that obligation, and to make new contracts under these Acts on a like basis. To the extent such annual obligations are reduced, the cost thereof shall be included in the cost to be absorbed by the power operations of the Federal Columbia River power system.

(b) The actual construction of the facilities herein authorized shall not be undertaken until at least 80 per centum of the conservation capacity in Fremont Reservoir is under subscription, nor until negotiations have been undertaken in accordance with the provisions of (a) of this section.

(c) No construction shall be undertaken on facilities of the lower Teton division which are required solely to provide a full water supply to lands in the Rexburg Bench area until the Secretary has submitted his report and finding of feasibility on this phase of the division to the President and to the Congress.

SEC. 5. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated for the construction of the lower Teton division of the Teton Basin Federal reclamation project, the sum of $52,000,000, plus or minus such amounts, if any, as may be justified by reason of ordinary fluctuations in construction costs as indicated by engineering cost indexes applicable to the types of construction involved therein, and, in addition thereto, such sums as may be required to operate and maintain said division.

The SPEAKER. Is a second demanded?

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, I demand a second.

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that a second be considered as ordered.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. ASPINALL].

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, on today's list of bills to come before the House under suspension of the rules there are five having to do with the carrying on of the reclamation program.

The five follow: First is the one that we are taking up at this time, that is, the lower Teton division project, which will be followed by a bill authorizing the Dixie project. Later on, if we get to it, there will be a bill to authorize research work on the saltcedar eradication program in the Pecos River Basin, to be followed by the Whitestone Coulee project, to be followed by the Crooked River project.

These bills total in their ultimate amount an authorization for the expenditure of $103,644,000 for reclamation purposes.

May I call to the attention of the Members of the House that if we are to have an orderly constructive reclamation program, it will be necessary to provide authorizations in time so that the Department of the Interior, which has jurisdiction over these matters, may be able to handle its business expeditiously and efficiently.

In 1962 before the Congress adjourned we authorized in the omnibus rivers and harbors bill approximately $1.2 billion, which is, of course, a sizable amount, providing for the Army Engineers to construct the project under their jurisdiction in an orderly manner.

So far in this session of the Congress we have only provided for the authorization of an additional $120 million for the Missouri Basin Project Act of 1944 already authorized. Also, we have authorized by House action a project which we passed about 10 days ago, three participating projects of the Colorado storage project and named as follows: the Savery-Pot Hook the Fruitland-Mesa, and the Bostwick Park. These three projects total $46 million approximately.

With these projects, if we have time and if we can get a rule from the Rules Committee, there will be the Garrison project which is another good reclamation project, totaling $207 million.

Adding all these together, we would have authorizations in this Congress of $356,644,000, which, may I say, is about the usual amount of authorizations for appropriations which Congress approves in every Congress.

There has been a statement floating around that we have had no new starts of recent years. We have had new starts as well as new authorizations for the last several Congresses.

In the 86th Congress we had authorizations totaling $262,857,000, in the 87th Congress we had authorizations totaling $281,713,000, and to date, as I have stated hereinbefore, for this Congress no authorizations except the amount authorized for carrying on of the work under the Missouri Basin 1944 Flood Control Act.

The new reclamation starts that we had for 1961 amounted to $241,012,000 and in 1962, $209,430,000. In 1963 there was just the one authorization of $75,309,000, and for 1964—that is, fiscal 1964—we had a total of $292,540,000.

The reclamation program, in other words, is carrying on its work in water resources development in an orderly manner, averaging somewhere around $250 to $300 million a year for construction purposes, with authorizations totaling a sufficient amount to keep an orderly program before the Bureau of Reclamation.

May I advise my colleagues that these five bills to which I have drawn your attention come out of our committee without any opposition, supported by the committee as good reclamation projects conforming to reclamation policy. The arguments and explanation of such bills will be handled here on the floor by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ROGERS], the efficient and able chairman of the Subcommittee on Irrigation and Reclamation, and by the ranking minority member of the committee, who is a constructive critic, may I say, of reclamation, supporting those projects which he believes conform to the rules and policies laid down by Congress and, of course, objecting to those programs which he considers do not. I think that all of these projects on todays calendar are good projects and deserve your support.

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, H.R. 2337 would authorize a meritorious and much-needed reclamation project in the State of Idaho which, to my knowledge, is not opposed by anyone. The legislation was approved by the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee after public hearings and thorough study of the project. The committee found the project to be sound from both a physical and economic standpoint and that it met every standard test of current reclamation doctrine and policy. It is a multiple-purpose project designed to make maximum use of the available water resources in the area.

The construction and operation of the Lower Teton division would provide irrigation service to about 151,000 acres of irrigable land in southeastern Idaho. In addition, it will provide flood protection to a highly developed area which has suffered severe flood damage in recent years. The project is in an area which is subject to both drought and floods, and both conditions in the same year are not uncommon. In a 6-month period in 1961 and 1962, the area was declared both a drought area and a flood disaster area. Serious floods occurred just a few weeks before the committee held its hearings on this project in June and the committee was impressed with the extent of the damage indicated by photographs furnished during the hearings.

The irrigation water service would be provided to lands in the Fremont-Madison Irrigation District. The principal need of the district is for storage capacity to firm up its water supply. The canals which serve the district lose their natural flow early in the irrigation season resulting in late season water shortages. This area is completely dependent upon agriculture and the frequent crop losses due to drought conditions have a serious adverse impact upon the economy which is felt throughout the entire State.

The principal project works of the Lower Teton division consist of a dam and reservoir on the Teton River, a 22,000 kilowatt hydroelectric powerplant, a pumping plant, canals, and about 100 ground water wells to supplement the surface water supply. Facilities would also be constructed at the reservoir to make it usable for recreation purposes. The combination of reservoir storage and ground water wells would make water available to about 114,000 acres that are presently irrigated but have an inadequate water supply and to 37,000 acres which, at present, are dry farmed. The powerplant, while limited in its firm power capacity because of releases on a highly seasonal schedule, would be very valuable during the irrigation season when the power load would include a large segment for irrigation pumping.

The lower Teton division is estimated to cost $52,034,000 of which $38,151,000 is allocated to irrigation, $6,960,000 to power, $6,850,000 to flood control, and $73,000 to recreation. The amount allocated to flood control and recreation would be nonreimbursable. The amount allocated to power would be repaid with interest within a 50-year period. The amount allocated to irrigation would be repaid within 50 years by revenues re-

ceived from the water users amounting to about $20,635,000 and revenues received from power marketed by Bonneville Power Administration. The economic analysis of the Lower Teton division shows that the benefits exceed the costs in a ratio of 2.2 to 1.

The committee adopted amendments to bring the project into line with policies presently being followed for all reclamation projects. As I have already indicated, the committee concluded that this propect was sound and feasible in all respects and that it was urgently needed. It is recommended to the House without any opposition in the committee that I know of and I hope that it will be approved.

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, I support H.R. 2337, a bill to provide for construction of the lower Teton division of the Teton Basin Federal reclamation project.

This project, which will be undertaken under the Federal reclamation laws, is located in Fremont and Madison Counties, Idaho. This is in the southeastern part of the State, not far from Yellowstone National Park.

The lower Teton division will be a true multipurpose undertaking. Its chief emphasis will be on irrigation, but it will also serve three other functions—flood control, the production of hydropower and, to a very limited extent, outdoor recreation.

The principal engineering structure of the Lower Teton division will be Fremont Dam. This will store as much as 315,000 acre-feet of water behind it. It is planned to supplement the water which this reservoir will supply with as many as 100 wells.

Most of the 151,000 acres of land which will eventually be furnished water by the project are already irrigated. The trouble is that their water supply is not dependable and that, particularly in the latter part of the farming season, severe shortages develop and crops do not mature. These supplemental irrigation lands total somewhat over 115,000 acres.

The other 37,000 acres are now dryfarmed and in grain. If it proves feasible to bring water to them they will in all likelihood be taken out of grain and put to more diversified use. The bill our commiteee has brought out includes an amendment providing that works for the specific purpose of irrigating these lands shall not be constructed until the Secretary of the Interior has sent to Congress a supplementary report establishing the engineering and economic feasibility of doing so. This was put into the bill on the recommendation of the Interior Department.

This may seem like a flaw in the legislation, but I do not think it is a serious one. There are two good reasons for going ahead with the project at this time despite the fact that we need more information about this part of the undertaking. First, there is the urgent need in the basin for the flood protection which Fremont Dam will afford and it would be foolish and costly to build Fremont Dam to only part capacity and then enlarge it later or to construct substitute flood protection works elsewhere now and then duplicate their benefits in Fremont later. Second, even if the 37,000 acres do not come in, the project is backed up financially by the whole Federal Columbia River power system, so there is no question about its cost being returned to the Government.

This brings me to another thing that commends the Lower Teton division to me. The per acre capital cost of the irrigation features of the project is considerably lower than many other projects we have considered in the past and will consider in the future. The irrigation allocation is $38,150,000, which amounts to about $250 per acre and this, as I said, is a good deal less than we have seen elsewhere. In addition, the water users are going to be able to return over the normal 50-year repayment period a considerably larger share of this cost than is frequently the case. It is estimated that they will return close to 55 percent of the capital cost, plus all the operation and maintenance costs. And, once again, as I have already said, the whole of the Lower Teton division will be linked economically with the Federal power system in that area and this is where recovery of the remainder of the cost will come from.

Mr. Speaker, I recommend passage of H.R. 2337.

Mr. HARDING. Mr. Speaker, H.R. 2337 is a bill that enjoys unanimous support in Idaho. There has not been a single voice in Idaho raised in opposition to this much needed project. Therefore, I was delighted that after hearings were held, the bill was reported from both the Irrigation and Reclamation Subcommittee and the full Interior Committee without a single vote of opposition.

H.R. 2337 provides for the construction of the Lower Teton division of the Teton Basin Federal reclamation project on the Teton River in Idaho. The Lower Teton division will consist of a 310-foot earth-filled dam which forms a reservoir with 315,000 acre-foot storage capacity. A 22,000-kilowatt powerplant, a pumping plant, approximately 100 ground wells, and a system of canals and laterals are also provided for in the project.

The project, in addition to much needed flood control, has provisions for fish and wildlife preservation and would provide for supplemental irrigation water for approximately 114,000 acres of presently irrigated lands and would provide water for the irrigation of 37,000 acres of land that is presently being dry farmed. The project will cost approximately $52 million and an economic analysis shows that the benefits exceed the costs in a ratio of 2.23 to 1 over a 100-year period of analysis.

The reason that this project has met with such unanimous support is because the Teton River is one of the few rivers running through a populated area in the United States in which there is absolutely no provision for flood control. From the time that the snow melts and begins to run off the Teton peaks and other mountain water sheds until the Teton River empties into the Snake River there is no possible way that floods can be checked.

This river passes through several small communities and near the city of Rexburg, Idaho. In 1962, 1963, and again this year the Teton River has been filled with such great amounts of snow runoff that damaging floods have been the result. However, in each of the 3 years, toward the end of the summer, there has been a need for additional irrigation water for farmers in the area. This project will store the spring runoff which is causing the floods and later in the season allow the water to be released orderly for irrigation as needed.

Mr. Speaker, as I said earlier, this project enjoys unanimous support in Idaho. It has been reported from both the Irrigation and Reclamation Subcommittee and the full Interior Committee without any opposition. I sincerely urge my colleagues to support H.R. 2337 here today.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MILLS). The question is, Will the House suspend the rules and pass the bill H.R. 2337.

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (S. 1123) to provide for the construction of the Lower Teton division of the Teton Basin Federal reclamation project, Idaho, and for other purposes, a bill similar to the one just passed by the House.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, in order to assist in the irrigation of arid and semiarid lands in the upper Snake River Valley, Idaho, to provide facilities for river regulation and control of floods, to utilize the hydroelectric power opportunities created thereby, to enhance recreation opportunities, and to provide for the conservation and development of fish and wildlife, and for other purposes, the Secretary of the Interior is authorized to construct, operate, and maintain the Lower Teton division of the Teton Basin Federal reclamation project. The principal engineering features of the said project shall be a dam and reservoir at the Fremont site, a pumping plant, powerplant, transmission facilities, canals and water distribution facilities, ground water development, and related facilities in the upper Snake River Valley, Idaho. In the construction, operation, and maintenance of the said project and project works, the Secretary shall be governed by the Federal reclamation laws (Act of June 17, 1902 (32 Stat. 388), and Acts amendatory thereof and supplementary thereto) and the project shall be operated consistent with the existing agreements as to storage rights in the Federal reclamation reservoirs in the upper Snake River Basin.

SEC. 2. The period provided in subsection (d) of section 9 of the Reclamation Project Act of 1939, as amended, for repayment of construction costs properly allocable to any block of lands and assigned to be repaid by the irrigators may be extended to fifty years,

exclusive of a development period, from the time water is first delivered to that block, or as near that number of years as is consistent with the adoption and operation of a repayment formula as therein provided. Costs allocated to irrigation in excess of the amount determined by the Secretary to be within the ability of the irrigators to repay within a fifty-year period shall be returned to the reclamation fund from revenues derived by the Secretary from the disposition of power generated at all Federal projects in Idaho.

SEC. 3. (a) The Secretary is authorized as a part of the Lower Teton division to construct, operate, and maintain public recreation facilities including access roads, to acquire or to withdraw from entry or other disposition under the public land laws such adjacent lands or interests therein as are necessary for present and future public recreation use, and to provide for public use and enjoyment of the land water areas of the project in a manner consistent with the other project purposes. The Secretary is authorized to enter into agreements with State or local public agencies or other public entities for the operation, maintenance, or additional development of project lands or facilities or to dispose of project lands or facilities to State or local agencies or other public entities by lease, exchange, or conveyance, upon such terms and conditions as will best promote their development and operation in the public interest for recreation purposes. The costs of the undertakings described in this section, including costs of investigation, planning, Federal operation, and maintenance and an appropriation share of the joint costs of the Lower Teton division, shall be nonreimbursable.

(b) The Secretary may make such reasonable provision in connection with the Lower Teton division as, upon further study in accordance with the Fish and Wildlife Coordination Act (48 Stat. 401, as amended; 16 U.S.C. 661 et seq.) he finds to be required for the conservation and development of fish and wildlife. An appropriate portion of the cost of the development shall be allocated to fish and wildlife as provided in said Act and it, together with the Federal operation and maintenance costs allocated to this function, shall be nonreimbursable and nonreturnable under the reclamation laws.

SEC. 4. (a) The Secretary is authorized to amend contracts heretofore made under the Acts of September 30, 1950 (64 Stat. 1083), and August 31, 1954 (68 Stat. 1026), whereby the water users assumed an obligation for winter power replacement based on the winter water saving program at the Minidoka powerplant to relieve the contractors ratably by one-third of that obligation, and to make new contracts under these Acts on a like basis. To the extent such annual obligations are reduced, the cost thereof shall be included in the cost to be absorbed by the power operations of the Federal power system in Idaho.

(b) No construction shall be undertaken on facilities of the Lower Teton division which are required solely to provide a full water supply to lands in the Rexburg Bench area until the Secretary has submitted his report and finding of feasibility on this phase of the division to the President and to the Congress.

SEC. 5. For a period of ten years from the date of enactment of this Act, no water from the project authorized by this Act shall be delivered to any water user for the production on newly irrigated lands of any basic agricultural commodity, as defined in the Agricultural Act of 1949, or any amendment thereof, if the total supply of such commodity for the marketing year in which the bulk of the crop would normally be marketed is in excess of the normal supply as defined in section 301(b)(10) of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, unless the Secretary of Agriculture calls for an increase in production of such commodity in the interest of national security.

SEC. 6. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated for the construction of the Lower Teton Division of the Teton Basin Federal Reclamation project $53,000,000 (1963 prices) plus or minus such amounts, if any, as may be required by reason of changes in the cost of construction work of the types involved therein as shown by engineering cost indexes and, in addition thereto, such sums as may be required to operate and maintain said unit.

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. ROGERS of Texas: Strike out all after the enacting clause of the bill S. 1123 and insert in lieu thereof the provisions of H.R. 2337 as passed, as follows:

"That, in order to assist in the irrigation of arid and semiarid lands in the upper Snake River Valley, Idaho, to provide facilities for river power opportunities created thereby and, as incidents to the foregoing purposes, to enhance recreational opportunities and provide for the conservation and development of fish and wildlife, the Secretary of the Interior is authorized to construct, operate, and maintain the Lower Teton division of the Teton Basin Federal reclamation project. The principal engineering features of the said project shall be a dam and reservoir at the Fremont site, a pumping plant, powerplant, canals and water distribution facilities, ground water development, and related facilities in the upper Snake River Valley, Idaho. In the construction, operation, and maintenance of the said project and project works the Secretary shall be governed by the Federal reclamation laws (Act of June 17, 1902 (32 Stat. 388), and Acts amendatory thereof and supplementary thereto). The project shall be operated consistent with the existing agreements as to storage rights in the Federal reclamation reservoirs in the upper Snake River Basin.

"SEC. 2. The period provided in subsection (d) of section 9 of the Reclamation Project Act of 1939, as amended, for repayment of construction costs properly allocable to any block of lands and assigned to be repaid by the irrigators may be extended to fifty years, exclusive of a development period, from the time water is first delivered to that block, or as near that number of years as is consistent with the adoption and operation of a repayment formula as therein provided. Costs allocated to irrigation in excess of the amount determined by the Secretary to be within the ability of the irrigators to repay within a fifty-year period shall be returned to the reclamation fund from revenues derived by the Secretary from the disposition of power marketed through the Bonneville Power Administration.

"SEC. 3. (a) The Secretary is authorized to construct, operate, and maintain or otherwise provide for basic public outdoor recreation facilities, to acquire or otherwise include within the division area such adjacent lands or interests therein as are necessary for public recreation use, to allocate water and reservoir capacity to recreation, and to provide for the public use and enjoyment of division lands, facilities, and water areas in a manner coordinated with the other division functions. The Secretary is authorized to enter into agreements with Federal agencies or State or local public bodies for the operation, maintenance, or additional development of division lands or facilities, or to dispose of division lands or facilities to Federal agencies or State or local public bodies by lease, transfer, conveyance, or exchange upon such terms and conditions as will best promote the development and operation of such lands and facilities in the public interest for recreation purposes. The costs of the aforesaid undertakings, including costs of investigation, planning, Federal operation and maintenance, shall be nonreimbursable. Nothing herein shall limit the authority of the Secretary granted by existing provisions of law relating to recreation development of water resource projects or to disposition of public lands for recreation purposes.

"(b) Costs of means and measures to prevent loss of and damage to fish and wildlife resources shall be considered as project costs and allocated as may be appropriate among other division functions.

"SEC. 4.

"(a) The Secretary is authorized to amend contracts heretofore made under the Acts of September 30, 1950 (64 Stat. 1083), and of August 31, 1954 (68 Stat. 1026), whereby the water users assumed an obligation for winter power replacement based on the winter water savings program at the Minidoka powerplant to relieve the contractors ratably by one-third of that obligation, and to make new contracts under these Acts on a like basis. To the extent such annual obligations are reduced, the cost thereof shall be included in the cost to be absorbed by the power operations of the Federal Columbia River power system.

"(b) The actual construction of the facilities herein authorized shall not be undertaken until at least 80 per centum of the conservation capacity in Fremont Reservoir is under subscription, nor until negotiations have been undertaken in accordance with the provisions of (a) of this section.

"(c) No construction shall be undertaken on facilities of the Lower Teton division which are required solely to provide a full water supply to lands in the Rexburg Bench area until the Secretary has submitted his report and finding of feasibility on this phase of the division to the President and to the Congress.

"SEC. 5. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated for the construction of the Lower Teton division of the Teton Basin Federal reclamation project, the sum of $52,000,000, plus or minus such amounts, if any, as may be justified by reason of ordinary fluctuations in construction costs as indicated by engineering cost indexes applicable to the types of construction involved therein, and, in addition thereto, such sums as may be required to operate and maintain said division."

The amendment was agreed to.

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

A similar House bill (H.R. 2337) was laid on the table.

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members be permitted to extend their remarks in the RECORD on the bill just passed.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

DIXIE PROJECT, UTAH

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 3279) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain the Dixie project, Utah, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, for the

purposes of developing the water resources of the Virgin and Santa Clara Rivers, including the furnishing of municipal and industrial water supplies, the furnishing of an irrigation water supply to approximately twenty-one thousand acres of land, the control of floods, the generation and sale of electric energy, the conservation and development of fish and wildlife resources, and the enhancement of recreation opportunities, the Secretary of the Interior is authorized to construct, operate, and maintain the Dixie project, Utah. The project shall consist of the Virgin City Dam and Reservoir, tunnels, canals, siphons, pumping plants, and other works necessary to serve irrigated and irrigable lands along and adjacent to the Virgin River; a dam on the Santa Clara River near Gunlock, Utah, and other works necessary to serve irrigated and irrigable lands along and adjacent to the Santa Clara River and on Ivins Beach; and hydroelectric plants and transmission facilities at the Virgin City Dam and at such other points as are desirable. The Dixie project shall be coordinated with the Cedar City water development program which includes the diversion of the waters of Crystal Creek into the Kolob Reservoir, and after completion of the Dixie project said waters of Crystal Creek and of the natural watershed of said Kolob Reservoir shall be exported for use of Cedar City and vicinity in accordance with an agreement entered by Cedar City and Iron County, Utah, on the 26th day of August 1953, with Kolob Reservoir and Storage Association, Incorporated, and Washington County, Utah.

SEC. 2. The project shall include such measures for the disposition of saline waters of La Verkin Springs as are necessary in the opinion of the Secretary to insure the delivery of water at downstream points along the Virgin River for water users in the States of Arizona and Nevada of suitable quality for irrigation, or provision shall be made to indemnify such water users for any impairment of water quality for irrigation purposes directly attributable to Dixie project operations.

SEC. 3. In constructing, operating, and maintaining the works authorized by this Act, the Secretary shall be governed by the Federal reclamation laws (Act of June 17, 1902 (32 Stat. 388), and Acts amendatory thereof or supplementary thereto), except as is otherwise provided in this Act.

SEC. 4. Construction of the project shall not be commenced until there shall be established a conservancy district or similar organization with such powers as may be required by the Secretary, these to include powers to tax both real and personal property within the boundary of the district and to enter into contracts with the United States for the repayment of reimbursable costs.

SEC. 5. The interest rate to be used for purposes of computing interest during construction and interest on the unpaid balance of those portions of the reimbursable costs which are properly allocable to commercial power development and municipal and industrial water supply shall be determined by the Secretary of the Treasury, as of the beginning of the fiscal year in which this bill is enacted, on the basis of the computed average interest rate payable by the Treasury upon its outstanding marketable public obligations, which are neither due nor callable for redemption for fifteen years from date of issue. If the interest rate so computed is not a multiple of one-eighth of 1 per centum, the rate of interest to be used for these purposes shall be the multiple of one-eighth of 1 per centum next lower than the rate so computed. The portions of the costs which are allocable to commercial power development and to municipal and industrial water supply shall be repaid over a period of fifty years with interest at the rate determined in accordance with this section. The portion of the cost which is allocable to irrigation shall be repaid, pursuant to reclamation law, within fifty years plus any authorized development period.

SEC. 6. The Secretary is authorized in connection with the project to construct, operate, and maintain or otherwise provide for the basic public outdoor recreation facilities, to acquire or otherwise to include within the project area such adjacent lands or interests therein as are necessary for public recreation use, to allocate water and reservoir capacity to recreation, and to provide for the public use and enjoyment of project lands, facilities, and water areas in a manner coordinated with other project purposes. The Secretary is authorized to enter into agreements with Federal agencies or State or local public bodies for the operation, maintenance, and additional development of project lands or facilities, or to dispose of project lands or facilities to Federal agencies, or State or local public bodies by lease, transfer, conveyance, or exchange, upon such terms and conditions as will best promote the development and operation of such lands or facilities in the public interest for recreation purposes. The costs of the aforesaid undertakings, and the costs of the project allocated to fish and wildlife enhancement, including costs of investigation, planning, Federal operation and maintenance, and an appropriate share of joint costs of the project, shall be nonreimbursable. Nothing herein shall limit the authority of the Secretary granted by existing provisions of law relating to recreation development of water resource projects, or disposition of public lands for recreational purposes.

SEC. 7. The use of all water diverted for this project from the Colorado River system shall be subject to and controlled by the Colorado River compact, the Boulder Canyon Project Act (45 Stat. 1057; 43 U.S.C. 617t), and the Mexican Water Treaty (Treaty Series 994) (59 Stat. 1219).

SEC. 8. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated for the construction of the Dixie project, the sum of $42,700,000, plus or minus such amounts, if any, as may be justified by reason of ordinary fluctuations in construction costs as indicated by engineering cost indexes applicable to types of construction involved therein, and, in addition thereto, such sums as may be required to operate and maintain said project.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is a second demanded?

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, I demand a second.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, a second will be considered as ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may desire.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 3279 would authorize construction of the multiple-purpose Dixie project in the Virgin River Basin in southwestern Utah. This is a meritorious and much-needed reclamation project which provides irrigation and municipal water service, electric energy for project use and commercial sale, and extensive benefits for fish and wildlife enhancement and recreation. The legislation was approved by the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee after public hearings and thorough study of the project. The hearings included field hearings in the project area and an on-the-ground inspection of the proposed development. The testimony received by the committee was unanimous in support of the development. On the basis of its hearings and study, the committee found the Dixie project to be sound from both a physical and economic standpoint, and that it met all the requirements of current reclamation policy.

The Dixie project is in an area where the climate is arid, with rainfall averaging only about 8 inches a year. The available water supply is completely inadequate. An adequate and dependable water supply for irrigation and for municipal use is the paramount need in the area. A dependable water supply would stabilize and revitalize the agricultural economy and would support municipal and industrial growth. The Dixie project would provide the water storage facilities necessary to meet this need. Without the project, economic growth of the communities in the project area would be limited.

The project area is adjacent to the Zion National Park and the recreation development is planned to supplement the facilities available in the Zion National Park, Bryce Canyon National Park, and other recreational areas in southwestern Utah.

The principal project facilities of the proposed Dixie project include two reservoirs, one powerplant, canals, and distribution and drainage systems. A total of about 21,000 acres would receive irrigation water of which a little over half would receive a new irrigation water supply. None of the crops grown in any of the areas to be irrigated fall under the Government's agricultural subsidy program. Municipal water would be furnished to meet the rapidly growing needs of St. George and Cedar City, and other communities in the project area.

The electric energy would be sold to the city of St. George which has already agreed to purchase all of the energy which would be available at a rate of 7.15 mills. The principal recreation facilities would be constructed at the Virgin City Reservoir which is located immediately downstream from the Zion National Park in an area where extensive recreation use is expected.

The Dixie project has been made financially feasible by the agreement of the State of Utah to assume the cost of relocating State Highway 15 at the Virgin City Reservoir site at a cost of almost $2 million. Highway relocation is normally a project cost. The remaining Dixie project cost is about $42,673,000, of which $30,182,000 is allocated to irrigation, $6,573,000 to power, $2,474,000 to municipal and industrial water supply, $142,000 to flood control, $1,494,000 to fish and wildlife, and $1,808,000 to recreation. The allocations to flood control, fish and wildlife, and recreation amounting to $3,444,000 would be nonreimbursable. The costs allocated to power would be repaid in 41 years with interest. The costs allocated to municipal and industrial water would be repaid in 50 years with interest. The cost allocated to irrigation would be repaid within a 50-year period, exclusive of any authorized development period, from the irrigation water revenues, including ad valorem taxes, and from surplus revenues from the sale of power and municipal water. The Dixie project is an

excellent project from an economic standpoint with the annual benefits exceeding cost in a ratio of 2.2 to 1.

The committee amended the legislation to require full repayment within a 50-year period and to bring it into line with current policy relative to recreation and fish and wildlife development and repayment.

As I have already indicated, the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs found the proposed Dixie project to be a sound and meritorious development meeting all the requirements for authorization and construction as a Federal reclamation project.

The committee recommends this project to the House without any opposition in the committee, so far as I know, and I hope that it will be approved.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MILLS). The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SAYLOR].

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, the Dixie project is located in the district of our colleague, the gentleman from Utah [Mr. BURTON]. For at least 35 years people have been talking about and planning to bring this project, or something like it, into being. Every time it looked as though it were about ready to get off the ground something happened. World War II was one example of this; the all-important Colorado River litigation was another; and complicated financing problems was a third. Now, at last, the Dixieites are ready to go, and I am ready to go with them.

What finally got them over the hurdle and made it possible to say that this project will pay itself out within 50 years is the willingness of the State of Utah to take on the cost of road relocations that the project will involve. This cost will amount to nearly $2 million. Normally this would be a project cost but, in this case, it will not be.

Like the Lower Teton project that we were discussing a few minutes ago, the Dixie project will be a true multipurpose undertaking. Nearly three-quarters of its estimated capital cost is allocated to irrigation. About one-seventh goes to hydropower. The remainder is divided among municipal and industrial water supply, outdoor recreation, and the enhancement of fish and wildlife conditions. The last three will be nonreimbursable, though a part of the recreation allocation of $1,808,000 may be offset by revenues recoverable through user fees and accruing to the land and water conservation fund after it gets into operation.

The irrigation allocation is very high on a per acre basis—nearly $1,500—but the indications are that the water users will pay directly close to 60 percent of this cost, that another 18 percent will be paid from an ad valorem tax levied by a conservancy district in the area, and that the remainder will come from surplus revenues from the sale of power and municipal and industrial water.

The powerplants will be small and will have an installed capacity of only 13,200 kilowatts. They will pay themselves out with interest in 41 years and any revenues that come in after that time will be used to assist in repaying the irrigation allocation. The same is true of municipal water. It will repay its allocation with interest and, in addition, a portion of the irrigation allocation in 50 years.

All in all, then, the Dixie project appears to me to be a worthwhile and economically justified project, and I therefore recommend enactment of H.R. 3279 as amended by the committee.

Mr. BURTON of Utah. Mr. Speaker, the Dixie project is a multipurpose reclamation development considered essential for the healthy growth of southwestern Utah. It would provide irrigation, industrial and municipal water and power, flood control, fish and wildlife, and recreational benefits.

For generations the Virgin and Santa Clara Rivers have been a menace to the hard-working residents of this area. Some seasons the waters have been so low, they could provide no relief to crops burning from drought; other seasons cloudburst floods have eaten away precious cropland, washed out diversion dams and choked canals with silt. Without regulation there is no dependable late season supply, and crops and orchards wither and die. This, gentlemen, in a section of my great State which has a climate conducive to growing of a variety of agricultural products over a long season. In fact, in our early history, the settlers grew cotton there.

The need for a dependable water supply has long been recognized. The Dixie project is the culmination of ideas and investigation by local, State and Federal experts over many years.

WHAT WILL IT DO?

The undependable flow of the Virgin and Santa Clara Rivers will be regulated; irrigation water will be provided for 21,060 acres of land; damaging downstreams flow of sediment would be halted, the city of St. George, Washington County seat would get 5,000 acre-feet of water annually, three hydroelectric plants with a total generating capacity of 13,200 kilowatts to a region that urgently needs electric power. The reservoirs created would provide fish and wildlife, recreational and flood control benefits.

THE NEED

The economy of this area has felt the impact of the erratic water supply. In spite of State and local initiative the economy has lagged and in terms of assessed valuation, Washington County with its great agricultural potential and scenic attractions remains one of the poorest counties in the State. Young people who would prefer to remain in the area are being forced to find their livelihood elsewhere. Development of resources and provision of an adequate and predictable water supply would serve as a base for the revitalization and modernization of agricultural development and provide for increases in local industry and population growth. The Dixie project is the hope of the residents of this area of providing a strong economic base and opportunities for the future. The State of Utah has assisted with small projects which will complement the Dixie project, and will relocate the highway around the Virgin City Reservoir at State expense.

COST AND REPAYMENT

The 2.2-to-1 benefit-cost ratio means that for each $1 of cost, $2.20 would be returned. Thus, the Dixie project is economically justified.

In accordance with reclamation law, the costs of flood control and fish and wildlife would be nonreimbursable. And because of its proximity to Zion National Park, the Department of Interior recommended that recreational costs, too, be nonreimbursable. Power costs would be repaid with interest in 50 years. Municipal and industrial water costs would be repaid with interest in 50 years.

Revenues from irrigators, plus the high ad valorem tax agreed to by residents of the area, would repay 78 percent of the irrigation costs over the usual period. The residents have agreed to this higher 5 mill tax levy in order to make the project economically feasible and have established the Washington County Water Conservancy District well in advance in order to demonstrate their full backing of the project.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 3279, with amendments.

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill, S. 26, to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain the Dixie project, Utah, and for other purposes, a similar bill to the one just passed by the House.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

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 for the purposes of developing the water resources of the Virgin and Santa Clara Rivers, including the furnishing of municipal and industrial water supplies, the furnishing of an irrigation water supply to approximately twenty-one thousand acres of land, the control of floods, the generation and sale of electric energy, the conservation and development of fish and wildlife resources, and the enhancement of recreation opportunities, the Secretary of the Interior is authorized to construct, operate, and maintain the Dixie project, Utah. The project shall consist of the Virgin City Dam and Reservoir, tunnels, canals, siphons, pumping plants, and other works necessary to serve irrigated and irrigable lands along and adjacent to the Virgin River; a dam on the Santa Clara River near Gunlock, Utah, and other works necessary to serve irrigated and irrigable lands along and adjacent to the Santa Clara River and on Ivins Bench; and hydroelectric plants and transmission facilities at the Virgin City Dam and at such other points as are desirable. The Dixie project shall be coordinated with the Cedar City water development program which includes the diversion of the waters of Crystal Creek into the Kolob Res-

ervoir, and after completion of the Dixie project said waters of Crystal Creek and of the natural watershed of said Kolob Reservoir shall be exported for use of Cedar City and vicinity in accordance with an agreement entered by Cedar City and Iron County, Utah, on the 26th day of August 1953, with Kolob Reservoir and Storage Association, Incorporated, and Washington County, Utah.

SEC. 2. The project shall include such measures for the disposition of saline waters of La Verkin Springs as are necessary in the opinion of the Secretary to insure the delivery of water at downstream points along the Virgin River for water users in the States of Arizona and Nevada of suitable quality for irrigation, or provision shall be made to indemnify such water users for any impairment of water quality for irrigation purposes directly attributable to Dixie project operations.

SEC. 3. In constructing, operating, and maintaining the works authorized by this Act, the Secretary shall be governed by the Federal reclamation laws (Act of June 17, 1902, 32 Stat. 388, and Acts amendatory thereof or supplementary thereto), except as is otherwise provided in this Act.

SEC. 4. Construction of the project shall not be commenced until there shall be established a conservancy district or similar organization with such powers as may be required by the Secretary, these to include powers to tax both real and personal property within the boundary of the district and to enter into contracts with the United States for the repayment of reimbursable costs.

SEC. 5. The interest rate to be used for purposes of computing interest during construction and interest on the unpaid balance of those portions of the reimbursable costs which are properly allocable to commercial power development and municipal and industrial water supply shall be determined by the Secretary of the Treasury, as of the beginning of the fiscal year in which this bill is enacted, on the basis of the computed average interest rate payable by the Treasury upon its outstanding marketable public obligations, which are neither due nor callable for redemption for fifteen years from date of issue. If the interest rate so computed is not a multiple of one-eighth of 1 per centum, the rate of interest to be used for these purposes shall be the multiple of one-eighth of 1 per centum next lower than the rate so computed. The portions of the costs which are allocable to commercial power development and to municipal and industrial water supply shall be repaid over a period of fifty years with interest at the rate determined in accordance with this section. The portion of the costs which is properly allocable to irrigation and which is beyond the water users' ability to repay in fifty years plus a ten-year development period but not to exceed $3,500,000 shall be returned to the reclamation fund within such period from revenues derived by the Secretary of the Interior from the disposition of power marketed from Federal projects in the Lower Colorado River Basin.

SEC. 6. The Secretary of the Interior is authorized as a part of the Dixie project to construct, operate, and maintain public recreation facilities including access roads, to acquire or to withdraw from entry or other disposition under the public land laws such adjacent lands or interests therein as are necessary for present and future public recreation use, and to provide for public use and enjoyment of the same and of the water areas of the project but these undertakings shall be coordinated with the other project purposes. The Secretary is authorized to enter into agreements with State or local public agencies or other public entities for the operation, maintenance, or additional development of project lands or facilities or to dispose of project lands or facilities to State or local agencies or other public entities by lease, transfer, exchange or conveyance, upon such terms and conditions as will best promote their development and operation in the public interest for recreation purposes. The costs of the undertakings described in this section, including costs of investigation, planning, operation, and maintenance and an appropriate share of the joint costs of the Dixie project, shall be nonreimbursable.

SEC. 7. (a) The use of all water diverted for this project from the Colorado River system shall be subject to and controlled by the Colorado River compact, the Boulder Canyon Project Act (45 Stat. 1057; 43 U.S.C. 617t), and the Mexican Water Treaty (Treaty Series 994) (59 Stat. 1219).

(b) In the operation and maintenance of all facilities under the jurisdiction and supervision of the Secretary of the Interior authorized by this Act, the Secretary of the Interior is directed to comply with the applicable provisions of the Colorado River compact, the Upper Colorado River Basin compact, the Boulder Canyon Project Act, the Boulder Canyon Project Adjustment Act, the Colorado River Storage Project Act (and any contract lawfully entered into by the United States under any of said Acts), the treaty with the United Mexican States, and the operating principles, and to comply with the laws of the State of Utah, relating to the control, appropriation, use, and distribution of water therein. In the event of the failure of the Secretary of the Interior to so comply, any State of the Colorado River Basin may maintain an action in the Supreme Court of the United States to enforce the provisions of this section and consent is given to the joinder of the United States as a party in such suits, as a defendant or otherwise.

SEC. 8. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of any moneys in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, such sums as may be required to carry out the purposes of this Act.

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. ROGERS of Texas: Strike out all after the enacting clause of S. 26 and insert the provisions of H.R. 3279, as passed.

The amendment was agreed to.

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

A similar House bill, H.R. 3279, was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may extend their remarks on the bills just passed.

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

There was no objection.

INCREASE FHA LOAN FUND LIMITATION

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 7073) to amend the Consolidated Farmers Home Administration Act of 1961 in order to increase the limitation on the amount of loans which may be insured under subtitle A of such act.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 308 of the Consolidated Farmers Home Administration Act of 1961 is amended by striking out the figure "$200,000,000" and inserting in lieu thereof the figure "$450,000,000".

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is a second demanded?

Mr. MCINTIRE. Mr. Speaker, I demand a second.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, a second will be considered as ordered.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. COOLEY].

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may require to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. POAGE], chairman of the subcommittee that conducted hearings on this bill.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Speaker, this legislation authorizes an addition in the authority of the Farmers Home Administration to guarantee loans. It does not authorize any addition in the lending authority of the Farmers Home Administration. The Farmers Home Administration makes loans to farmers who cannot secure credit from other sources. It also guarantees loans that are made by private individuals. The limit on that heretofore has been $200 million. This bill would raise that limit to $450 million. But I will point out that over the life of this agency, there have been no losses as a result of this guarantee provision. The Farmers Home Administration charges one-half of 1 percent, I believe, for this guarantee that it makes and over the period of years since the organization of the Farmers Home Administration down to the present, this fund has built up something like $10 million or $12 million surplus. In other words, there has been more money come into the fund than has been used to pay the obligations of the fund.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, reasoning on the basis of that history, it is our feeling that if we increase the amount of the guaranteed loans, the money for which is provided by private investors rather than by the Federal Government, it could be done to say the least at a very minimal expense to the Federal Government.

We recognize full well that the losses will be somewhat increased, but they can be increased and still have a break-even point which you cannot do if you put the Government in the direct lending business.

The need for these loans is admitted. The Farmers Home Administration had some 12,000 applications for these loans in May of this year which they could not fill because they did not have available funds or the authority to guarantee the loans.

It was the feeling of many members of the committee earlier in the year that we must make provision for an increase in these guaranteed loans.

In all frankness, Mr. Speaker, when we can make loans under the poverty program to small farmers who do not have the ability even to meet the existing requirements of the Farmers Home Administration, it was the feeling of at

least many of us on the committee, that certainly we ought not do that without making loans available to those who had shown they had a little better degree of management and did a little harder work and had a little more likelihood of repaying the loans.

In other words, this is harder credit than is to be provided under the poverty bill.

We believe it is rather ridiculous to provide for the making of loans to people who cannot show any ability to repay and then say we will not even let the Farmers Home Administration guarantee the loans of those who probably can repay and who can that way be brought up out of poverty through their own hard work, certainly with very little if any cost to the Government.

Mr. McINTIRE. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. POAGE] has outlined the bill very well. It is a matter which has been before our Subcommittee on Conservation and Credit of the Committee on Agriculture for some time.

These loans, as has been stated, are insured loans. This bill would not change in any way the criteria upon which these loans are based. The same requirements will prevail as have prevailed under the legislation which authorized insured loans up to a maximum of $200 million.

This bill merely provides for increased authorization in order that these loans may continue to be made. They are in fact real estate loans. Instead of requiring that there be appropriated funds for lending on the part of the Farmers Home Administration for these long-term real estate loans, the insured loan provision permits the Farmers Home Administration to make the loans and to insure them with investing companies. Many are banks or other companies within the lending area and many are the larger investment companies which are looking for loans of this character.

This bill would provide an additional $250 million. As has been mentioned earlier, there is evidence that a substantial portion of this will be needed within a reasonable length of time.

It was the opinion of the committee that the extension of authority in the amount of $250 million, while it may seem to be a substantial increase over the $200 million already authorized, is warranted. It is our opinion that the Farmers Home Administration will continue its very careful analysis of the applications and that the loans will continue to be sound loans, as has been proved by the record.

Mr. Speaker, I have been requested to yield to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. OLIVER P. BOLTON] and I yield to him at this time for 1 minute.

Mr. OLIVER P. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman yielding. I have asked for this time in order to ask the gentleman from Texas [Mr. POAGE], a couple of questions.

As I understand this, it is purely an extension of the authorization for insuring loans from $200 million up to $450 million. Is that correct?

Mr. POAGE. Yes. That is exactly what it is.

Mr. OLIVER P. BOLTON. Therefore, this is a revolving ceiling. As one loan becomes paid off it goes back into the credit of the Farmers Home Administration?

Mr. POAGE. That is correct, except it is an annual ceiling and they cannot make more than that in any 1 year.

Mr. OLIVER P. BOLTON. But there is no time limit on this legislation at all. Is that correct?

Mr. POAGE. No. It is permanent.

Mr. OLIVER P. BOLTON. And there is no other time limit to this excepting the loans to be made must be good?

Mr. POAGE. Yes. All the restrictions that apply to the regular Farmers Home Administration loans.

Mr. OLIVER P. BOLTON. I am very interested in this because the initials of this administration are FHA and we have had another FHA provision up the other day when we were substituting a dollar ceiling for loans, and the administration and the party on the other side took a very strong position against it. Would the gentleman care to explain whether the administration is in favor of this bill?

Mr. POAGE. I would not want to try to speak for the administration, but I think I can in all fairness say they would want it passed.

Mr. OLIVER P. BOLTON. Does the gentleman know whether this has been cleared with the HHFA?

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. McINTIRE. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman 1 additional minute.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield further, I do not see how this can involve the HHFA at all. It is not a home loan at all. This is the Farmers Home Administration, and it does not involve the construction of homes. It is not a housing proposition.

Mr. OLIVER P. BOLTON. I understand, but it is a very similar proposition, is it not?

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. OLIVER P. BOLTON. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. COOLEY. The answer is no. This provides operating loans for land acquisition under the broad language of the Farmers Home Administration. It has been in operation for many, many years. Through this we have provided substantially for many acreage additions.

Mr. OLIVER P. BOLTON. I could not agree with the gentleman more, and I find the program is a very satisfactory one and working very well. I am interested, I will say to the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Agriculture, if the position on this FHA bill should be that a permanent dollar ceiling raised and established as a dollar ceiling continuing until Congress takes action is favored in this case; but when it was considered under the other FHA proposition, it was turned down.

I thank the gentleman.

Mr. COOLEY. They are two different programs.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MILLS). The time of the gentleman has again expired.

Mr. McINTIRE. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS].

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, there is so much boondoggling going on these days that I cannot keep track of all of it.

Will the gentleman from Texas tell me whether the Farmers Home Administration is engaged in any way in the building of golf courses, ski slides, toboggan slides, and all that kind of business?

Mr. POAGE. Certainly these loans are not. I do not want to say categorically that there is no participation on the part of this agency, because there is a general recreation program, as the gentleman is aware, that is financed through several agencies of the Government. I think it is possible that the Farmers Home Administration does make some of those loans, but this fund and the funds involved here do not encompass any of those kinds of loans. These are land acquisition loans, and that program cannot be involved here.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. COOLEY. The gentleman from Iowa had reference, I believe, to the ski jumps financed by REA money and not by Farmers Home Administration money.

Mr. GROSS. I thought I made it clear that I could not keep track of all the boondoggling going on. I did not know whether there was any of it in this program or not.

Mr. McINTIRE. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. WAGGONNER].

Mr. WAGGONNER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I take this time to ask the chairman of the subcommittee, in view of the fact that we are increasing this ceiling on real estate loans today, if there has been any consideration given by the committee to increasing the amount of money available for operating loans.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, there has been consideration given to it but we have not found an easily usable vehicle for that purpose. Since we have these guaranteed loans and can do this without expense to the Government in the case of these real estate loans, we have taken this step. The operating loans have to be made directly by the Government because you cannot get that kind of loan guarantee; at least it is more difficult and we do not have such a program. But we do recognize the need for additional operating funds.

Mr. WAGGONNER. One other point that might be clarified, Mr. Chairman, and that is that the language of the report which I note was issued June 25, 1964, refers to grants available under the Economic Opportunity Act.

Mr. POAGE. This report was written, of course, before the passage of that bill; before it was amended, of course, taking out those grants.

Mr. WAGGONNER. I thank the gentleman.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MILLS). The question is on the motion, Will the House suspend the rules and pass the bill H.R. 7073?

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXTENSION AND AMENDMENT OF PUBLIC LAW 480

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 12298) to extend the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954, as amended, is further amended as follows:

(1) Effective January 1, 1965, section 103(b) of such Act is amended by striking out "1962" and substituting in lieu thereof "1965", by striking out "1964" and substituting in lieu thereof "1967", by striking out "$4,500,000,000" and substituting in lieu thereof "$4,000,000,000", and by inserting prior to the colon the following: "plus any amount by which agreements entered into in prior years have called or will call for appropriations to reimburse the Commodity Credit Corporation in amounts less than authorized for such prior years by this Act as in effect during such years".

(2) Section 104 of such Act is amended by inserting in subsection (c) after the words "common defense" the words "including internal security".

(3) Section 104 of such Act is amended by striking from subsection (e) the words "not more than 25 per centum of the currencies received pursuant to each such agreement shall be available" and substituting "currencies shall also be available to the maximum usable extent".

(4) Section 104 of such Act is amended by adding the following new subsection:

"(u) To use foreign currencies which are in excess of the normal requirements of the United States as determined by the Secretary of the Treasury, to promote the development of the resources of less developed friendly foreign countries in a manner which will secure to the United States the maximum benefit from currencies accruing under this title: *Provided, however,* That no such use shall be made of such currencies which would have the effect of reducing the dollar reimbursement to the Commodity Credit Corporation for foreign currencies. There is hereby established an advisory committee composed of the Secretary of Agriculture, the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, the Administrator of the Agency for International Development, the chairman and the ranking minority member of the House Committee on Agriculture, and the chairman and the ranking minority member of the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry. The function of such Committee shall be to review from time to time the status of foreign currencies which accrue under this title and to make recommendations to the President with regard to (1) the use of excess currencies under the authority conferred upon him by this subsection and (2) grants under subsection (e) hereof."

(5) The first proviso at the end of section 104 of such Act is amended by striking out "to not less than 10 per centum of the foreign currencies which accrue under this title:" and substituting ", effective with respect to agreements entered into beginning January 1, 1965, to not less than 20 per centum in the aggregate of the foreign currencies which accrue under such agreements:".

(6) Section 108 of such Act is amended by striking out the words "six months" and inserting in lieu thereof the word "year".

(7) Sections 109 and 204 of such Act are amended by striking out "1964" and substituting in lieu thereof "1967".

(8) Section 203 of such Act is amended by striking out "1961" and substituting "1965"; by striking out "1964" and substituting "1967"; by striking out "$300,000,000", and substituting "$450,000,000"; and by inserting after "charges for general average contributions arising out of the ocean transport of commodities transferred pursuant hereto" the following: "or donated under said section 416, section 308 of this Act or section 9 of the Act of September 6, 1958."

(9) Section 203 of the Act is amended by inserting after the third sentence of said section the following new sentence: "In addition to other funds available for such purposes under any other Act, funds made available under this title may be used to purchase foreign currencies accruing under title I in order to meet costs (except the personnel and administrative costs of cooperating sponsors, distributing agencies, and recipient agencies, and the costs of construction or maintenance of any church owned or operated edifice and edifices to be used for sectarian purposes) designed to assure that commodities made available under this title or under title III are used to carry out more effectively the purposes for which such commodities are made available or to promote community and other self-help activities designed to alleviate the causes of the need for such assistance: *Provided, however,* That such funds shall be used only to supplement and not substitute for, funds normally available for such purposes from other non-United States Government sources." and by inserting after the word "costs" in the last sentence the words "or for the purchase of foreign currencies".

(10) Section 101 of such Act is amended by striking out in subsection (f) the words "from the government or agencies thereof" and further by striking the period at the end of subsection (f) and adding the following: ", and which are not less favorable than the highest of exchange rates obtainable by any other nation.".

SEC. 2. Subsection (b) of section 612 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, is amended (1) by redesignating it as subsection (t) of section 104 of the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954, as amended.

(2) By striking "this Act" and substituting "the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended.".

(3) By changing the period at the end of the subsection to a comma and adding "except that in the case of any such foreign currencies acquired through operations under title I of the Agricultural Trade Development and assistance Act of 1954, as amended, the United States dollars received from the sale of such foreign currencies shall be deposited to the account of the Commodity Credit Corporation and shall be treated as a reimbursement to Commodity Credit Corporation under section 105 of this Act."

SEC. 3. Section 416 of the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended, is amended by adding the following at the end of such section: "The assistance to needy persons provided in (4) above shall, insofar as practicable, be directed toward community and other self-help activities designed to alleviate the causes of the need for such assistance.".

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is a second demanded?

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, I demand a second.

Mr. DAGUE. Mr. Speaker, I demand a second.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Pennsylvania, a member of the committee, demands a second.

Mr. BOW. A point of order, Mr. Speaker; I am opposed to the bill and I understand the gentleman from Pennsylvania is not opposed to the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is the gentleman from Pennsylvania opposed to the bill?

Mr. DAGUE. Mr. Speaker, I am not opposed to the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BOW], demands a second. Without objection, a second will be considered as ordered.

There was no objection.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will count. [After counting.] One hundred and one Members are present, not a quorum.

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

A call of the House was ordered.

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

[Roll No. 234]

Abbitt	Gurney	Nedzi
Adair	Hanna	Osmers
Andrews, Ala.	Harsha	Pepper
Ashley	Harvey, Mich.	Pilcher
Auchincloss	Healey	Pirnie
Avery	Hoeven	Pucinski
Baring	Hoffman	Rains
Blatnik	Horton	Randall
Bolling	Jones, Ala.	Roybal
Bolton, Frances P.	Jones, Mo.	Ryan, Mich.
Bromwell	Kee	St. George
Brown, Calif.	Kluczynski	St Germain
Buckley	Kyl	Sheppard
Cameron	Landrum	Shipley
Daddario	Lankford	Smith, Calif.
Davis, Tenn.	Lesinski	Staebler
Diggs	Lindsay	Steed
Dingell	McClory	Taft
Elliott	McMillan	Thompson, La.
Ellsworth	MacGregor	Toll
Forrester	Martin, Mass.	Tollefson
Fraser	Miller, Calif.	Vinson
Gill	Miller, N.Y.	Wallhauser
Grabowski	Montoya	Whalley
	Moss	

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MILLS). On this rollcall 360 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

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

EXTENSION AND AMENDMENT OF PUBLIC LAW 480

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. POAGE], the chairman of the subcommittee who handled this bill and conducted the hearings.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Speaker, this bill provides for an extension of Public Law 480 for 3 years.

We believe that Public Law 480 has been one of the most successful programs of its kind ever promulgated by

the Congress. It has moved vast quantities of agricultural products into the world markets. It has rendered a great service to American agriculture. It has rendered a comparable service to the cause of peace throughout the world, in that it has served as a very important part of our foreign aid program. We believe that in many respects it provides the best kind of foreign aid, although it is, and we believe it must remain, basically an agricultural program.

This bill would extend Public Law 480 for a period of 3 years. It would make relatively minor changes in the law as it exists, but changes which I believe and most of us believe should be made.

It will increase from 10 to 20 percent the proportion of foreign currencies which are received from the sale of agricultural commodities which must be devoted exclusively to U.S. uses and therefore made subject to the appropriating process.

Let me make that point plain, because I recognize there will be efforts to confuse the House as to the effect of this bill on the appropriating process. Under the law as it now stands, 10 percent of the funds carried in any agreement with a foreign country must be made available for American uses. Those American uses are subject to appropriation by the Appropriations Committee. Under this bill as we have written it, 20 percent must be made available in that way. In other words, we have doubled the percentage of these funds which must be made available to the appropriating process.

We have also changed the provision which now provides that not more than 25 percent of these foreign currencies shall be made available for Cooley type loans; that is, loans to American industry. We have provided that all that can be effectively used for that purpose shall be made available for loans to American corporations doing business in these foreign countries.

We have provided a change in the value which foreign countries may place on their currencies, so that the sales which are made to foreign countries must be made at the most favorable legal rate of exchange and in no event at a rate less than the most favorable rate available to any other country.

Now, frankly, my friends, that one point has been a hole as large as a barn door, because unless we can say we are getting as favorable a rate as any other country, you can understand that no matter what our price on our commodity is, if we do not get the most favorable exchange rate, we are not getting a fair shake.

We believe that these provisions in this bill are bound to give us a better and a stronger program than we have ever had. We have in the bill a number of relatively minor changes, such as authorizing the use of certain of the title II and III currencies, to purchase foreign currencies from title I to use to buy tools and equipment to be able to carry out these relief programs carried out under titles II and III. We provide in title I, which is the major portion of this bill, that it shall be extended for 3 years and that there shall be $4 billion available, which is a decrease of $500 million.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has again expired.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DAGUE].

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. DAGUE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may be privileged to extend their remarks at this point in the RECORD on this bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MILLS). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Speaker, I support the extension of Public Law 480 as I have supported this program since its inception in the 83d Congress. I have some reservations, however, about certain provisions in the bill but on the whole, the committee has produced a piece of legislation which is necessary to the continued welfare of American agriculture. I share apprehensions with others that Public Law 480 is becoming more and more an instrument of foreign aid, but the Committee on Agriculture has made a number of changes and recommendations of the executive branch to restrict this part of the program.

Public Law 480 is today more popularly known as the food-for-peace program. It was instituted as the food-for-peace program in the Eisenhower administration in 1959. This was proved when on February 9, 1960, President Eisenhower in his message to the Congress, as set forth in House Document 330, 86th Congress, 2d session, said:

> The food-for-peace program, initiated pursuant to my recommendations of last year, has been vigorously advanced. On my recent trip abroad, I saw many constructive results from these efforts and the need and opportunity for even greater use of this humanitarian program. Clearly we should continue to do our utmost to use our abundance constructively in the worldwide battle against hunger. The law we enacted in 1954, known as Public Law 480 of the 83d Congress, has been especially helpful to us in waging this battle.

There are many provisions in this legislation which I vigorously support. These include the following:

First. The provision to allow foreign currencies to be used for internal security operations of friendly foreign countries. This amendment will be particularly helpful in the execution of our foreign policy in South Vietnam. As we all know, the Vietcong Communists now terrorize and murder all those who oppose them. This amendment will make funds available to more effectively and efficiently protect the population of South Vietnam through the strategic hamlet program.

Second. The provision which removes the limitation on loans to American businessmen overseas. This program, popularly known as the Cooley loan program, has been both popular and successful. The present 25-percent limitation has been removed by the committee in an effort to stimulate further use of foreign currencies for this purpose.

Third. A provision to encourage maximum use of title I currencies for U.S. uses. At present the law requires that at least 10 percent of the foreign currencies generated under title I be earmarked for U.S. uses. The committee has amended this provision of law to require that no less than 20 percent of these currencies be subject to U.S. uses.

Fourth. A provision to encourage maximum exchange rates. In title I foreign currency sales, the exchange rate at which foreign countries agreed to purchase our farm commodities is often unrealistic. The committee amended provisions to get the best possible bargain for the United States on these exchange rates in future negotiations.

There are, of course, a number of other important provisions in this bill which extend titles I and II of Public Law 480 for 3 more years. These are set forth in the committee report and will be debated today.

Mr. DAGUE. Mr. Speaker, while I have some reservations about H.R. 12298, I feel that this legislation is, on the whole, both needed and justified. As a member of the Foreign Agricultural Operations Subcommittee I had the opportunity to consider at length the administration's proposals and recommendations together with the suggested amendments of other groups and individuals.

The administration sought a 5-year extension of both titles I and II, but the subcommittee and the full committee both agreed that a 3-year extension was an ample period of time for this very large program to operate without a full congressional review.

The administration also sought in various ways to make Public Law 480 primarily a foreign aid program. For example, it was proposed that the Commodity Credit Corporation be empowered to go into the market and buy farm commodities which were not in surplus, simply to meet an earlier promise made by the executive branch for the donation of these commodities. This provision would have changed the basic structure of Public Law 480 very drastically and would have no longer retained the basic concept that the food-for-peace program is one which shares our abundance and not one which stimulates surplus just for the sake of giving it away.

The bill before you today makes a number of important changes in the law in addition to extending both title I and title II for 3 years.

While the language of the bill shows the expenditure of $4 billion for title I programs for the next 3 years, the actual amount will be closer to $5.5 billion when unused previous obligations and CCC repayments are taken into account.

Title II expenditures will be in the neighborhood of $1.5 billion during the next 3 years, again taking into account unused authorizations.

The bill also increases from 10 to 20 percent the proportion of foreign currencies which must be used exclusively for meeting U.S. Government needs in foreign countries. The bill establishes a

seven-man advisory committee to consult with and make recommendations to the President concerning the use of foreign currencies in excess of anticipated needs. This committee will be made up of the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, the Secretary of Agriculture, the Administrator of AID, the chairman and ranking minority members of the House and Senate Agriculture Committees. These excessive currencies now approach $1.2 billion and are set forth on page 32 of the committee report. In addition, the Advisory Committee will also consult the President on the use of foreign currencies in future agreements for economic development grants under section 104(e) of the act.

The bill authorizes the use of foreign currencies to supplement surplus food and self-help work projects, but the committee has limited the use of these funds to nonsectarian projects.

In addition, the bill allows foreign currencies to be used for increasing our effectiveness in the defense of the people of South Vietnam; it encourages further investment by U.S. private enterprise in foreign countries; it attempts to gain more favorable exchange rates for the United States in the negotiation of title I sales agreements, and it steps up the percentage of title I foreign currencies from 10 to 20 percent.

The bill also changes the reporting period from 6 months to an annual basis. It is certainly my hope that reports and statistics will be furnished to the committee and to the Congress more frequently than annually because this program is indeed a massive one entailing very substantial expenditures of the taxpayers' money.

All in all, the Committee on Agriculture has worked diligently and sincerely to bring to the House a bill which has the committee's overwhelming support.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, I can agree with a great deal that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. POAGE] has said. This is a fine program. I think I introduced one of the original bills in the House which eventually became Public Law 480. I think it has done a great deal of good throughout the world, and I think it should be continued.

My objection goes to this bill and to some of the amendments that are in this bill. I think the gentleman from Texas [Mr. POAGE], must have had a twinge of conscience when he said he was convinced that somebody would try to mislead the House on the question of appropriations. I am not going to try to mislead this House. I am going to try to give the House the facts. We did not get the facts in the presentation that has been made here.

Let me read from page 33 of the committee report on the section by section explanation. Under title I, paragraph 1 reads in part as follows: It says that this bill, if passed, "authorizes agreements to be entered into during such 3-year period in an amount which does not call for appropriation to reimburse CCC in a total amount in excess of $4 billion plus the carryover of unused authorization from prior years."

This is their own report. Without appropriations, $4 billion.

Now, what are we doing here? This is a complete backdoor spending bill. It is unfortunate that we do not have several hours to debate this bill, for it is a good bill in certain areas and we should have an opportunity to present to the House the chance to amend it. We know now that we are going to be here for a while after next Friday. We are coming back. Let us get a rule. Let us bring this bill in and let the House work its will rather than say to us take this or have nothing at all in this field of foreign aid.

Now let me call your attention to one other matter. In the past, on the question of excess requirements of foreign currencies, you ladies and gentlemen of the House have had the opportunity to pass upon them and how they shall be used.

What happens under this bill? Your rights that you have exercised in the past are now delegated to a new Commission, taken away from the House so that you cannot pass upon them, and turned over to a Commission to make this determination or recommendation to the President. And who is on that Commission? The Secretary of Agriculture, the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, the Administrator of the Agency for International Development, the chairman and ranking members of the House Committee on Agriculture and the chairman and ranking members of the Senate committee.

What you are asked to do in this bill—and this I object to—is to take away from you and delegate to this Commission your responsibility. I think this is wrong. I think this responsibility should stay with the House of Representatives, and we should not delegate to the Secretary of Agriculture and the Director of AID and to the others our responsibility.

Always remember when we talk about this $4 billion-plus that is going to be taken without appropriation that under the Constitution of the United States no funds shall be taken from the Treasury except through appropriation by you, the Congress of the United States, originating here in the House. But we are asked under this bill to forego that. We are asked in this bill to delegate our authority, our responsibility, to a group in the executive branch, with some of the members of the Committees on Agriculture working with them.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the Members to vote against the suspension of the rules. There is pending in the Committee on Rules now an application for a rule on this bill. Let us get a rule on it. This is a great amount of funds that is involved. The responsibility is on us. Let us get it back here where we will be able to offer amendments to it, and if the will of the House is not to accept the amendments, well and good. But it seems to me that this is not the kind of a bill that should be in here under suspension of the rules.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, will the distinguished gentleman from Ohio yield?

Mr. BOW. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from New York.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I have just this minute come to the floor from our committee room upstairs. May I ask the distinguished gentleman, is this the back-door spending bill that the gentleman from Ohio has discussed with me?

Mr. BOW. This is the bill that I discussed with the gentleman.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Then I am vigorously opposed to it.

Mr. BOW I thank the gentleman.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 2 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, I just want to observe that this bill was very carefully considered in the Committee on Agriculture. My recollection is that every member of that 35-man committee approved the draft you now have before you. Under this program, commonly known as Public Law 480, we have disposed of surplus agricultural commodities valued at more than $11 billion, and I do not believe any program we have had has been as free from criticism as this program under Public Law 480.

The gentleman who just addressed the House apparently is under some impression that we are doing something different now from what we have been doing over the years. This program has been in operation beginning in 1954. What we are actually doing is recognizing the fact that about twice as much authority should be given to your committee to appropriate, but here we are not appropriating American dollars. We are not appropriating any dollars in this bill and I am at a loss to understand why the gentleman is disturbed about it, because we are changing some parts of the program to make it more workable and more acceptable. Let me observe that if you damn this bill as back-door spending you might as well say that everything the CCC does is back-door spending.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOLEY. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. BOW. The gentleman says he does not know why I am disturbed. I am disturbed because of the fact that you are here setting up a new advisory commission on how these funds shall be used. I remind the gentleman that we used to hear these same arguments about these currencies in France and England and Belgium and other countries. We said they were surplus, we will never use them. They are gone.

They are gone. What we use these surplus currencies for is the operation of our embassies, the USIA, and the official business of Government abroad. These funds will be gone before long. When the gentleman says these are not American dollars, I say to the gentleman that they were bought with American dollars and they are just as important as American dollars.

Mr. COOLEY. The Committee on Appropriations of which the gentleman from Ohio is a member has the responsibility of appropriating dollars for the purpose of purchasing this currency. So you do have control over it.

You appropriated 17 percent of the program, and if we do what you suggest, you will take this great program which has been in operation under Public Law 480 and bring it down to 17 percent of its normal volume of operation.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MILLS). The time of the gentleman from North Carolina has expired.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman 1 additional minute.

Mr. COOLEY. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. COOLEY. Certainly.

Mr. BOW. The gentleman says that we appropriate these dollars with which to purchase these currencies.

Does the gentleman mean that we appropriate the money with which to obtain the excess currencies?

Mr. COOLEY. That is right, to buy them.

Mr. BOW. Or do we appropriate certain funds with which to obtain foreign currencies in those countries where they are not in excess?

Mr. COOLEY. They are appropriated to be used to defray American mission expenses abroad.

Mr. BOW. But in the case of excess currency does the gentleman say we appropriate money with which to buy excess currencies?

Mr. COOLEY. We appropriate all of the dollars and we just provide for the use of these commodities. That is all we do.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, will the distinguished gentleman from North Carolina yield to me?

Mr. COOLEY. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. I should like to say that we had an example of foreign currency back-door spending today in connection with the appropriation bill on which we adopted the conference report at noon.

You will recall that the House was originally presented with a request to spend $12 million to save the Nubian monuments in the River Nile. The House appropriated no money whatever for such purpose. The bill then went to the other body and it turned out that the other body, while also appropriating no funds for this project, and which will delight many dilettantes throughout the Nation, found that the State Department proposed that it would use Public Law 480 program money in connection with saving those monuments. That, I say, is back-door spending and I am unalterably opposed to such procedure.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from North Carolina has again expired.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 1 additional minute.

Mr. Speaker, if the gentlemen are complaining about back-door spending, we hear that statement every time we come out here with an agricultural bill dealing with agricultural commodities.

Certainly, when you deplete the capital stock of the Commodity Credit Corporation, the House Committee on Agriculture does not bring in legislation authorizing the building up of those capital values. It comes from the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. Speaker, I want to go back and emphasize the fact that if the Members will check the record they will find that the Committee on Appropriations only appropriates 17 percent of the money used in the operation of the Public Law 480 program. If we leave the matter to the Committee on Appropriations they will just restrict this program to 15 or 20 percent. We want it to go on and operate in order to dispose of these surplus commodities and in that way save American dollars.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOLEY. Certainly, I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. BOW. We do not restrict it. This House of Representatives, the body that is here now, are the ones who pass upon those appropriations. If there is any restricting done, it is done by this full House and the gentleman from North Carolina knows it.

Mr. COOLEY. You have the primary responsibility for initiating appropriations and bringing them before the House.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN].

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, in this debate we have frequently heard the expression "dispose" of billions of dollars' worth of commodities.

Mr. Speaker, It has been my privilege to head the Subcommittee on Agricultural Appropriations for some several years. In the next few days we will be before the House requesting $5.5 billion in cash and according to the Senate bill $1,992,453,000 will be to restore the impairment for Public Law 480 sales.

Mr. Speaker, I do not like the relaxation that I see contained in this bill to extend Public Law 480 and I will tell the Members of the House why I do not like this change, though I agree we must extend the law.

Under section 3 we have heretofore had at least a limitation not to exceed 25 percent on how much could be used of these foreign currencies for such loans. I know they say this is only foreign currency, but in foreign countries you must have foreign currency. Here is what we are doing. We are making available these foreign currencies under section 3 to put American corporations and individuals in business in foreign countries.

They are in turn contributing to the production of agricultural commodities and either sending them back to the United States or taking U.S. markets. Then we are having to pick up the cost through the Commodity Credit Corporation takeover of U.S. production.

I have before me a report by the investigators of the Appropriations Committee. It is not as yet complete. As of now the information that we have is that we have had a total of imports of $17.32 billion in 1963, $4.12 billion in agricultural commodities, including $2.293 billion which competed with U.S. farm products.

We have made in grants of foreign currency to Argentina, for example, $24 million for grain storage facilities. Beef and veal have produced sales in the United States 12 percent higher than in 1960.

In Brazil we have made available these foreign currencies of over $34 million, and their imports of beef to the United States have increased 470 percent. That is the reason you have this problem of a conference on beef imports going on right now.

Our committee is trying to get the facts together showing that through the use of these foreign currencies we are putting American businessmen overseas who send the products back here or take our foreign markets, which will wreck the Commodity Credit Corporation, our section 32 funds, and in the long run American agricultural programs.

I urge you to send this bill back to the committee. Let it stand as it is until we have a chance to clean up the bad things that are done with these currencies now. We are putting ourselves out of business with the use of foreign currencies.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTEN. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. COOLEY. Does the gentleman refer to the imports of beef?

Mr. WHITTEN. Yes; along with other commodities.

Mr. COOLEY. You do not have any foreign loans for that. How much beef do we import?

Mr. WHITTEN. It has increased 12 percent from Argentina in 1958 to 1962; in Brazil it has increased 470 percent. In Mexico we have had foreign aid assistance, $47 million. Mexico is an important cotton producer.

In the next few days we will be asking you for $5.5 billion to finance the U.S. Commodity Credit Corporation. May I say in all frankness, in my judgment these funds will last the rest of this fiscal year. I say that we need to send this bill back, and tighten it up, not loosen it up.

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTEN. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. HORAN. I want to agree with my colleague from Mississippi, who is chairman of the subcommittee on which I have the honor of being the ranking minority member. We feel that this measure should come to the floor under a rule, to be discussed and amended, probably. We have complained about back-door spending. Why continue something that we found to be a fault, and which bypasses—I think this is important to every Member of the House—the Congress of the United States. I agree with the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. WHITTEN. I thank the gentleman. Our record shows in these foreign currencies generated here that AID has and will pay up to 50 percent of the cost to explore certain things. They will make these loans and encourage American investors to go in business abroad.

This bill should come back in the regular order to be tightened up.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTEN. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. COOLEY. I know the gentleman from Mississippi does not intend to mislead the House or try to mislead this House.

I think he should be aware of the fact that we have had no Public Law 480 sales to Australia or New Zealand, and that is where the beef is coming from. The gentleman mentioned South America and Africa. We cannot bring it in here from that area because of the hoof-and-mouth disease. So where is the beef coming in from?

Mr. WHITTEN. I did not refer to the two countries the gentleman did. I said Argentina, Brazil, and Mexico are the countries from which these imports come into our country.

Mr. COOLEY. Is any coming in from Argentina, on account of the hoof-and-mouth disease?

Mr. WHITTEN. There has been an increase in meat imports and in cotton, and foreign exports have also increased in competition with the United States. In Brazil you have had an increase of 470 percent in meat exports to the United States.

Mr. COOLEY. Of what?

Mr. WHITTEN. Of beef.

Mr. COOLEY. From Argentina?

Mr. WHITTEN. No, Brazil.

Mr. COOLEY. How are you going to bring it in from Brazil? There is hoof-and-mouth disease in the whole area.

Mr. WHITTEN. There is an increase in meat exports to the United States today of 470 percent.

Mr. COOLEY. What figure is the gentleman reading from?

Mr. WHITTEN. This is from the report from investigators of the Appropriations Committee, which is not complete at the present time.

May I read you just a little of what our Appropriations Committee investigators have already reported with regard to our "foreign competition" by American companies abroad, including American grants, loans and foreign currencies, as would be permitted by this bill.

U.S. INTERESTS IN FOREIGN AGRICULTURAL PRODUCTION

A. ARGENTINA

The principal U.S. firms engaged in the livestock and meat industry in Argentina are International Packers Limited (IPL), Chicago, Ill., and the King Ranch of Kingsville, Tex. IPL subsidiaries in Argentina are Swift, Armour, La Blanca, and Provita; IPL also has an interest in 3 ranching operations containing approximately 766,000 acres and 108,000 cattle. IPL has received a $5 million loan from the Export-Import Bank and has investment guaranties from AID of $12,990,000 convertibility and $12,300,000 for expropriation. King Ranch owns and operates 4 ranches totaling some 118,600 acres with about 30,000 cattle and 16,000 sheep.

B. AUSTRALIA

Cotton

The Wee Wa district of New South Wales is the site of a rapidly expanding irrigated cotton growing area which has been financed largely by American capital supplied by cotton interests in California and Arizona. A report by the agricultural attaché in Australia states that the increased production of cotton in this area will undoubtedly have an adverse effect on U.S. exports of raw cotton to Australia, and could reduce such exports by 28,000 to 35,000 bales annually.

Red meats

U.S. interests in Australia are: Esperance Land and Development Co., Western Australia (owned by Chase International Investment Corp. of New York City, American Factors Associates, Ltd., of Honolulu, Hawaii, J. H. Whitney and Co. of New York City, and Elders–G.M. Co., Ltd.) has an option on 1,450,000 acres and currently has about 8,500 sheep and 1,000 cattle. Intercontinental Meat Traders, Inc., Limited, Brisbane, is a subsidiary of Intercontinental Meat Traders, Inc., Chicago, Ill. IPL affiliated companies in Australia are Swift Australian Co., Ltd., Brisbane; Mayfair Hams, Ltd., Sydney; and Armour & Co., Ltd., Sydney. International Portion Foods Ltd., Brisbane, is a branch of Henderson's Portion Pak, Inc., Coral Gables, Fla. King Ranch Australia, Ltd., associate of the King Ranch in Texas, operates a number of large ranches over 1.7 million acres in Northern Territory, Queensland, and New South Wales. Mr. Art Linkletter owns 22,000 acres at Esperance on which he is raising sheep and cattle, and he recently purchased, in partnership with Mr. Allen T. Chase a 650,000-acre cattle station in Northern Territory. The Peterborough Meat Export Co., Ltd., Peterborough, South Australia, is operated by Mr. Joseph Popp, a U.S. citizen connected with two packing companies in Detroit, Mich. Swift Australian and King Ranch formed a company in 1962 which purchased for approximately $4.5 million over 8,000 square miles of land in Queensland and Northern Territory. Wilson Meats Ltd., Brisbane, is a wholly owned subsidiary of Wilson and Co., Inc., Chicago.

C. COLOMBIA

Purina Limitada, Cartagena, Colombia, wholly owned subsidiary of Ralston Purina Co., St. Louis, Mo., received a "Cooley" loan of 800,000 Colombia pesos (approximately $80,000) in 1959 from the Export-Import Bank for the purpose of financing facilities for the production of animal feeds.

D. HONDURAS

The major U.S. interest in the meat trade of Honduras is through International Foods Corp., S.A., a wholly owned subsidiary of Alberti Foods, Inc., Chicago, of which L. K. Alberti, Jr., a U.S. citizen, is president. Associated with Mr. Alberti in his Honduran interests is Adam Smith, also a U.S. citizen, who is president of Sanda Corp., Miami, Fla. International Foods owns ASTCO, a Honduran transport and warehousing company with a 700,000-pound capacity freezer in Puerto Cortes, and has financial interests in three Honduran packing plants which export boneless beef.

Ganadera Industrial Hondurena, S.A., Tegucigalpa, exports commercial grade boneless beef. Mr. William Montiel, a U.S. citizen, own 25 percent of the stock of the company. Mr. Montiel also has a financial interest in one of the packing plants in which International Foods has an interest, and in a slaughterhouse in Nicaragua. Ganadera Industrial and the other plant in which International Foods and Mr. Montiel have an interest have contracts to sell boneless beef to Gurrentz International Corp., Miami, Fla., and Pittsburgh, Pa.

Matadero de Puerto Arturo is part of the livestock division of the Tela Railroad Co., a wholly owned subsidiary of United Fruit Co., Boston. The livestock division has about 21,000 cattle, and the slaughterhouse produces boneless beef for export and local sales.

Another boneless beef exporting company, Empacadora del Norte, S.A., Puerto Castilla, is not yet in operation. Its principal officers are Temis Ramirez de Arellano and Ruben Santiago, both United States (Puerto Rico) nationals.

E. MEXICO

Ralston Purina de Mexico, S.A. de C.V., a wholly owned subsidiary of Ralston Purina Co., St. Louis, received a "Cooley" loan of 10 million Mexican pesos (approximately $800,000) in December 1958 from the Export-Import Bank for the purpose of financing facilities for the cultivation, manufacture, storage, and sale of animal feed and the construction of a sesame solvent plant. The Export-Import Bank had rejected the loan application in April 1950.

The American Embassy in Mexico had advised the Export-Import Bank that any development of the animal feed business in Mexico would compete with U.S. exports. However, imports of U.S. animal feed are bound to be replaced by domestic production in the future, and it would be desirable to aid American enterprise to expand production in Mexico rather than leave the field open for others.

USDA had advised the Export-Import Bank in April 1950 that the resulting increased production of feeds in Mexico would compete directly with mixed animal feeds then being exported from the United States to Mexico sufficiently to preclude approval of the application. In October 1958 USDA advised the Export-Import Bank that it had given further study to the competition involved and had concluded that it did not preclude favorable consideration of the application. USDA officials stated that they had concluded that feed grain exports from the United States could be expected to increase with expanded mixing facilities. Data furnished to the staff by USDA indicate that Mexican imports did not increase with expanded mixing facilities; average annual imports of corn for 1955–59 totaled 346,454 metric tons, whereas imports were 240,400 tons in 1958; 29,600 tons in 1959; 52,845 tons in 1960; and 42,551 tons in 1961.

Industrial Pecuaria, S.A., a Mexican firm owned 50 percent by Archer-Daniels-Midland Co., of Minneapolis, Minn., and 50 percent by Mexican investors, received a "Cooley" loan of 10 million Mexican pesos (approximately $800,000) from the Export-Import Bank in February 1959 for the purpose of financing facilities for the production and storage of animal feeds. In April 1958 the Export-Import Bank had rejected the application; the American Embassy in Mexico had made a recommendation similar to that made in the Ralston Purina case, and USDA recommended against the loan. However, as in the Ralston Purina case, USDA reversed its prior recommendation in October 1958.

Textiles Morelos, S.A., owned not less than 50 percent by Burlington Industries, Inc., Greensboro, N.C., received a "Cooley" loan in February 1959 of 3,233,362 Mexican pesos (approximately $258,000) to be used to acquire textile production facilities.

F. NEW ZEALAND

IPL has a wholly owned subsidiary, Swift New Zealand Co., Ltd., Wellington, which dates back to the early 1930's when first an export agency and then a slaughter plant were acquired. Swift slaughter presently accounts for between 7 and 8 percent of all New Zealand lamb and mutton slaughters and approximately 8 percent of all cattle slaughter. Swift operates an experimental, demonstration-type farm on leased property and is attempting to lease additional acreage for stockholding purposes to stabilize slaughter operations.

G. PARAGUAY

The principal U.S. firm engaged in the livestock and meat industry in Paraguay is International Products Corp.; canned corned beef is its major meat export.

International Products Corp. received a loan not to exceed $2.6 million in 1958 from the Development Loan Fund for modernization and expansion. In 1960 the company was in financial difficulties and AID postponed payments due under the development loan. The corporation also entered into a credit agreement with private investors in December 1961, and in January 1962 AID agreed to subordinate its loan to the loan of the private investors. In January 1962 AID entered into guarantee agreements under which the private investors were protected against the risks of convertibility, expropriation, and confiscation.

In March 1963 International Products Corp. made application for a "Cooley" loan for a sum equivalent to $450,000 for improving its cattle and pasture operations; this application is now being considered by AID.

Pan Western Enterprises, Inc., with a U.S. address at New Orleans, La., purchased 246,670 acres of land on the Upper Paraguay River in January 1962, and began operating a large cattle ranch in 1963. Pan Western Enterprises applied in October 1962 for a "Cooley" loan for a sum equivalent to $821,400 to help meet the costs of a beef cattle production operation in the Chaco of Paraguay. AID approved the application in March 1963 subject to approval by Paraguay and the U.S. country team there. The country team registered strong objections. The objections of the country team were overruled and the loan was approved in April 1963.

(6) MEXICO

Mexico, an important producer of good quality staple, produced 2,425,000 bales of cotton in 1962, 19 percent more than the annual average production for 1955–59. Preliminary indications were for a considerably smaller crop in 1963 of about 2 million bales. Approximately three-fourths of the total crop entered world trade; exports of 1,897,000 bales in 1962 were 21 percent higher than the annual average exports of 1955–59. Sales were large to France, West Germany, Italy, and especially to Japan which took in 1962, 775,000 bales, or 25 percent of the cotton imported by that country, against only 29 percent of the total from the United States.

Mexico not only supplies a very substantial number of live cattle to the United States, but, additionally, produced in 1958–62 an annual average of 938 million pounds of beef and veal, 18 percent more than the average annual production of 1953–57. Preliminary data indicate a further increase in 1963 to a level 19 percent higher than the 1958–62 average. Pork production also increased by about 11 percent between the two 5-year periods and in 1963 was about 12 percent higher than average for the preceding 5 years. Mutton and lamb production in 1958–62 was 8 percent higher than in 1953–57. Beef and veal exports, largely to the United States, averaged 79 million pounds in 1958–62, 155 percent higher than in the preceding 5 years. Exports to the United States during the 5-year period 1958–62 averaged about 78 million pounds, up 370 percent as compared with the preceding 5 years. Preliminary data for 1963 indicate U.S. imports from that source of 103 million pounds, mostly of boneless beef, 33 percent more than average for the preceding 5 years.

[Amounts in thousands]

Type of aid and purpose:	
AID dollar loans: supervised agricultural credit	$20,000
AID dollar grants:	
Completed projects: National University School of Veterinary	144
Social Progress Trust Fund: National Financiera, S.A., for improved use of farmlands	4,000

[Amounts in thousands]

Type of aid and purpose—Con.	
Food for peace (foreign currency):	
Title I, sec. 104(e) "Cooley" loans:	
International Harvester Co. of Mexico, S.A., for farm implements and truck parts facilities	$129
John Deere de Mexico, S.A., for agricultural tractors and implement facilities	400
Ralston Purina de Mexico, S.A., for animal feed and sesame solvent plant	801
Industrial Pecuaria, S.A., for animal feeds production facilities	801
Title I, sec. 104(e) "grants":	
Modernization and construction of grain storage facilities	10,326
Project total	36,601
Undistributed activity costs	269
Total	36,870

On June 30, 1962, a loan agreement was executed whereby AID agreed to loan $20 million to Nacional Financiera, S.A., an autonomous financial institution of the Government of Mexico.

The loan provides for expanded short-, medium-, and long-term crop financing and farm improvement credit to small farmers, technical assistance, guidance, and control to insure that such credit results in needed improvements in agricultural resources and productivity, and such activities as may be required to provide the basis for granting of property titles to farmers prospectively eligible for such credit.

About $2 million has been loaned from this fund, as of March 1964, to some 775 farmers with the average loan approximately $3,000.

(7) PAKISTAN

Cotton production in Pakistan in 1962 of 1,690,000 bales was 23 percent above the annual average for 1955–59. Preliminary data for 1963 indicate a larger crop of 1,725,000 bales. Exports in 1962 were 683,000 bales, 47 percent higher than the average for 1955–59. Japan in that year purchased 254,000 bales from Pakistan.

[Amounts in thousands]

Type of aid and purpose:	
AID dollar loans:	
Land reclamation	$15,200
Indus water supply	70,000
Mechanical equipment organization	1,500
Operation and maintenance of Rechna Doab project	750
Salinity control and reclamation	10,000
Coastal embankment project	6,500
Karnafuli multipurpose dam	20,250
AID dollar grants:	
Completed projects:	
Locust control	59
Soil and water conservation	625
Soil mechanics hydraulic laboratory	163
Bolan Dam	75
Nakhi Dhand reclamation	820
Ground water explorations	188
Taunsa barrage project	5,885
Water resources advisory	134
Animal husbandry	18
Plant protection	752
Fertilizer distribution	10,565
Agricultural workshop	1,026

EXCERPTS FROM INTERIM REPORT ON U.S. IMPORTS (MAY REPORT)

1. Total U.S. imports were $17.032 billion in 1963. The $4.012 billion of agricultural commodities included $2.293 billion which competed with U.S. farm crops.

2. Most recent tariff reductions for U.S. imports of meat, meat products, cattle, cotton, wheat, corn, barley, and oats were all made prior to 1955.

3. There are 11 AID programs for loans, grants and technical assistance to furnish agricultural assistance to foreign countries.

ARGENTINA

AID agricultural programs have totaled over $24 million for grain storage facilities and livestock improvements. Beef and veal production has increased with sales to United States 12 percent higher in 1958–62 than 1954–57. Cotton and corn exports also have increased substantially.

BRAZIL

AID agricultural programs have totaled over $34 million, including at least three projects to increase livestock production. Beef and veal production has increased with exports to United States up 470 percent in 1958–62 compared to 1954–57. Cotton exports have also increased sharply since 1960.

MEXICO

AID agricultural assistance has been about $37 million. Mexico is important cotton producer with three-fourths of crop entering world trade. Also imports large number of live cattle and beef and beef products into United States.

PAKISTAN

AID agricultural assistance nearly $279 million for irrigation, salinity control and land reclamation. Cotton exports in 1962 were 47 percent higher than 1955–59.

INVESTMENT SURVEYS

Since 1961 have spent $848,000 for 17 Americans to go to Argentina, Brazil, Central America, Colombia, Ecuador, India, Pakistan, Turkey, North Borneo, Nigeria and Thailand. Fourteen additional applications under consideration which will cost $196,300.

INVESTMENT GUARANTEES

Total of 778 political risk investment guarantees have been issued since 1948.

TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE

In 1963 there were 766 technicians employed overseas in food and agricultural fields. In 1963 about 400 foreigners received agricultural training in the United States under AID programs. In all, about 3,800 foreign nationals were trained in agriculture and home economics in 1963.

U.S. INTERESTS IN FOREIGN AGRICULTURE PRODUCTION

Argentina

International Packers, Ltd. (IPL), Chicago, including subsidiaries: Swift, Armour, La Blanca, and Provita.
King Ranch, Kingsville, Tex.

Australia

Chase International Investment Corp., New York City.
American Factors Associates, Honolulu.
J. H. Whitney & Co., New York City.
Elders-G. M. Co., Ltd.
Intercontinental Meat Traders, Inc., Chicago.
International Packers, Ltd., Chicago.
King Ranch Australia, Ltd.
Art Linkletter and Allen T. Chase.

Colombia

Ralston Purina Co., St. Louis.

Honduras

Alberti Foods, Inc., Chicago.
Adam Smith, Miami.
William Montiel.
United Fruit Co., Boston.

Mexico

Ralston Purina, St. Louis.
Archer-Daniels-Midland Co., Minneapolis.

Burlington Industries, Inc., Greensboro, N.C.

New Zealand

International Packers, Ltd., Chicago.

Paraguay

Pan Western Enterprises, New Orleans.

And may I say, the present law permits the restriction of imports of beef into the United States. I quote from our committee report:

Accordingly, [Congress] enacted section 22 of the act of August 24, 1935. The pertinent provisions of this law are as follows:

"(a) Whenever the Secretary of Agriculture has reason to believe that any article or articles are being or are practically certain to be imported into the United States under such conditions and in such quantities as to render or tend to render ineffective, or materially interfere with, any program or operation undertaken under this title or the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act, as amended, or section 32, Public Law numbered 320, Seventy-fourth Congress, approved August 24, 1935, as amended, or any loan, purchase, or other program or operation undertaken by the Department of Agriculture, or any agency operating under its direction, with respect to any agricultural commodity or product thereof, or to reduce substantially the amount of any product processed in the United States from any agricultural commodity or product thereof with respect to which any such program or operation is being undertaken, he shall so advise the President, and, if the President agrees that there is reason for such belief, the President shall cause an immediate investigation to be made by the United States Tariff Commission, which shall give precedence to investigations under this section to determine such facts * * *.

"(b) If, on the basis of such investigation and report to him of findings and recommendations made in connection therewith, the President finds the existence of such facts, he shall by proclamation impose such fees not in excess of 50 per centum ad valorem or such quantitative limitations on any article or articles which may be entered, or withdrawn from warehouse for consumption, as he finds and declares shown by such investigation to be necessary in order that the entry of such article will not render or tend to render ineffective, or materially interfere with, any program or operation referred to in subsection (a) of this section, or reduce substantially the amount of any product processed in the United States from any such agricultural commodity or product thereof with respect to which any such program or operation is being undertaken: * * *.

"In any case where the Secretary of Agriculture determines and reports to the President with regard to any article or articles that a condition exists requiring emergency treatment, the President may take immediate action under this section without awaiting the recommendations of the Tariff Commission, such action to continue in effect pending the report and recommendations of the Tariff Commission and action thereon by the President.

"(c) The fees and limitations imposed by the President by proclamation under this section and any revocation, suspension, or modification thereof, shall become effective on such data as shall be therein specified, and such fees shall be treated for administrative purposes and for the purposes of section 32 of Public Law numbered 330, Seventy-fourth Congress, approved August 24, 1935, as amended, as duties imposed by the Tariff Act of 1930, but such fees shall not be considered as duties for the purpose of granting any preferential concession under any international obligation of the United States."

Mr. HARVEY of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. HARVEY of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I am rising to defend Public Law 480 on the floor of the House as one who not only assisted in bringing it into being but as one who has followed it sympathetically, yet critically, during the 10 years of its life. For every criticism that will be leveled at it here today, I could probably name you others of greater proportions; nor would those criticisms necessarily be confined to either the Eisenhower or Kennedy-Johnson administrations.

While the primary purpose of this act is to assist in the orderly disposal of our surplus food and fiber, my interest is also due to its goal of assisting in creating better markets abroad at the same time. As one who has given much thought and study to the problem of world hunger, I can state here that this program was never envisioned to be more than a stopgap measure; and when viewed in this light it has been reasonably successful. The need of the rest of the world for more food is so great that if we were to donate all our agricultural production and were able to have it equitably distributed, we would not then solve the shortage problem. This does bring to our attention one facet of this food-distribution activity that is all too frequently overlooked—the problem of actually getting food to those who are hungry in an orderly fashion and in the best possible processed form; moreover, to accurately evaluate the needs in terms of dietary preferences.

It is a known fact that whole segments of our world population have literally starved to death rather than eat food that was not to their liking. We have come a long way since the first law—Public Law 480—was enacted in 1954. Indeed we have had to learn the hard way, for there was little past experience to guide us except for such short termed ones that existed after World Wars I and II. Not only were we confronted with the problem of distribution, but we were also confronted with the problem of how much of each sale should be in the form of a grant, how much as long-term credit, and how much in actual dollar amounts. We were also attempting to meet the issue of moving these commodities into commerce without displacing or disrupting the normal channels of trade. Two other disposal plans entered into the picture as well. One was the donations to such organizations as CARE. While this outlet has not accounted—percentagewise—for a large amount, it has had a large psychological impact upon people of other lands, especially those who are so needy. Another outlet that we envisioned as an excellent one is that of barter. This has been a somewhat controversial measure, and there is a division of opinion within our own committee as to the value of this plan. We have, however, a substantial stockpile of strategic mineral materials of the type that would be invaluable in time of wartime crisis; the mere fact that we do have this supply may be another reason why we may not have to get involved in another world war.

The other objective of Public Law 480, namely, to use our surpluses as a tool for market development abroad, has succeeded far better than we had anticipated. Previously we had not given much attention or effort to expanding our export outlets for agricultural commodities. Our markets have expanded and will continue to do so at a very satisfactory rate, in my judgment. Time will not permit me to elaborate on this point as I would like to do. To me the greatest commercial benefit that has accrued has been the encouragement that our efforts have generated among private commodity groups; the soybean industry is an outstanding example.

H.R. 12269 provides for a 3-year extension of the act and will keep the cost of the program at no more than we have been expending in prior years. We think that we have tightened the regulations in some areas where the need was indicated. The fact that we have heard no charge of maladministration stems not only from the capable administration the program has enjoyed but also the close scrutiny the appropriate committees of the House and Senate have exercised. This extension provides for even closer inspection to make sure that the intent of the Congress is followed.

There has arisen one conflict of policy which we of the Agriculture Committee have with certain individuals within the State Department. We have believed that our aim should be to use the program of disposal only to the extent that actual surpluses "as determined by the Congress" accumulate beyond the normal requirements of the commercial channels of trade. Those who oppose this policy are of the belief that we should continue to generate surpluses purposely so that they may be used as an extra arm of the diplomatic corps—in other words, used as a weapon in the cold war. Now those of us who are most concerned with this program believe that if this is to be the policy of our Government, then we should include the cost of such a program in the foreign aid program and not load it into the backs of the farmers of our country.

There will be objections and criticisms directed at this program, and some of them will have a measure of justification; in fact, some of them are the ones that I have also voiced. Particularly have I objected to foreign aid in any form going to Communist-dominated countries. But this has been done and may be done again. The differences of opinion on this subject have not been primarily political; both parties have their advocates and dissenters. This, however, has not been a major item, and the recovery of funds now frozen in these countries is not feasible. I never agreed with the massiveness nor the terms of our wheat agreement with India either; nor has it succeeded as its proponents were convinced it would at the time of its enactment. And so I could go down a whole list of complaints, but, even so, I

must say that I am supporting it in spite of its faults not without carefully weighing them.

In conclusion, I should like to repeat that we should regard this legislation at best as a stopgap measure; through other efforts, such as our point 4—technical assistance—Fulbright scholarships, Peace Corps, participation in the Food and Agricultural Organization of the United Nations, not to mention the efforts of private foundations, such as Ford and Rockefeller, a massive educational program is underway in most of the underdeveloped and hungry nations. But the processes of education are time consuming, even though we agree that this represents the best solution of the hunger-health problems of great sections of world population. Again, I reiterate that this is good legislation and should be extended for the 3 years provided for in the bill.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FINDLEY].

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, as a member of the Committee on Agriculture I feel it is my responsibility to try to convey to this body some idea of the magnitude of this program.

We are asked here to provide for a 3-year program of financing by backdoor spending which would average $2.3 billion a year.

You will recall that not long ago we considered a foreign aid bill which was pared down to $3 billion a year. We have insisted upon annual scrutiny of foreign aid, and very properly so. Well here we have a program which rivals the foreign aid program both in size and in character.

Although the bill before us today provides for major and worthwhile improvements in the Public Law 480 program, it definitely needs still more improvement. This program departed far from its original concept of surplus disposal and market development. It has become a massive worldwide feeding program—and I mean exactly that. One hundred and twelve different countries are listed in the committee report as benefiting under donation aspects of this program.

Under the foreign aid authorization and appropriation this year, 100 countries were listed as benefited. This goes foreign aid 12 countries better.

The committee report itself boasts in the following words:

> Under these programs, the products of American farmers have reached more than 100 million people and more than 100 nations.

Strong efforts were made to permit nonsurplus purchases, so as to broaden this program still more. The amendment was rejected in committee, but the other body has accepted an amendment which authorized $50 million appropriations for purchases of beef, poultry, dairy, and other products.

To what extent should the U.S. taxpayers undertake this worldwide feeding responsibility? The question should be debated thoroughly and fairly. The opportunities for overseas feeding are endless. The population of India rises about 1 million each month, for example.

Is the "soft currency" procedure utilized in title I in the public interest? This question too needs thorough and fair debate. For example, a Pakistan banker blandly informed a USDA official the other day that the United States should be grateful that Pakistan has provided us with a way to dispose of some of our surplus wheat production. In his view, the soft currency procedure is an advantage to us. It illustrates the misconceptions which flow from these so-called sales. The misconceptions are just as abundant at home as abroad.

So we ought to realize the magnitude of this program, and I think in fairness to ourselves and to the taxpayers we should insist upon annual scrutiny of it.

We would be well advised to scrap title I entirely and provide only for hard currency sales or donations. If this were done, we would all have a clearer idea of what is going on.

Examination of the committee report will reveal the way in which the donations have been given indiscriminately to friend and foe alike.

Among those aided is Communist-leaning Laos, Communist-leaning British Guiana, Communist Poland, Communist Yugoslavia and Red-leaning Indonesia. And among the so-called friendly countries that have been benefited under title II government-to-government donations, believe it or not, are listed Soviet-occupied Germany, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, and Yugoslavia.

We should realize that this program has the effect of delaying realistic and sensible domestic farm programs. In a sense Public Law 480 has served as the burial ground for legislative mistakes. It has put off the day of decision.

It is high time we take a careful annual look at all this giveaway and bring it under control.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Maine [Mr. McINTIRE].

Mr. McINTIRE. Mr. Speaker, reference has been made to the loans for capital investment in some of these countries.

I would point out that it seemed to the committee that with the availability of these currencies and the interest of private investors in the United States to invest in these countries that this is a constructive way in which to use these currencies.

The original proposition in Public Law 480 was enacted in 1957 and some of the figures that have been given here are not related to the situations in which this provision has been applicable.

It was the thought of the committee in view of the broad legislation and the broad funding through the various vehicles that are going on in this day and age, these surpluses can be constructively used by private investors abroad. In relation to the charge that has been made that these industries that are assisted abroad are pouring foreign agricultural products into this country, if that proves to be the case then it is in direct violation of the provision of the act which we deal with here in this instance.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SPRINGER].

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, this law was enacted 10 years ago this month. The authors of the original bill were Congressmen Judd, Harrison, Poage, Burleson, and myself. Three of us still remain—Mr. Poage, Mr. Burleson, and myself—Congressmen Judd and Harrison are gone.

I have watched this program develop over the 10 years. I have been in nearly every country this side of the Iron Curtain where it is working. It is working well.

What the distinguished gentleman from Ohio brings up today is nothing new. He has been here every single time this program has been renewed, and not only he but other members of the Committee on Appropriations have been doing the same thing. This is not a new thing today. They have been fighting this bill for at least 6 of the 10 years, that I know of. This is not a new thing they bring to the floor of the House today. It is the same old thing they have brought up time and time again.

If this program is to function, it has to function in the way in which it is functioning at the present time. It cannot have exactly what the gentleman from Ohio desires at all if it is to be successful, or it will not be. They insist it will be.

I tell the Members that this program will not succeed if the entrapments are put on the bill that they seek to put on the bill.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 2 minutes.

I say to my distinguished and dear friend from the State of Illinois that his facts are entirely wrong in each instance.

I have supported this program. The fact of the matter is I believe I introduced a bill prior to that of the gentleman from Illinois to accomplish the same thing.

I support this bill and the purposes of the bill now before us, but I resent taking away from the House of Representatives its prerogatives and its responsibilities. That is what this bill would do, and it is not the same bill which has been before the House before, on which the House has voted before.

It seems to me, Mr. Speaker, since we know that this Congress will be in session and since the distinguished Committee on Agriculture has requested a rule, that there is no reason why we should not get a rule and bring the bill in for consideration. I wonder whether the entire House may not be confused about what really are the facts. We should have a full debate on a $4 billion bill rather than an attempt to bring it in and to pass it in 40 minutes when some of the rules of the House are being violated.

I say to the gentleman from Illinois and also to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. COOLEY] and the gentleman from Texas [Mr. POAGE] that I support the principles of this bill and I will be here with them trying to support the principles of this bill, but I do not believe

we should take away from the House its responsibilities.

Since we are going to be in session, let us get a rule. Let us bring this in, and open it up so that not only the Members of the House will know what is in this bill but also the people of the country themselves.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DERWINSKI].

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I should like to point out to the House that those of us who have objected to this bill are not objecting to the basic program. We are objecting to the procedure under which this bill has reached the floor.

If I correctly understood the statement of the gentleman from North Carolina, he pointed out that this was a form of foreign aid program. He pointed out that it has included $11 billion over the past 10 years. If the Foreign Affairs Committee tried to bring the foreign aid bill to the floor of the House under a suspension of the rules, with 40 minutes of debate and without an opportunity for amendment, the House would explode.

Why is this procedure followed? Why can we not get a rule? Why not give us the opportunity to work on improving these programs?

I should like to point out that all we wish to do is to perfect this program and to bring it up to its potential.

I wish to direct specific attention of Members to page 32 of the committee report, to the excess currency as of June 30, 1964. It may be interesting to note that approximately half of the $1,156 million is held by two Communist countries. This means there is in the hands of two Communist governments a veto power over what we claim to be technically our money.

We cannot spend a red cent in any of these Red countries without the specific approval of the Communist government. This is the type of thing I believe the House and the Congress in its entirety should give attention to. As I understand the schedule, we will be back for 2 weeks early in September. We certainly have enough time to debate this program and to help the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. COOLEY] to improve on this program and to provide conditions whereby these funds will be better administered. Certainly we have time to adjust parts of the program that have been subject to criticism.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DERWINSKI. Yes. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. COOLEY. You want to give to the Committee on Appropriations the authority and responsibility of appropriating money, dollars, to finance all of the staples, every bushel of wheat and bale of cotton we have in storage. That is all we are asking for, to turn it over to them and let them run it. That is exactly what we want. We are dealing with commodities, and they are dealing with dollars. We have nothing to do with a dollar appropriation except when it come to the House.

Mr. DERWINSKI. All I am asking is to give the House a chance to perfect the whole program.

Mr. COOLEY. We appreciate that, and we think 35 Members acting without regard to politics heard the matter and came out with a unanimous vote.

Mr. DERWINSKI. If the gentleman will permit me to make a comment, I directed to the committee what I thought was a constructive suggestion. One of the ranking members of the gentleman's committee pointed out to me in candor that he felt the program could be improved, but if we were to bring this bill to the floor, it might be opening up a Pandora's box and take control away from the State Department. When you consider the membership of the House, and it's interest in perfecting this program we will help the taxpayers and foreign policy by constructive adjustments.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. COOLEY. I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. MATTHEWS].

Mr. MATTHEWS. Mr. Speaker, may I emphasize this bill comes to us today with just about as unanimous support as I think it is possible to obtain from a committee. Both sides of the aisle have worked diligently for weeks on this measure. This is not a fly-by-night proposition.

Mr. Speaker, the main thrust of the opposition, I believe, has been perhaps on the way that we envisioned the Committee on Appropriations spending some of the money that has been accumulating under title I. It is not intended to take away one iota of authority from the Committee on Appropriations. It is intended in the future, as in the past, that any money that has to do with U.S. missions abroad, or other activities that are a part of the Committee on Appropriations procedures, will still be within their authority. However, Mr. Speaker, we have over $1 billion in soft currencies in just several nations throughout the world. It is the intention of this committee, by the appointment of the special advisory committee, to try to do something about this $1 billion worth of currency that we are not using, that we cannot use, and that we have at the present time no foreseeable use for. I think it tidies up the appropriations process. It says that we do not want $1 billion of soft currency lying around. We want to look into it with the help of the special advisory committee to see if there is not some way beyond the requirements of the Committee on Appropriations, and beyond these uses for which the money will be retained, whereby we can put this soft money into use and not have it lie around in various nations of the world.

Mr. Speaker, this is a good bill and it ought to be passed.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield the remaining time to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. POAGE].

Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POAGE. Yes. I yield to the chairman.

Mr. COOLEY. As I understand the situation, we have no assurances at all that this House will reconvene after the convention. If we postpone this action now, we do not know when it will come out.

Mr. POAGE. I think we have this assurance: if we pass the bill now, we get a continuing surplus disposal program; that we get continuing foreign aid. If we do not act now, we either have to take a Senate bill or a continuing resolution. Every Member of the House recognizes that fact.

But some of us have become so obsessed with the idea of giving more authority to the Appropriations Committee that we are forgetting about Public Law 480 and its great services to this country. I believe that the Appropriations Committee has a good deal to do in this House. It has pretty nearly all that the Members can handle in the time that they have, and sometimes they do not get it done. They are away behind right now with most of their work. You heard the chairman of the Appropriations Committee just awhile ago ask for time to bring in some continuing resolutions for the month of September. In other words, they are so far behind right now that they have to talk about continuing resolutions next month, not this month, yet they want more authority.

What we are suggesting here is, let us pass this bill which has served the United States so well and forget about giving the Appropritions Committee additional authority.

I am sorry to have to say that when the chairman of the Agricultural Subcommittee of that Appropriations Committee stood right here he talked about how we were going to use this money, how we were buying beef from the Argentine and Brazil. Why, we have not bought a pound of fresh beef from any of those countries for 25 years, because of the foot-and-mouth disease and the chairman ought to know it.

As a matter of fact, what we have been doing is keeping that beef out. We have been getting beef from Australia and New Zealand, and we have not got a dollar's worth of counterpart in any of those countries. As a matter of fact, somebody does not know his lesson. And I believe the Appropriations Committee has given a pretty good illustration this afternoon that they are are more interested in their power than they are in maintaining the welfare of the United States.

We brought you a bill here that is important to this country; we brought you a bill here that is important to agriculture; we brought you a bill here that is important to our foreign relations. And we believe that if we pass it now we will have the opportunity to continue a good program. Everybody who has spoken has said how good the program was, but they want to amend it this way and they want to amend it that way.

You saw the bills that came up from the Ways and Means Committee awhile ago. They were not subject to amendment. No, when they bring their bills in they are not subject to amendment because we all recognize that those things are of paramount importance to the Nation and that it is important to pass

them and get them on the statute books. The bill is important and deserves the same treatment.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired. All time has expired.

The question is, Will the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 12298, as amended?

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. Bow) there were—ayes 82, noes 71.

So (two-thirds not having voted in favor thereof) the motion was rejected.

REDUCE USE OF WATER IN PECOS RIVER BASIN

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass Senate Joint Resolution 49 authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to carry out a continuing program to reduce nonbeneficial consumptive use of water in the Pecos River Basin, in all New Mexico and Texas, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That in order to prevent further decreases in the supply of water in the Pecos River Basin, and in order to increase and protect such water supply for municipal, industrial, irrigation, and recreational uses, and for the conservation of fish and wildlife, and to provide protection for the farmlands in such basin from the hazards of floods, the Secretary of the Interior (hereinafter referred to as the "Secretary") is authorized and directed to take such measures as he deems necessary and appropriate to carry out a continuing program to reduce the nonbeneficial consumption of water in the basin, including that by salt cedar and other undesirable phreatophytes. Such program shall be carried out in the Pecos River Basin from its headwaters in New Mexico to the town of Girvin, Texas: *Provided, however,* That no money shall be appropriated for and no work commenced on the clearing of the floodway authorized by the Act of February 20, 1958 (72 Stat. 17), unless provision shall have been made to replace any Carlsbad Irrigation District terminal storage which might be lost by the clearing of said floodway.

SEC. 2. As a condition to undertaking the program authorized by the first section of this joint resolution, the Secretary shall require the States of New Mexico and Texas to give such assurances as he deems adequate that such States will acquire such lands, easements, rights-of-way, and other interests in lands as the Secretary considers necessary effectively to carry out such program.

SEC. 3. (a) As a further condition to undertaking the program authorized by this joint resolution, the Secretary may, with respect to those beneficiaries in New Mexico and Texas which the Secretary determines to be likely to benefit directly from the results of such program, require such commitments as he deems appropriate that such beneficiaries will repay the United States so much of the reimbursable costs incurred by it in carrying out such program as do not exceed the value of the benefits accruing to such beneficiaries from such program. The Secretary shall not require the repayment of such costs unless he determines that it is feasible (1) to identify the beneficiaries that are directly benefited by the program, and (2) to measure the extent to which each beneficiary is benefited by such program.

(b) Repayment contracts entered into pursuant to the provisions of this section shall be subject to such terms and conditions as the Secretary may prescribe, except that the amount of the repayment installment and total obligation in the case of any beneficiary shall be fixed by the Secretary in accordance with the ability of such beneficiary to pay, taking into consideration all other financial obligations of such beneficiary.

(c) Any costs of the program which the Secretary determines are properly allocable to flood control, fish and wildlife conservation and development, recreation, or restoration of streamflow shall be considered as nonreimbursable costs.

(d) In conducting the program, the Secretary shall take such measures as may be necessary to insure that there will be no interference with regular streamflow, no contamination of water, and the least possible hazard to fish and wildlife resources.

SEC. 4. Nothing contained in this joint resolution shall be construed to abrogate, amend, modify, or be in conflict with any provisions of the Pecos River compact.

SEC. 5. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated not more than $2,500,000 for the initial eradication or suppression of salt cedar and other undesirable phreatophytes on lands within the area to which this joint resolution applies and, in addition thereto, such further sums as may be necessary to maintain continued control over this land to prevent its reinfestation.

The SPEAKER. Is a second demanded?

Mr. FOREMAN. Mr. Speaker, I deman a second.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, a second will be considered as ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. I yield myself 3 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, Senate Joint Resolution 49 would authorize a continuing program in the Pecos River Basin in New Mexico and Texas to reduce nonbeneficial consumptive use of water by saltcedar and other phreatophytes. It has been thoroughly studied by the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee and is approved without opposition in the committee.

The objective of the legislation would be accomplished by the initial eradication of saltcedar from some 70,000 to 80,000 acres along the Pecos River and the continued control over these lands to prevent reinfestation. The bill authorizes an expenditure of $2,500,000 for the initial clearing or $30 to $35 per acre. In addition, the bill authorizes an amount estimated at $600,000 annually to maintain continued control over the cleared lands. It is estimated that some 140,000 to 150,000 acre-feet of water annually can be salvaged from this program. This would mean a cost of some $3 to $4 per acre-foot which would be more economical than any other means of providing additional water in an area where the shortage of water is one of the most serious problems.

The nonbeneficial consumptive use of water by phreatophytes is a long-standing problem in the Pecos River Basin and other basins in the southwestern United States. The U.S. Geological Survey estimated several years ago that these undesirable phreatophytes covered 15 million acres of bottom lands in the 17 Western States and consumed around 25 million acre-feet of water annually. The plants spread rapidly and the seriousness of the problem is increasing. It is more serious in the Pecos River Basin because of the extreme water shortage that exists there. Saltcedar is the best known and most troublesome of the phreatophytes. It was first noted in the Pecos River Basin in about 1914 and since that time has rapidly increased in both density of growth and area. In the relatively short period of 11 years, one area of infestation, which was kept under observation by serial photographs, was approximately doubled. As the area of growth spreads, the density of growth increases in the older areas and more and more water is consumed. It has been estimated that, unless corrective measures are taken, saltcedars will be consuming all of the available water supply from the Pecos River by about 2010.

The problem of control of phreatophyte growth in the Pecos River Basin has been tackled by several local, State, and Federal agencies, and much research on the problem has been conducted. However, in spite of the research and control measures that have been taken, the problem is increasing. The program authorized by this legislation would be a cooperative program with State and local interests working with the Federal Government. While the beneficiaries of the program would be primarily those in the basin who would obtain additional water, other areas of the Nation where this problem exists would also benefit from the experience and information gained as a result of the activities in the Pecos River Basin.

The irrigated areas along the Pecos River are limited by the amount of water that has been available. The irrigated area has decreased in recent years due to a lack of water and many of the areas that have been irrigated have had serious water shortages. For example, in Texas, about 45,000 acres are susceptible of irrigation from the Pecos River but in recent years only about 15,000 acres have been irrigated. The irrigated acreage in New Mexico has diminished also, but by a somewhat smaller percentage.

The water that would be salvaged and recovered through eradication of the phreatophytes would affect the entire hydrologic complex of the basin. The increase occurring in the Pecos River would be subject to diversion through existing priorities established under State law. It would be very difficult to determine, however, the specific amount of water accruing to any given water-right holder. Because of the problem of identifying specific beneficiaries, it would be extremely difficult to establish repayment arrangements. Nevertheless, the legislation includes the principle of repayment whereby the beneficiaries, if they can be identified and have the ability, are required to help pay for the cost of this program.

In a way, the phreatophyte removal program would be similar to some of the other activities, such as flood control, pollution abatement, and so forth, which are undertaken by the Federal Government because of the general public interest involved and where it is impossible, or at least difficult, to identify the bene-

ficiaries or the amount of the benefit accruing to each.

The Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, on the basis of its hearings and study of this serious problem, concluded that the problem was of such magnitude and so serious that Federal assistance is warranted. The water-related economy of the Pecos River Basin is at stake. The solution seemed to be beyond the capability of State and local interests. The committee believes that the program this legislation would authorize is justified as a Federal expense and that the cost represents a sound investment in the resources of the Pecos River Basin.

Mr. Speaker, the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs believes Senate Joint Resolution 49 is meritorious legislation and recommends its enactment.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. What is meant by saltcedar?

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. That is one of the phreatophytes. It is a growth or plant that occurs along the waterway and consumes a great deal of water for its growth. If they can dispose of these phreatophytes, or plants, you can save that water and it is available for consumptive use.

Mr. GROSS. Is this brackish, otherwise known as brackish water?

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. No; it is not brackish. It is fresh water, and these phreatophytes, or saltcedar, come from a cedar tree. The gentleman from Iowa has seen a lot of it. It consumes a tremendous amount of fresh water coming downstream.

Mr. GROSS. You are going to clear some land, bring more land into production through this program?

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. It will clear more land along the sides of the Pecos River. That land will be available, but it will make available also a great deal of the water for downstream consumptive use and for other purposes.

Mr. FOREMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, although this bill, Senate Joint Resolution 49, very directly involves my congressional district and my State of Texas, including the proposed expenditure of about 2.5 million Federal dollars along the Pecos River, I have several very serious reservations regarding this legislation. I am of the opinion that if the project is worth doing at all, it should be done, where possible, on a participating, share-the-cost basis with the farmers and ranchers doing a portion of the work, supervising the project and sharing the financial responsibility, rather than initiating an entirely new costly Federal aid project. The Federal Great Plains conservation program is an all-inclusive soil and water conservation plan, operating on a participating basis, that pays up to as much as 80 percent of the cost of various conservation projects. This program of helping farmers and ranchers to help themselves offers considerably more logic and sense to me, than establishing a completely new aid program and Federal bureau to do the job.

No one is more concerned about the preservation of our natural resources and water and soil conservation practices than I am. I have supported our water and soil conservation programs with my work and votes in the House of Representatives. But at the same time, I am also concerned about the conservation of our tax dollars and our own responsibilities and self-respect. I do not believe new Federal aid programs financed with our hard-earned tax dollars is the best answer to all our problems.

There are a good many questions that I think need answering.

First, why not build a concrete canal or a closed conduit? Then we would not have the yearly $600,000 reoccurring mowing and eradication costs.

Second, do you know enough about the problem of proper eradication of saltcedar and other undesirable growths? These are presently the subject of research by the Department of Agriculture from a base at Los Lunas, N. Mex.

The results of this research, directed toward a permanent solution to the problem, limited by available funds and staff, has been so encouraging that the Agricultural Research Service has already requested construction of a laboratory at an estimated cost of $500,000. With an adequate staff to step up the pace of the research. The research service is confident that with the necessary research facilities a laboratory would provide, long strides could be expected toward a permanent solution of the saltcedar problem and development of an economical and effective method for the eradication and prevention of reinfestation of salt cedars and other undesirable phreatophytes.

Another question: Is the initial cost of $2.5 million realistic? When this bill was first considered, officials discussed the problem involving 50,000 acres of saltcedars at $100 an acre, which would have been $5 million. Now that the question has been brought up, this has been revised down to approximately $33 per acre and only about 80,000 acres. I have talked to private contractors who do this on a regular basis, and they do the job for $25 per acre.

There are many questions that need to be answered here. We have some suggestive evidence, though no positive proof, that some of the saltcedars may have been planted by some Government agency many years ago to prevent erosion and washout of the river.

There are a good many things we ought to answer before we get into spending $2.5 million on an initial project and a continuing project which will cost upwards of $600,000 per year.

If we approve of eradicating saltcedar weeds along the Pecos River, and then the folks of Tennessee come to us and ask us to spend $2.5 million to eradicate the Johnson grass in the fields of Tennessee, then we would probably be just as justified to do so.

Because of the interest in, and the problem presented by, the request for Federal aid and control of a saltcedar eradication program for the Pecos River Basin, I have, and am now, conducting various research studies, tests and engineering surveys to see what the real need is. A recent U.S. Department of the Interior geological water-supply survey states:

> The contribution of water to the Pecos River in the reach between Alamogordo Dam and Red Bluff Reservoir has been trending downward for the past 40 years.

Although several factors are involved in the streamflow depletion measured, the principal causes seem to be the ground-water developments near Roswell and Carlsbad, N. Mex., and the natural factors of drought—no rain. Says the report:

> Some of the depletion of the riverflow has been because of the saltcedar growth.

Because of the progressive diminution of inflow from its drainage basin, due to the drought of recent years, and because of the tremendous increase in the use of ground water—pumps, wells, and springs—in the farming acres of Roswell and Carlsbad, the Pecos River has not had the amount of water to carry that it once did. If there just is not any, or at least, any appreciable amount of water running down a riverbed, it really does not make a great deal of difference whether the riverbed is bare—paved—or covered with saltcedar. Of course, if it starts raining again, there would be water running down the river—but if it were raining again, we probably would not be too concerned about the river water—or would we?

I have many reservations about this. I cannot in good conscience urge you to support this proposed very costly legislation without further study that I believe is very necessary.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOREMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. There is no flood control project in this program?

Mr. FOREMAN. We have not had flooding problems in the Pecos River Basin for some years. The trouble is we have no water.

Mr. GROSS. This is in no sense a flood control project?

Mr. FOREMAN. The bill says it is to prevent the flooding of the basin, that to eliminate saltcedars would also eliminate this problem. It is written into the bill, and in the report, that this is one of the results to come about from this program.

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. MORRIS].

Mr. MORRIS. Mr. Speaker, I think this is probably one of the most important research and water development bills that has ever been brought before this Congress. I should like to comment very briefly on some of the questions raised by our good friend from Texas [Mr. FOREMAN].

There is nothing in the legislation that would prevent the Bureau of Reclamation from contracting with private contractors to do this job. In fact, I think that we can reasonably expect that we will contract with private contractors,

because I think they could probably do the best job of eradicating saltcedars.

I should like to point out some of the difficulties that would be present in specifically saying to each landowner along the river, "You pay back this amount of money, and you pay back this amount because you are going to benefit by this amount."

It is just as difficult to tell who as individuals will benefit by this legislation as it is to tell who will benefit by a flood control project that may be built on the Mississippi River or some other river in this country, because the surface water in this area is so interrelated with the ground water that any time you have an increased flow of the water in the river on the surface you are going to increase the flow from the artesian wells, which comes from the ground water. We are also going to increase the water from the wells which are being pumped. So the problem of determining who would benefit and how much is extremely difficult.

We do say in the language of the bill that the Secretary should try to make this determination as to who would benefit, if that is feasible, and ask for repayment of the cost on a pro rata share.

I think it is very urgent that we act on this bill at the present time, because right now in the western part of the United States about 17 million acres consume in beneficial use an estimated 25 million feet of water a year.

In the Pecos Valley alone, the infestation by these undesirable phreatophytes has more than doubled between 1939 and 1950.

Some people might ask why should we conduct this research in an eradication program in the Pecos Valley? For the simple reason that the Pecos Valley is the oldest irrigated part of our country and we must use this area because we have records of what the streamflow was before this infestation.

It is estimated by the Bureau of Reclamation that we could save in the Pecos Valley alone approximately 140,000 or 150,000 acre-feet of water which could be used for beneficial uses in not only New Mexico but downstream.

In addition, and I think this is the most important part of all in this legislation, and it is not the preventive nature of it, but it is that we hope to gain valuable knowledge and experience in this research and eradication program which will help us in the future to prevent the entire water supply of the western part of these United States from being in jeopardy.

Mr. FOREMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MORRIS. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. FOREMAN. When this bill was under discussion in the committee of which the gentleman is a member, the subject came up about the Federal Great Plains conservation program which is a participating program that helps farmers and ranchers to help themselves on such projects. Has there been a report from the Federal Great Plains conservation program as to whether it could be utilized in this program?

Mr. MORRIS. I do not know that there has been an official report. I know some of the officials in the Department of Agriculture who handle the Great Plains programs and they tell me that some of the difficulties and problems which they would have in trying to do this under the Great Plains program is that they would have no really fair method of prorating the cost-sharing basis fairly and equitably.

As the gentleman from Texas very well knows, because he is very familiar with the area, a great deal of this is pumped from the underground basin and the underground basin is fed from the Pecos River also. A firm who is pumping from underground water could not see any direct benefit by eradicating the phreatophytes in the riverbank because he gets his water from underground and not by diversion.

I sympathize with the gentleman's idea of trying to do this through the methods which he has suggested, but I just do not believe it could ever be done. Furthermore, this is a national problem and it is not just a regional problem.

Mr. FOREMAN. I certainly commend the gentleman for his concern in this matter and, as I stated earlier, no one is more concerned about the conservation of water than I am. I want to conserve and preserve our water and soil resources, but I am also concerned about the cost—the economics of such a program. If this is done, I would certainly be interested in following through and in seeing that it would be done as economically as possible and with private contractors doing the job.

Mr. MORRIS. I think it is the best method.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MORRIS. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. JENSEN. I know something about the saltcedar infestation in that area. I have seen it with my own eyes. It is a very serious problem. Does the gentleman believe this commission which you want to set up to make a survey of this problem will find that a program of eradication of the saltcedars will conserve millions and millions of acre-feet of water? Is that what you believe will be the result of such a survey?

Mr. MORRIS. It is the concerted belief and opinion of the gentleman from New Mexico—I believe backed up by the report from the Bureau of Reclamation—that if we can get this program going we shall have an excellent chance in the future, in the whole West, of saving millions of acre-feet of water for the beneficial use of the United States.

Mr. JENSEN. I must say that certainly water is liquid gold in that part of the country. If the eradication of this saltcedar will do what the gentleman believes it will do, then I am very much for this measure.

Mr. MORRIS. I thank the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. FOREMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SAYLOR].

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, if there is anything that we must all guard against it is waste. This word is one of the most offensive in the English language to nearly all of us. We speak of "waste of time, waste of money, waste of effort, waste of talent, waste of breath." Whenever we speak this way, we mean two things: We mean that that which is being wasted is scarce and valuable and we mean that something which is scarce and valuable is being deliberately or carelessly lost or put to nonbeneficial use.

The measure that we are considering now, Senate Joint Resolution 49, is concerned with waste of another scarce and valuable asset—water. It is not merely concerned with it; it proposes a way by which this waste can be curtailed or wiped out, a means whereby that which is now going into nonbeneficial use can be saved so that it can do good work again.

What is the situation here? It is very simple. There are some 60,000 to 70,000 acres of saltcedars and other phreatophytic growths in the 40 or so miles between Alamagordo and McMillan Dams and the whole 250 miles between Santa Rosa, N. Mex., and Girvin, Tex., is badly infested. These phreatophytes not only serve no useful purpose but also they consume immense quantities of water that is badly needed to support the agriculture of the basin. They use up and waste as much as 6 acre-feet per acre that they inhabit.

In addition, these phreatophytes have been increasing rapidly. They were first noticed in the Pecos Basin in 1914. By 1939, there were 14,200 acres of them in the reach between Alamogordo and McMillan. By 1950 this had doubled. Today, as I said before, we have 60,000 to 70,000 acres of them using up between 360,000 and 420,000 acre-feet of water each year—enough to irrigate 125,000 acres of land in good and useful crops. And the estimate is that, if steps are not taken to eradicate this growth, there will be no water at all left for human use in the Pecos Basin.

Today, in a world of ever-increasing population, we are becoming more and more aware of the importance of avoiding waste of water. We have instituted pollution control programs, we have undertaken a saline water conversion program, we construct dams and reservoirs all over the country, we are working out methods of reducing evaporation losses from reservoir surfaces. We do all this with one common object in view—that of saving or reclaiming or finding new supplies of water.

I doubt that there is any cheaper method of doing this in the case of the Pecos Basin than that which is being proposed in Senate Joint Resolution 49. For an initial capital cost of about $6 per acre-foot and an annual cost of about one-quarter that figure, we can save this water and allow it to be put to beneficial use. Even if none of this money is repaid—and the bill contains repayment provisions if the proper parties can be identified—this will be a very worthwhile investment.

I urge that the rules be suspended and that the joint resolution be passed.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SAYLOR. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. HALL. I should like to have a bit of information about this. Is this a tree or is it a weed? I know what a phreatophyte is, and I know it is a water consumer.

How do they destroy it? How do they prevent its recurrence? How do they prevent erosion once it is destroyed?

Mr. SAYLOR. It is a tree.

Mr. HALL. Is there any wood value in this tree?

Mr. SAYLOR. It has no wood value at all. The figures before our committee indicate that an acre of these saltcedars or phreatophytes will use about 6 acre-feet of water a year. This infestation is such that one thing they must do first is to find out how to eradicate it. Second, they must learn how to keep it from coming back.

Mr. HALL. They do not know yet how to eradicate it?

Mr. SAYLOR. I believe they know how. It can be burned off.

Mr. HALL. Is it indigenous?

Mr. SAYLOR. It is indigenous to the area.

Mr. HALL. Can it be destroyed by chemicals or by burning?

Mr. SAYLOR. It can be destroyed either by chemicals or by burning.

Mr. HALL. In the Ozarks we have the winged elm, the red cedar, the buck brush, and the black oak. We would like to get rid of those, and allow the blue stem grass to get back to what was indigenous originally before the forests were cut off.

Could we make a similar request to this, to get back to the natural grasses, livestock, and dairy grazing if this is successful?

Mr. SAYLOR. I think you could do that. I believe our committee would look with favor upon it.

This is a waste of a valuable natural asset, exactly as the bushes which are growing in your section represent a waste of a very valuable asset.

Mr. MORRIS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SAYLOR. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from New Mexico.

Mr. MORRIS. We would hope that the research which would be conducted would give us knowledge, from a project of this nature, which could be used to do the very things of which the gentleman speaks, in his great State of Missouri.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield further, perhaps we are going at this backward. We have decided in that area to do the research first under the U.S. Forest Service, working on the problem while we are grazing on the new blue stem. This requires fertilization and seeding, after overcutting the crown, so that the indigenous grasses will come back. Those are very nutritious. Certainly we should do some research first in the laboratories or under the Forest Service, and then the experiments in the field.

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. POOL].

Mr. POOL. Mr. Speaker, I favor this legislation because, as Congressman at Large from the State of Texas, I know our first problem is water. We are going to get 180,000 acre-feet of water from this program, and to us this is worth money. We are dry in Texas, all across the Rio Grande from New Mexico down to Brownsville.

I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks on Senate Joint Resolution 49, I would like to discuss the legislation now before this House, legislation which would authorize the eradication of thousands of acres of saltcedar trees in the basin of the Pecos River. The Pecos flows from New Mexico into far west Texas, where it becomes a tributary of the Rio Grande. It is a winding river which brings the beneficence of water to one of the driest reaches of our land.

The Pecos has never been more than a modest river by eastern standards, but its water was once sufficient to irrigate 40,000 acres of Texas farmland. In recent years, that flow has diminished until there is now no more water for growing the melons, grapes, and alfalfa for which the Pecos Basin was once famous. The flow of water has dwindled as the saltcedar trees have multiplied.

The first saltcedars were seen along the Pecos in 1914. There are now 70,000 acres of these trees, dense growths which spread out for acres from the river. Each year, each acre of saltcedars consumes enough water to spread a foot of water over 5 acres of farmland. The trees grow tall, multiply fast, and sink their roots deep. Saltcedar roots will travel as far as 90 feet to find water. The trees are actually growing in the stream in many places, forming islands and diverting the channel.

The Pecos, 50 years after the appearance of the saltcedars, has nearly vanished. The importance of this legislation to many of my colleagues in this chamber lies in the fact that saltcedars have now appeared in the river basins of 17 other States. This program on the Pecos will be a pilot study for other basin areas which will face the same problem in future years.

Where water is precious, men are jealous of their rights to it. Yet, between Texas and New Mexico there exists a realistic spirit of cooperation on a resource so vital to life that it often strains friendships between neighbors, between townships and counties and States. Texas and New Mexico share the water of the Pecos under agreements reached by the Pecos River Commission, established by the Congress. J. C. Wilson of Pecos, commissioner for Texas; and T. E. Lusk of Carlsbad, commissioner for New Mexico, typify the relationship of the two States which share this precious water. Each represents the interests of his State jealously and zealously, but with an understanding that cooperation must exist for the survival of the farm economy of the entire interstate basin.

The members of the Pecos River Commission and Governors of both States have seen the need for this eradication program, and the Department of Interior has stressed its practicality and importance. The cost of water recovered is estimated at from $3 to $4 an acre-foot—a very low figure.

I am proud to have had the opportunity to cooperate with my colleagues, the Honorable THOMAS MORRIS and JOSEPH MONTOYA of New Mexico, in introducing this legislation and I strongly commend the bill which has come before the House from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ROGERS] that the House suspend the rules and pass the Senate joint resolution, Senate Joint Resolution 49.

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

AGREEMENT TO POSTPONE CONSIDERATION OF BILLS UNDER SUSPENSION OF THE RULES

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that it shall be in order for the Speaker to recognize for motions to suspend the rules and pass the bills remaining undisposed of on the whip notice today on a day to be agreed upon by the Speaker, the majority leader, and the minority leader.

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

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, and I am not going to object, this has been a matter of considerable concern and conversation. As far as I am concerned, since it is limited to those bills remaining on the calendar, I shall not object. As a matter of fact, I have agreed to this arrangement. I know there are Members who would like to have other bills considered, and I would express the hope that if this unanimous-consent request is granted, the other bills that are on the list could be disposed of as quickly as possible under the arrangement suggested by the majority leader.

With that, Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, further reserving the right to object, it would not be the thought that these bills would be called up this week, or would it?

Mr. ALBERT. They will not be called up this week. Ample notice will be given.

Mr. GROSS. And this is confined, as the minority leader has said, to the bills that have not been called up on today's calendar?

Mr. ALBERT. As specified in the request.

Mr. GROSS. And no other bills?

Mr. ALBERT. No other bills.

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, further reserving the right to object, on the 31st of August the Third International Atomic Energy Conference occurs at Geneva. The next bill on this calendar is S. 3075 amending the Atomic Energy Act of 1954 to provide for private ownership of special nuclear materials. If passed and enacted into law by that time, this will give the United States a tremendous boost in the eyes of the world through that Conference. I am wondering if there is any possibility, Mr. Speaker, that the House might consider acting

upon that bill. I know of no substantial opposition to it. It would take but a very few minutes, and I think that the value that this House could give to it, vis-a-vis the Iron Curtain countries progress in this important field would be well worth the few minutes that we took for the consideration of the next bill.

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

Mr. HOSMER. I have not withdrawn my reservation, Mr. Speaker, and I would ask the majority leader if, accepting what I have said to be the fact, he would consider withdrawing his request and permitting this other bill to be considered during the few minutes time it would take.

Mr. ALBERT. Well, in response to the gentleman, the majority leader has not consulted with the minority leader or the Speaker on this matter of this particular bill. I would say that it would seem to me that the important thing would be that this bill was up for consideration. Our acting on the bill would not necessarily mean its passage.

Mr. HOSMER. The other body has already passed the bill. This final action is all we need to do here.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield to me under his reservation?

Mr. HOSMER. I will be glad to yield to the minority leader.

Mr. HALLECK. I would like to suggest to my friend from California who spoke to me about this a moment ago that there are other ways, if there is a real emergency situation here, to bring about the consideration of this bill in plenty of time for the purpose which the gentleman discusses. In other words, if it is as noncontroversial as the gentleman says it is, it might be disposed of under some arrangement that would start with a unanimous-consent request. Otherwise I would assume again if there is not a controversy, as the gentleman indicates, a rule could be quickly granted and at the proper time the matter could be disposed of.

I will say to the gentleman from California there are numerous Members who are not too happy about some of their bills not being reached, but it has seemed to be in the better interests of all of the membership that this arrangement be entered into.

Mr. HOSMER. I thank the gentleman for his counsel and, against my own better judgment, I withdraw my objection.

Mr. ALBERT. I thank the gentleman.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will state that if arrangements can be worked out on this or any other bill, through a unanimous-consent request, where the matter has been carefully screened, the Chair will be glad to recognize for that purpose. That does not mean today. It means sometime this week, if it is carefully screened through the leadership. Members are protected in the knowledge that the screening has taken place.

NEHALEM BAND OF TILLAMOOK INDIANS

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H.R. 11118) to provide for the disposition of funds from judgments in favor of the Nehalem Band of the Tillamook Indians and the Tillamook Band of the Tillamook Indians, with Senate amendments thereto, and concur in the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments, as follows:

Page 2, line 25, strike out "tax" and insert: "tax."

Page 3, strike out lines 1 to 5, inclusive.

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

There was no objection.

The Senate amendments were concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. FUQUA. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 229 I was absent on official business. Had I been present I would have voted "nay."

NATIONAL HUMANITIES FOUNDATION

Mr. MOORHEAD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MOORHEAD. Mr. Speaker, I am privileged today to introduce a bill to provide for the establishment of the National Humanities Foundation to promote progress and scholarship in the humanities.

The purpose of the National Humanities Foundation should be to develop and promote a broadly conceived policy of support for the humanities and the arts, but there should be no attempt to direct, control, or otherwise influence the scholarship, teaching, research, or artistic endeavors which are supported by the National Humanities Foundation.

The humanities and the arts should be broadly defined so as to include, but not be limited to, the study of languages, literature, history, and philosophy; the history, criticism, and theory of art and music; the history of religion, science, and law; the creative and performing arts, including theater and dance; and those aspects of the social sciences that have humanistic content and employ humanistic methods.

My sponsorship of this legislation grows out of my recent reading of the report of the Commission on the Humanities sponsored by the American Council of Learned Societies, the Council of Graduate Schools in the United States, and the United Chapters of Phi Beta Kappa.

Dr. Barnaby C. Keeney, president of Brown University, was chairman of the commission which wrote the report. Dr. Herman B. Wells, chancellor of Indiana University, was vice chairman. Other distinguished educators who served on the commission were President Kingman Brewster, Jr., Yale University; Rev. Theodore M. Hesburgh, C.S.C., president of the University of Notre Dame; and Dr. Clark Kerr, president of the University of California. Public members of the commission were Mr. Arthur H. Dean, senior partner of Sullivan & Cromwell; Mr. Devereux C. Josephs, former chairman of New York Life Insurance Co.; Dr. Glenn T. Seaborg, Chairman of U.S. Atomic Energy Commission; and Mr. Thomas J. Watson, Jr., chairman of International Business Machines Corp.

I do not believe the National Humanities Foundation will require a large Federal subsidy. In fact, for the first year I am seeking an appropriation of $150,000. Rather the Foundation should be run something like the Smithsonian Institution which is empowered to accept gifts, endowments, and grants from foundations.

The distinguished British historian, Mr. Arnold Toynbee, has said:

> Man is astonishingly good at dealing with the physical world, but he is just as astonishingly bad at dealing with human nature; therefore, an inch gained in the understanding of and command over human nature is worth a mile in the understanding of and command over physical nature.

The educated man recognizes that the humanities are the study of that which is most human. They record not only our lives but the very substance of which our lives are made. Their subject is every man. I propose therefore a program for all our people, a program to meet a need no less serious than that of national defense. The humanities speak for our beliefs, our ideals, and our highest achievements.

In an age in which we have seen of necessity a spectacular growth in science, it is essential that we preserve the interdependence of science and the humanities so that men will remain the masters of their technology and not unthinking servants.

Let us all recall that over the centuries the humanities have sustained mankind at the deepest level of his being. They flourished in Greece and Rome, in the Middle Ages, in the Renaissance, and in the Age of Enlightment. In the formative years of this Republic it was a group of statesmen steeped in humanities who fused their own experience with their intellectual capacities to create the Constitution of the Republic.

At all times, but particularly in this age, which the poet W. H. Auden has described as the "age of anxiety," man's nature requires that a vision be held before him—an ideal for which he may strive. The teachers of the humanities can offer their fellow countrymen a vision of the eternal verities—truth, goodness, beauty, virtue, justices, and freedom.

Second, a democracy in crisis demands the wisdom of every man. The humanities record the best and the worst

of our past and chart a course for wise men to follow.

Third, frequently this country is accused of being a nation of materialism. Our critics find it hard to fathom the motives of a country which will spend billions of dollars on defense and so little to maintain the creative and imaginative abilities of our own people. The arts cross the barriers imposed by language and contrasting customs.

Fourth, world leadership such as is now our responsibility cannot rest solely upon superior physical force, vast industrial wealth, or preponderate technology. Only the elevation of this Nation's goal and the excellence of our conduct entitle us to ask other Nations to follow.

Fifth, science is bringing greater and greater leisure to America. "What shall I do with my spare time?" all too quickly becomes the question. "Who am I? What shall I make of my life?" When men and women find nothing within themselves they turn to trivials and the society to which they belong becomes socially delinquent and potentially unstable. The humanities are the time-tested answer to man's questioning and his need for self-expression.

In introducing this legislation I am mindful of the words that the late President Kennedy spoke on October 26, 1963—less than a month before his death. He took the occasion of the dedication of the Robert Frost Library at Amherst College to say:

I look forward to an America which will reward achievement in the arts as we reward achievement in business or statecraft. I look forward to an America which will steadily raise the standards of artistic accomplishment and which will steadily enlarge cultural opportunities for all of our citizens. And I look forward to an America which commands respect throughout the world not only for its strength but for its civilization as well. And I look forward to a world which will be safe not only for democracy and diversity but also for personal distinction.

President Johnson is holding forth to the American people the vision of the "great society." We have the physical resources to create this society; material, cultural and spiritual. All that is needed is the decision of the American people. I believe that the creation of the National Humanities Foundation by the Congress can be the cornerstone of the "great society."

AN ECONOMIC ANALYSIS OF THE REPUBLICAN PLATFORM

Mr. SHRIVER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CURTIS] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, Prof. Henry C. Wallich of Yale University, formerly a member of President Eisenhower's Council of Economic Advisers, has written an economic analysis of the 1964 Republican platform for the Journal of Commerce. Dr. Wallich's conclusion after careful study of the document is that the economic planks are not far out of the "mainstream" of Republican thought.

One of Professor Wallich's most interesting conclusions is that the economic model underlying the Republican platform, given favorable conditions, will probably outdistance that of the Democrats in terms of economic growth. The Republican model, he says, is an economy which relies principally on strong incentives to insure the full use of resources, and on competition to insure their optimal allocation. Dr. Wallich points out that it contrasts with the Democratic model, which relies more heavily on fiscal and monetary policies to achieve full resource use, and upon various forms of intervention and control to achieve an allocation that reflects its concepts of welfare.

The improvements in the Republican model and in future platforms, according to Dr. Wallich, must be sought in measures that assure stability in the use of resources at a high level without interfering with strong incentives and free markets.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that Dr. Wallich's analysis of the 1964 Republican platform be included in the RECORD at this point:

AN ECONOMIC ANALYSIS OF THE REPUBLICAN PLATFORM: JOURNAL OF COMMERCE

(By Henry C. Wallich)

Some commentators have said that the Republican platform represents a sharp break with the former views of the party. Careful analysis reveals that the economic sections at any rate contain few dramatic changes. By and large these sections are of a sort that most Republicans could live with.

There are some things missing that progressive Republicans would wish had been put in. A few are in that they—and most nonpolitical economists—would wish had been left out. But if the platform is no mandate for the kind of economic policy that the progressive wing of the Republican Party would like to see, neither is it inconsistent with such a policy.

The voter, accustomed to politicians' forgetfulness where platforms are concerned, often is tempted to write off the document altogether. If so, he misconceives its true purpose. The platform does not settle issues, it poses them. It compels the politicians, individuals normally oriented toward action or at any rate toward speech, to stop and think. It compels them to take positions. It provides a test of strength on these positions.

The voter who takes the trouble to read the platform still does not know what his party would do if it came to form a government. Nobody knows that. But he certainly knows what the pressures are going to be. That is the function of the platform.

The simplest evidence that much of the Republican platform is not far out of the "mainstream" of Republican thought comes from the fact that it incorporates most of the 1960 platform and of the 1962 declaration of Republican principle and policy. At the beginning of the constructive program section, it is stated that, in the interests of brevity, these two documents are not repeated. The platform continues "We incorporate into this platform as pledges renewed those commitments which are relevant to the problems of 1964." While this downgrades the impact, it does serve to preserve continuity. A number of points from the 1962 declaration of principles, moreover, appear in very similar language in the 1964 platform.

A second factor contributing to balance in the economic part of the platform is the spadework done by the Critical Issues Council, a group of Republican-oriented citizens not affiliated with the official party organization. The papers of the council, published during the months preceding the convention and presented in summary form to the platform committee, generally have a middle of the road tenor.

Balance has further been facilitated by the device of dividing the platform document into two parts and releasing it to the press in two stages. The first part contains an indictment of the Democratic administration, the second the positive proposals. Most of the vitriol is discharged in the first part. This leaves an opportunity for a calmer statement on economic policy in the second part.

Balance probably was not the primary reason for the one-two punch technique. Splitting the platform into two parts was a means of giving the press an opportunity to concentrate on the indictments. But the device helps to make the positive program more businesslike than political statements often can afford to be.

Finally, the 1964 platform is a very flexible document which allows many shades of opinion to find support among its numerous proposals. The platform is, in fact, a new approach in platform writing techniques. The planks of the economic section are not assembled according to functional criteria. They do not, in other words, deal with fiscal affairs in one place, with labor in a second, with agriculture in a third. Instead, the planks are organized according to major principles, running from "faith in the individual" to "faith in the competitive system" to "faith in limited government."

The platform writers discovered, not very surprisingly, that most major public policies have something to contribute under more than one of these headings. Something therefore had to be said about the budget under "faith in the individual" as well as under "faith in limited government", and the same is true of agriculture, labor, small business, and all the rest.

With this structure, the platform attempts not so much to list a program as to project a philosophy. This is appropriate for the party out of power: it is not required to run on its record, as the governing party must. Nor does it have the means of putting together a carefully documented program. It lacks control of the vast staffs in the Washington agencies that the party in power can command. It is not under the discipline of responsibility that compels a party in power to bring into line its many divergent elements.

By avoiding to be specific on all subjects, the Republican platform can claim to be a more honest document than if a great many things had been spelled out that, in the nature of politics, are destined to be forgotten later. The specifics are mixed in with the generalities. And it is fairly easy to see which are the specifics, and which the generalities.

The specifics are proposals that are optional, that can be implemented by some feasible piece of legislation or administrative action, such as "tax credits for college education," or "emphasis upon channeling more private capital into sound urban development projects". Given the will and the votes, these things could be done.

Examples of generalities are "elimination of excessive bureaucracy," "the redevelopment of an atmosphere of confidence—in which vigorous competition can flourish," or "an end to chronic deficit financing, proudly reaffirming our belief in a balanced budget." None of this would commit a victorious

Republican Party to any particular course of action, because it is not clear what course of action would achieve the objective, or even what the objective would be in any particular case.

The number of generalities is large in this platform, the number of specifics small. This reflects the differences between the two wings of the Republican Party, which this year are acute, and the preference of Senator GOLDWATER for a short document. But when the 1960 platform is taken into account, the pledges of which are specifically renewed, the range of specific commitments widens.

In some respects this makes the 1964 Republican platform all things to all men. Promoters of freer trade can find support in it as well as protectionists. Budget balancers can cite it and so can protagonists of a flexible fiscal policy. But if failure to arrive at a singleminded economic orientation is a defect, it is also a feature of political significance: in a year in which the Republican Party has made a sharp turn in political direction, it has shifted its stance only mildly on matters of economic policy.

WHERE DO WE STAND?

I have said that the economics of the 1964 platform represent much less of a shift than its political planks. The incorporation of the 1960 platform, insofar as relevant to the problems of 1964, which has been overlooked by many, contributes substantially to this effect. But continuity can be demonstrated also by an analysis of many of the provisions of the 1964 platform alone.

Budget balancing is the acid test of financial ideology. The 1964 pledge is a string of words of art. "An end to chronic deficit financing, proudly reaffirming our belief in a balanced budget." It sounds like budget balancing but it isn't. Chronic deficits are to be ended, and belief in a balanced budget is affirmed, but no commitment is made to balance any particular budget. Occasional deficits are all right, and how closely action in achieving balance is to follow belief is left to the judgment of the reader. The symbolism of the balanced budget is maintained, but somehow the drafting committee has failed to find the words, among the thousands in the financial dictionary, that would convert symbol into program.

The 1964 statement on budget balancing is not significantly harder than its predecessors. In 1962 the statement of principles demanded "more than lipservice to a balanced budget." The 1960 platform proclaimed "Except in times of war or economic adversity, expenditures should be covered by revenues." In each statement there is an element of flexibility.

All these statements, of course, still fall far short of a statement on the budget such as many economists would like to see. Such a statement would say that the budget should be in surplus when consistent with high use of resources and in deficit when required to achieve such use. But it should not be forgotten that balanced-budget-mindedness did not keep Republicans from cutting taxes in 1948 and 1954 in the face of economic recession, even though that may not have been the decisive consideration for all legislators.

On the subject of Federal expenditures, the 1964 platform also takes a stand from which more than one group may take comfort. Here, however, it is not so much a question of the liberal versus the conservative wing, as the taxpayer versus various interested groups.

Pledged is a cut in Federal expenditures of "not less than $5 billion" from present levels. Understandably, no very detailed list of the victims of this cut is provided. There are indications, however, that among them would be agricultural subsidies, space, and Federal grant-in-aid programs.

But there are increases, too. These would be demanded principally by proposals for modernization and broadening of the weapons program, "adequate pay scales" for the career governmental services, military and civilian, strengthening of various social security and health programs, labor training and rehabilitation, and others.

Any increases on behalf of these proposals would mean, of course, that total cuts would have to be correspondingly larger than the proposed $5 billion. I have no doubt that most students of the budget, Republicans as well as a good many Democrats, could individually identify budget areas where they would like to see such cuts. I fear, however, that when the budgeteers come together, each would object to the proposals of the others. The area of agreement on budget cuts traditionally has been small.

Some expenditure cuts, under the Republican platform, would be facilitated by transfers of Federal programs and responsibilities to State and local authorities. This would take the form of a "major overhaul of all Federal grant-in-aid programs." The platform is emphatic about the need to strengthen State and local responsibilities.

Experience has shown, however, that State and local authorities are far from eager for this defederalization of activities. At a minimum, it would have to be accompanied by substantial transfers of resources. The platform proposes "credit against Federal taxes for specified State and local taxes paid, and a transfer to the States of excise and other Federal tax sources." A program of this sort would be a major step forward in sharing the more rapidly increasing Federal tax resources with the hard-pressed States. But while helping to reduce expenditures, the program would cut revenues and thus would fail to contribute toward budget balance or surplus.

Since social security is for the most part outside the regular budget, the Republican platform's proposals in this area do not bear directly upon the state of the budget. The proposals are interesting, however, in their own right, because Republican intentions in this area have been exposed to some skepticism.

At least eight planks, under various headings, deal with social security. Most of them are minor; two, however, are substantial: a general pledge of "a strong, sound system of social security, with improved benefits to our people," and "revision of the social security laws to allow higher earnings, without loss of benefits, by our elderly people." Both proposals, if implemented, would cost substantial money and presumably would require increases in social security levies.

The social security proposals are broadly in lines with the 1960 platform. The latter went into considerably more detail, and listed a wider range of proposals. But since that applies to programs other than social security as well, it cannot be said that the subject is being given short shrift by the 1964 platform.

The platform is less specific where jobs for those not yet eligible for social security are concerned. It arraigns the administration for its failure to reduce unemployment to 4 percent, thereby seeming implicitly to accept the 4 percent target. It attacks the administration's proposal of double pay for overtime. Its principal means for providing jobs are twofold: reliance on the "dynamo of economic growth—free competitive enterprise" and a variety of measures of the structural kind, such as training programs, job information and placement services, vocational rehabilitation, and temporary exemptions from the minimum wage law for teenagers. A clear stand is here taken against the administration's view that unemployment is principally caused by a shortage of demand.

NEW DEPARTURES

The preceding articles have shown that, in most economic matters, the 1964 platform is constructed pretty much according to traditional blueprints. A few significant departures, however, can also be observed.

One departure leads to omission of the usual reference to the need for an independent Federal Reserve System. Such references are contained in the 1960 platform and the 1962 declaration and are therefore automatically repledged in the present platform. Yet, at a time when the Federal Reserve is under fire, the omission arouses attention.

There is no lack of concern over inflation. The administration is criticized for permitting a 5-percent price rise. Protection is pledged against inflation, and competitiveness demanded for American products in domestic and foreign markets. But these concerns are for the most part tied to the effects of public spending. Monetary policy as such is not mentioned.

On this reading of the platform, the Federal Reserve evidently must face up to the fact that it now has critics on the right as well as on the left. This has long been the case in academic circles. Now it is becoming a fact in the political arena.

The reasons underlying these attitudes presumably must be sought in the unsatisfactory performance of the economy in recent years. The Federal Reserve failed to cure them; ergo, the Federal Reserve must carry some of the blame.

The critics' dissatisfaction with the performance of the economy is understandable. Their allocation of blame, however, does not necessarily follow. The Federal Reserve, as its critics should be the first to acknowledge, not only is not all wise, it also is not all powerful. Even a strong credit push by the Federal Reserve would probably have been of rather limited effectiveness in combating the unemployment of recent years.

But the balance-of-payments deficit has prevented the Federal Reserve from making as strong a push as it might have under other circumstances. Interest rates had to be kept up in order to stem the outflow of capital. This reorientation of monetary policy toward the balance of payments, and away from domestic stabilization policy, has been the experience of central banks all over the convertible world. For its contribution to saving the dollar the Federal Reserve gets no credit. But it is blamed for what it did not do domestically.

On balance-of-payments matters, the Republican platform is brief but sensible. It demands high priority for the solution of the present problem. It sees the solution in maintenance of competitiveness, expansion of exports, stimulation of foreign tourism in the United States, and greater sharing of foreign aid burdens. It also includes the controversial proposal for cutting of forces abroad, but proposes that it be done gradually and as manpower can be replaced by increased firepower.

The platform also asks for a strengthening of the international monetary system without sacrifice of freedom of policymaking. Presumably that implies an improvement of existing facilities of the IMF and of the system of currency swaps and foreign currency bonds.

Foreign aid receives fairly constructive treatment. A "drastic reorganization and reorientation of the entire foreign aid effort" is demanded. All aid is to serve the cause of freedom, none is to bolster and sustain anti-American regimes. No demand is made for drastic cutbacks, while sales of surplus farm products under Public Law 480 receive favorable mention.

In the area of international trade, proponents of a liberal trade policy must hunt long and hard among the many planks of the platform before they can come across one

that may please them. The overall tenor is protectionist. Meaningful safeguards are demanded against disruptive surges of imports, such as are alleged to have occurred in the case of beef and other meat products, textiles, oil, glass, coal, lumber, and steel. The force of the demand is tempered by the qualification that these safeguards are sought against irreparable injuries. The demand for import labeling, however, is also renewed.

On the positive side, the administration is arraigned for failure to preserve American markets abroad. "Tough, realistic negotiations to remove the many discriminatory and restrictive trade practices of foreign nations" are urged, which with some good will can be construed as a proposal in support of the Trade Expansion Act. But the absence of more specific reference sticks out.

In taking a look at the platform as a whole, the economist feels compelled to ask a question that may seem abstruse to the man of affairs. Yet it goes to the heart of the difference between Republican and Democratic philosophy. What is the economic model underlying the Republican platform: What is it, in the Republican view, that makes the economy tick?

The Republican model is an economy which relies principally on strong incentives to insure the full use of resources, and on competition to insure their optimal allocation. It contrasts with the Democratic model, which relies more heavily on fiscal and monetary policies to achieve full resource use, and upon various forms of intervention and control to achieve an allocation that reflects its concepts of welfare.

The nature of the Republican model becomes apparent in the platform's concern with tax incentives, removal of restraints on small and large business, a hands-off policy for government. Business expenditures rather than those of Government are relied upon to maintain an adequate level of demand. The Democratic model goes the other way.

The Republican model, given favorable conditions, will probably outdistance that of the Democrats in terms of economic growth. The Government takes fewer resources out of the economy, and interferes less with their optimum allocation. But if conditions are not favorable, the Republican model may lack stability, and may temporarily stagnate. Improvements in the model, and in future platforms, must be sought in measures that assure stability in the use of resources at a high level without interfering with strong incentives and free markets.

A WORTHY PROGRAM

Mr. SHRIVER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. RUMSFELD] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. RUMSFELD. Mr. Speaker, for 54 years the Boy Scout program has played a significant role in the lives of hundreds of thousands of young boys in America. It has given them a sense of purpose, has broadened their knowledge, and has developed citizenship responsibility. In the face of increasing incidents of crime and defiance of law and order among youth and the growing number of school dropouts who cannot find employment, the Boy Scout program cannot be overlooked. I agree with the editorial of the Chicago Tribune, August 13, that the proposal of Raymond Hilliard, director of the Cook County Department of Public Aid, to institute a campaign for the establishment of more Scout troops in our cities is a wise and effective approach to a serious problem. The editorial follows:

A WORTHY PROGRAM

Raymond Hilliard, director of the Cook County Department of Public Aid, has made a proposal that may be more valuable than some of the schemes of the billion dollar Johnson "war on poverty" program. Mr. Hilliard's plan is for a combined campaign by his department, suburban churches, and the Boy Scouts of America to establish more Scout troops in slum areas of the inner city.

Wherever possible, scoutmasters would be recruited from among young Negro leaders. A suburban church, synagogue, or a combination of suburban congregations could adopt or sponsor a troop. Men of the suburban congregation would be asked to volunteer their services—perhaps one evening a week plus an occasional day for hikes or other adventures. Sponsoring groups could help provide uniforms and funds for camping expenses.

In the Chicago suburbs nearly half of the boys get the benefits of belonging to the Boy Scouts. In the inner city only 10 percent become Scouts, and few of these are in slum areas. The Boy Scout organization has had 54 years of experience teaching boys respect and discipline and, as Mr. Hilliard says, "keeping boys productively busy and out of mischief, and satisfying the cravings of every boy to 'gang up' with other boys."

His program deserves support.

UNLESS CONGRESS ACTS NOW THOUSANDS OF JOBS WILL BE LOST IN CALIFORNIA

Mr. SHRIVER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. MARTIN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MARTIN of California. Mr. Speaker, we need to extend Public Law 78 or its equivalent now, not after Congress convenes next year. Why? Because farmers decrease their planted acreage when assurance is lacking that a dependable labor force will be available at harvesttime.

Public Law 78 will expire on December 31, 1964. With no dependable labor force available next year to harvest crops California farmers have limited their acreage so far this year.

An article in the Los Angeles Times of August 16, 1964, clearly shows the depressing effect upon the California economy by the demise of Public Law 78. Limited planting up to now means we have already lost thousands of jobs in California next year.

If Congress acts now to extend Public Law 78, farmers in California will immediately plant more acreage. We cannot retrieve those jobs already lost but we can and should prevent further losses by extending the only workable program yet devised by Congress for supplemental Mexican agricultural labor.

The attached Times article is clear: Unless Congress acts now thousands of jobs, those in agriculture, and those in businesses which so to speak "feed on agriculture" will be lost in California next year.

BRACERO LOSS PERILS STATE'S BILLION-DOLLAR FARM INDUSTRY: NEARLY ALL CALIFORNIA COULD BE SEVERELY AFFECTED NEXT YEAR

(By Gene Blake)

California's $3.43 billion farm industry—and related business valued at $10 billion—is facing a crisis which could severely affect nearly every man, woman, and child in the State.

It will come next year if enough farmworkers are not found to harvest crops now picked by nearly 62,000 Mexican braceros at the peaks of the seasons.

Public Law 78, under which Mexican nationals have been recruited for temporary farmwork on this side of the border, ends December 31. There is no chance for another extension at the end of this year.

Growers say they cannot recruit American domestic workers for the "stoop" labor. They say they've tried with the help of State employment departments here and across the Nation, but failed.

UNIONS DISPUTE GROWER'S CLAIMS

The growers' claims are disputed by some church, social welfare and labor union groups, who argue that a domestic force could be obtained if better pay and working conditions were provided.

While the charges and countercharges and alternative proposals are bandied about, officials close to the situation are growing concerned.

One thing that worries them is that most Californians just don't care—because they are unaware how much their livelihood and California's entire economy depend on the State's farm industry.

For example, the Council of California Growers points out that one of every three jobs in the State rests directly or indirectly on agriculture.

SWELL TO MORE THAN $14 BILLION

California's record $3.43 billion worth of farm commodities in 1963—highest in the Nation—was three times the value of oil and natural gas production in the State.

As the farm commodities flow through the channels of trade, commerce and industry, it is estimated by economists that the monetary effects swell to more than $14 billion.

Services of 312,900 workers, rising to a total of 406,300 at peak harvest, are utilized by farming itself.

But for every 100 employed in agriculture, another 263 are working in such closely related industries as canning, preserving, packaging, transporting, storing and selling.

STEEL INDUSTRY INVOLVED

And there's more, when the chain reactions created by the farm industry needs are considered:

The steel industry annually sells 600,000 tons of tinplate for metal containers to California canneries. Glassmakers each year sell 1.3 billion jars, with a value of $54 million, to California food processors.

Thirty million pounds of low-density polyethylene are supplied annually by the plastics industry for use by California agriculture in items such as food packaging.

Paper products manufacturers provide 400 million fiber box containers. About 40 million wooden containers, with a value of more than $15 million, are supplied for packing produce.

A million miles of printed labels are used by the State's food canners and packagers each year. Food advertising in California amounts to over $125 million annually.

California farmers each year buy an estimated $2.2 billion worth of goods and services—labor, machines, petroleum products,

transportation. California lending institutions provided California farmers with $734 million in loans in a recent year.

The estimated annual payroll in 1962 of agriculture-related business and industry in the Los Angeles-Orange County metropolitan area alone was well over $1 billion.

Thus it can be seen that nearly every Californian has a big stake in California agriculture—and ample reason to be concerned lest the crops wither and die for want of pickers.

Of course, not all the enumerated industries and jobs and income will vanish if there is no one to replace the braceros, for their numbers average annually less than 10 percent of the California farmworkers.

RATIO HAS DROPPED

The ratio has dropped from a peak of 15 percent in 1957, largely due to the mechanization, growers say.

Major crops for which braceros are employed are tomatoes, strawberries, asparagus, lemons, lettuce, melons, sugarbeets, and celery.

Aggregate value of these crops in 1962 was $435 million, and it is estimated they gave a $1.74 billion boost to the State's total economy.

Western Growers Association estimates that more than 60 percent of the workers harvesting California's fresh vegetables and melons are braceros.

That industry annually accounts for 117,000 railway carlot shipments, 137,000 carload equivalents of truck transportation, 820,000 tons of ice at points of shipment alone, $10 million worth of petroleum products, $6.5 million in seeds, 156 million containers, and 93 million pounds of fertilizers.

Investments of the fresh vegetable and melon industry include $34 million in packinghouses and equipment, $6 million in special harvest machinery, 17,500 trucks and 16,800 tractors.

TOMATOES CHIEF CROP

Tomatoes are the chief crop harvested by braceros, accounting for a $130 million product in 1962. Of the 43,700 workers in the tomato fields at peak harvest that year, 80 percent were braceros.

Without a sufficient force to harvest the tomatoes when they ripen, they would rot away under the blazing sun within days and the entire crop would be lost. Consider what the impact would be.

The California Tomato Growers Association reports that about 50,000 persons are employed in tomato canneries during the season.

Annual expenditures of the tomato growers, the association says, include $4 million for fuel and machinery repair service, $3.5 million for fertilizers, $3 million for insecticides and their application, $5.5 million for seeds and plants.

In 1962, tomato processors spent $70 million for metal containers, $11 million for glass containers, $1.8 million for caps and lids, $12 million for cartons, $6 million for labels, $12.8 million for trucks hauling raw tomatoes to plants, $32 million for shipping finished products to market, and $45 million for cannery employees.

HUNT PLANT EXAMPLE

A lot of dry statistics? Maybe. But they mean food and clothing and shelter and perhaps even a few modest luxuries for thousands of human beings.

One example of a processing plant is the Hunt Foods & Industries, Inc., a $10 million complex in Fullerton.

It provides jobs for a permanent force of 1,400 persons, plus another 1,200 during peak production months. Its payroll averages nearly $500,000 a month.

The St. Regis Paper Co. in Fullerton devotes 85 percent of its production to agricultural needs, mostly for growers employing braceros. It utilizes $5 million worth of products annually, has an average annual payroll of $750,000, pays $300,000 for services and $80,000 in local taxes.

These are but a few examples of the industries that might be hit—with a resultant blow to the economy—should their raw materials or markets be cut off by a farm labor shortage.

Growers are working desperately on mechanization as one solution. But Dr. George B. Alcorn, director of the agricultural extension service at the University of California, says machines will not replace men for many years in most California crops now picked by hand.

The tomato harvesting machine is farthest along the development route and by next year might handle half the crop, Dr. Alcorn says.

It has taken 17 years to develop a modified tomato that can be harvested mechanically, due to the necessity of having at least 90 percent of the fruit ripen on the vine at one time. Each machine capable of harvesting about 100 acres a season is expected to cost at least $25,000.

MANY YEARS DISTANT

The citrus industry is spending $1 million on research in the next few years, but mechanical harvesting for citrus is many years distant. Mechanical harvesting of strawberries, asparagus, and celery appears to be about as far off.

Other prospects are 1967 for lettuce, the late 1960's for grapes, and 1970 for cantaloups.

Meanwhile, California growers' fears of competition from Mexico and other States are mounting.

Mexico has doubled its irrigated acreage since 1950, from 6 million to 12 million acres. Since 1952, its exports of agricultural products into this country have increased 65 percent, from about $164 million to $271 million.

In Mexico, farm labor is plentiful and cheap—equivalent to about $1.50 a day compared with the average of $1.33 an hour in California.

California growers also are feeling the pinch of competition from other States, chiefly Texas, where the hourly rate is 84 cents. The national average is less than 95 cents.

"If Mexico fills the market vacuum, and apparently she has the capacity to do so, it may make little difference to the consumer," says O. W. Fillerup, executive vice president of the council.

"But it will make a big difference to the many thousands of workers employed in our agriculture-related industries—the packing sheds, the ice plants, the canneries, freeze plants, dehydrators and truck and rail lines."

The Agricultural Producers Labor Committee, created by the citrus and avocado growers of California and Arizona, last fall set up the Farmers Harvest Association to recruit domestic workers.

During a 6-week period, with the help of the State department of employment, FHA recruited unemployed men in the Los Angeles area. They were assembled downtown each Monday and were taken by bus to grower association camps in the San Gabriel Valley and the Ventura area.

The most recruited in any one week was 39, and only 16 were still working at the end of the week, reported Dick Daniels, manager of FHA.

ABANDON PROGRAM

Thereafter, the number declined to such a point that the FHA and department of employment agreed to discontinue the program as being uneconomical.

In a nationwide search, 1,200 unemployed farmworkers were obtained from Texas, but less than 15 percent stayed through the harvest.

"They just came for the ride," one official says.

In all, during the first 6 months of the year, FHA recruited 1,879 domestic workers. Each worked an average of 70.9 hours, for a total of 133,280 man-hours.

But the number of working hours available for that type of labor totaled 8,389,440.

SEEK OTHER SOLUTIONS

And so, the growers are seeking other possible solutions. One may be a Senate bill which in effect would create an American bracero force. Another is a provision of the Immigration Act which permits individual growers to contract for temporary or permanent foreign workers.

A section of President Johnson's $948 million antipoverty program approved by Congress last week may be of some help. It sets aside $15 million for attention to the problems of education, sanitation, child care, and housing for migrant farmworkers.

Perhaps needed most at this point, however, is general public awareness of the crisis and its widespread impact.

FEDERAL SPENDING IN SOUTH DAKOTA IS CLEAR CUT, BUT TOTAL TAX TAKE IS NOT SO OBVIOUS

Mr. SHRIVER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. BERRY] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. BERRY. Mr. Speaker, the spenders are at it again, getting ready for the fall campaign by propagandizing the unthinking public in probably every State in the Union on how much more money that State gets from the Federal Treasury than it pays into the Federal Treasury.

This is the old community Christmas tree approach. Make the people believe they can get more off the tree than they put on it, and they will vote for the spenders.

The junior Senator from South Dakota took occasion yesterday to place in the RECORD a glowing story of how his State and mine has been raiding the Federal Treasury. He is so proud of the fact that his figures show that by counting every payroll in every bureau and branch of the Federal Government, every subsidy payment, every emergency payment, school lunch, surplus commodities and even including the small business loans and home loans, and so forth, and by figuring everything, there went into the State last year $507,155,261. Then he says the "total Internal Revenue collections in South Dakota, fiscal year 1963 were $147,800,000."

Senator MCGOVERN concludes from this vast list of agency salaries and payments which went into the State last year that South Dakota received $3 from the Treasury for each $1 it contributed.

Apparently there are very few States which do not grab more from the Christmas tree than they hang on because last year the Federal Treasury went into the hole to the tune of $8 billion. The year 1963 was chickenfeed in comparison with 1964 because this is an election year, and

the spenders have contrived dozens of new methods of spreading Federal money out to the voters. All of these new poverty war programs will require thousands of new employees, and the spenders are dancing around the Christmas tree with real glee.

The story which the junior Senator from South Dakota prepared boasting of the State's raid on the Treasury was carried in most of the daily papers of the State. The Sioux Falls Argus Leader gave it a full half page with special headlines, but that paper wanted to be fair about it and in an editorial pointed out, as I had tried to point out, that the McGovern figures were a very small part of the Federal tax contributions from South Dakota. I am inserting the editorial of the Argus Leader in this RECORD to offset the bureaucratic propaganda carried in this news story which was reprinted in the RECORD on page 19440 under date of August 13.

To prepare a dollar-and-cent response to the figures the bureaucrats have compiled for the junior Senator is, of course, impossible. The editorial points out that corporations like the Homestake Mining Co., the largest gold mine in the Northern Hemisphere, pays its tax in California. Large contracting firms come into the State to do construction work, but they pay their income tax, they make their social security and unemployment tax payments in some other State where their headquarters is maintained. These are a few examples of the taxes Mr. McGOVERN's constituents pay, which he is trying to rob them of the credit for paying.

Let us take another example. The junior Senator recently made an impassioned plea for the wheat farmers by pointing out that there is less than 2 cents worth of wheat in a loaf of bread; the balance is hidden taxes and charges. What constitutes these 131 hidden taxes in a loaf of bread? First the farmer must buy his machinery and equipment. On this he pays 30 percent of the cost price in taxes, most of which are Federal. He pays social security and unemployment taxes on his labor. If he hires the grain hauled to the elevator, he pays another combination of transportation taxes. The elevator must take out tax cuts and social security, and so forth.

The grain is loaded on boxcars and shipped to grain terminals, and all kinds of Federal taxes go into that move. It is sold to the miller. Another tax is collected. The miller processes the grain, and taxes again are added. The bakery must add another layer of Federal taxes. Thousands of loaves of bread are baked outside of South Dakota by these large chain bakeries and shipped into the State where the consumer pays all of these, layer after layer of Federal taxes. When he was making the pitch for the 2 cents' worth of wheat that go into a loaf of bread he apparently was talking out of the other side of his political position.

As the States of the Nation dance around the "Christmas tree," grabbing off the goodies, there are few which put back as many as they remove. Through these "vote buying" programs, the Nation is going in the hole from $8 to $10 billion annually. A total of $312 billion has already been spent more than was taken in. The "Christmas tree" has been loaded with these goodies.

For every dollar borrowed by the Treasury to make these goodies available, the taxpayer must pay back $3 over a 30-year period.

It is estimated that inflation has already eaten up the value of the tax cut. Inflation is the greatest enemy the poor people have since it destroys their small savings, their social security, and their unemployment benefits. It is, however, this philosophy that somehow, sometime the people of a country can get $3 out of the Treasury for every $1 they put in which brings about unbearable indebtedness, unbearable interest rates, unbearable inflation, and eventually complete bankruptcy through destruction of the currency. And when that happens, even the spenders know the Nation has gone down the drain, as many great nations have done in the past.

Mr. Speaker, the editorial of the Sioux Falls Argus Leader is as follows:

FEDERAL SPENDING IN SOUTH DAKOTA IS CLEAR CUT, BUT TOTAL TAX TAKE ISN'T SO OBVIOUS

The figures which U.S. Senator GEORGE MCGOVERN put together showing Federal expenditures in South Dakota constitute a revealing look at Uncle Sam's activities in our State. The article appeared in Sunday's Argus-Leader.

Senator MCGOVERN pointed out that for every $1 South Dakota sends to Washington, $3 comes back in Federal payments. During fiscal year 1963 the Federal Government paid out $507,155,000 in South Dakota. Collections by the Internal Revenue Service for the same period were $147,300,000.

MCGOVERN said: "Release of these figures does not imply my approval of all Federal outlays. Some I have supported and some I have opposed.

"However, the figures do indicate the relative importance of Federal activities in the total South Dakota economy. The $507 million Federal outlays in fiscal 1963 compare to a record $757 million gross farm income ($357 million net farm income) in the State in 1962."

The outlays by the Departments of Agriculture, Defense, and Health, Education, and Welfare lead the list.

Defense outlays were $165 million. Agriculture expenditures totaled $131 million, including $37.5 million of crop price support loans and $23 million in acreage diversion payments. Health, Education, and Welfare spent $81 million in the State.

SPENDING HAS NATIONAL BASIS

Some Defense expenditures in South Dakota should not be considered solely for the benefit of the State's citizens. The military costs are part of the Government's defense plan for the Nation. Thirty-one million dollars of defense expenditures went for such "civil functions" as Missouri River dams. The dams cannot be considered a strictly South Dakota project. They are part of the Missouri River Basin development; their benefits extend beyond our borders.

The $55.7 million of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare expenditures in South Dakota went for old-age survivor insurance payments and another $9.3 million was in aid to the aged, blind, disabled, and dependent children.

Federal expenditures by the Bureau of Indian Affairs totaled $14,836,050; this is a national, not a State obligation. Payments by the Veterans' Administration for payroll, benefits to veterans, VA center, and hospitals totaled $532,281,599.

These major expenditures cited above constitute proper functions of the Federal Government. So do such activities as the Post Office. Federal courts, Federal Aviation Agency, Weather Bureau and the like.

Anyone who seriously suggests that Uncle Sam curtail his activities in South Dakota should get down to specifics. MCGOVERN's analysis will help the discussion along.

THE HIDDEN TAX TAKE

To provide a complete picture of this matter, however, it is well to point out that South Dakotans pay enormous sums yearly in Federal taxes of a type not included in Senator MCGOVERN's tabulation.

One can only guess at the total of this amount.

South Dakotans, for example, buy large quantities of products that are produced by the General Motors Corp. This company pays a huge amount yearly in Federal income taxes. Of these taxes South Dakotans obviously contribute their share.

The same statement applies to the Federal income taxes paid by International Harvester Co., the Standard Oil Co. of Indiana, and literally hundreds of other large corporations. Their tax payments, though, are credited to the States where their headquarters offices are situated.

Another specific example is that of the Homestake Mining Co. A large share of its earnings come out of the gold mine at Lead but its Federal income taxes are paid in California where the headquarters is situated. Reference also may be made to Northwestern Bell Telephone Co. whose home office is at Omaha. Headquarters offices of Northern States Power Co. and Western Power & Gas Co. aren't in South Dakota.

South Dakotans still smoke many cigarettes and other tobacco products. They also consume some liquor. But no liquor or tobacco companies have their headquarters in South Dakota. Senator MCGOVERN did not itemize his report of South Dakota tax payments and we are not sure whether or not the total included their indirect payments of Federal cigarette and liquor taxes in the total. The same statement may be made in regard to the Federal automobile tax. Usually these aren't included in tabulations such as that which MCGOVERN presented and the chances are that they aren't in his figures.

When we study these additional payments, as we most certainly should, then we can realize that Washington isn't as generous a Santa Claus as he is often pictured in inadequate recapitulations. It may be that the story is the other way around—that Washington is a Santa Claus who collects from South Dakota much more than he distributes.

NATIONAL CHAMPIONSHIP IN VFW TEENER BASEBALL, SALUTE TO GASTON TEENERS

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. WHITENER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Speaker, on last Saturday afternoon I was privileged to be among a great number of residents of Gaston County, N.C., who welcomed the return of the national champion

Gaston VFW Teeners baseball team to our home county. These young fellows were bringing back from Hershey, Pa., their second consecutive national championship in VFW Teener baseball.

The record of accomplishment of teams sponsored by Absher-Flowers Post 9337, Veterans of Foreign Wars, Gastonia, N.C., of which I am a member, has probably established a record in this competition which will never again be equaled in that they have won the national championship for 4 of the past 5 years and were runners-up in 1962. This is a phenomenal record and one of which all North Carolinians are justly proud.

These fine young boys under the leadership of Coaches J. V. McGinnis and Russell Bergmann are outstanding young athletes and gentlemen. They had that type of training at home and from their coaches which brings out the best in them in their relationship to others in athletics as well as in the wider aspects of life. J. V. McGinnis, coach of the team, is a former professional baseball player and a lifelong resident of Gaston County. He is employed as a carrier in the U.S. Post Office, Gastonia, N.C., where he is rendering outstanding service. He and Russ Bergmann have coached the Gaston Teeners since 1960 with real teamwork. Russ Bergmann was head coach until this year when he was forced to give up the duties because of his physical health. Nevertheless, he has been by the side of Coach McGinnis and has rendered great service to the young fellows who were under their guidance.

Russ Bergmann is a remarkable gentleman in every respect and has had solid experience as a professional baseball player and high school coach and now is personnel director of the A. M. Smyre Manufacturing Co., of Gastonia. He and J. V. McGinnis gladly give their time to the teener baseball program without compensation, which is an evidence of their great public spirit.

It was a genuine pleasure for me to meet the boys on this team and to observe firsthand their mannerliness and excellent demeanor. They are real champions. I salute them and call their remarkable achievements to the attention of my colleagues in the House of Representatives.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that a statement of past winners, a portion of the sports column by Dwight Frady, and an editorial entitled "Salute to Gaston Teeners," all of which appeared in the Gastonia Gazette, Saturday, August 15, 1964, be made a part of the RECORD.

[From the Gastonia (N.C.) Gazette, Aug. 15, 1964]

WHAT HEART TEENERS DISPLAYED IN SERIES

(By Dwight Frady)

You've gotta have heart to be a champion—and a goodly amount of guts, too. That's exactly how the Gaston VFW Teeners must be described following their tremendous comeback Friday in the national finals in Hershey, Pa.

It was a tremendous achievement so here and now let's toss a lot of roses in their path as they return home today.

Name one boy as being the difference in the tournament would be doing an injustice to all. And you just can't beat the coaching of J. V. McGinnis and Russ Bergmann.

In fact, every member of the Absher-Flowers VFW Post is to be congratulated. It's a tremendous feeling of pride by one and all, for both Gastonia and the county.

The Teeners come from all over Gaston. You might expect them to do it once—that is, come out of the loser's bracket in Hershey to go all the way.

But twice—what an achievement and they did it yesterday with 8–0 and 5–4 wins over previously unbeaten West Allis, Wis., thereby capping off five straight wins following their lone loss of the season.

The Gastons finished the season with 14 victories in 15 games.

One other thing. Bill Broome was figured as a light-hitting third baseman. But his eight hits in Hershey now ranks him as a heavyweight.

We're proud of all of you, fellows.

SALUTE TO GASTON TEENERS

You can tell that the boys from Gaston County like chocolate candy the way they keep going back to Hershey, Pa., every year.

And you can tell that they like the sweet taste of victory the way the keep bringing home the goodies.

Yesterday, our Teeners did it again. They now have won the last four out of five Teener championships, and they did it yesterday the hard way. Clutching along in the losers bracket after dropping the second game, they had to pull themselves up through main strength and ambition before the bunting was theirs.

They had to win the first game in the morning, which they did; and they had to win the game in the afternoon, which they did. They beat West Allis, Wis., 5 to 4, in the final game and suddenly there was a whole lot of cheering going on.

The local aggregation is composed of a group of fine, hustling youngsters. You will find their names listed on our sports pages.

But don't forget that the Teeners were guided by the best one-two punch in kid baseball—J. V. McGinnis, coach, and Russ Bergmann, pitching coach.

These two men know their onions when it comes to getting the most and the best out of a boy on a baseball diamond.

Once again, the Gazette is proud to salute the Gaston Teeners, world champions for the fourth time in five tries.

Hats off to you lads. All of Gaston County appreciates what you have done.

PAST WINNERS

1953: Winner, Uniontown, Pa.

1954: Winner, Elgin, Ill., runner-up, Winnsboro, La.

1955: Winner, Beatrice, Nebr., runner-up, Johnston, R.I.

1956: Winner, Gloucester City, N.J., runner-up, Gastonia, N.C.

1957: Winner, Panama Canal Zone, runner-up, Tyrone, Pa.

1958: Winner, Bossier City, La., runner-up, Lenoir, N.C.

1959: Winner, Uniontown, Pa., runner-up, Endicott, N.Y.

1960: Winner, Gastonia, N.C., runner-up, Struthers, Ohio.

1961: Winner, Gastonia, N.C., runner-up, Bossier City, La.

1962: Winner, Chester Suburban, Brookhaven, Pa., runner-up, Gastonia, N.C.

1963: Winner, Gastonia, N.C., runner-up, Gloucester City, N.J.

1964: Winner, Gastonia, N.C., runner-up, West Allis, Wis.

1964 GASTONIA V.F.W. TEENER NATIONAL CHAMPIONS, GASTONIA, N.C., ABSHER-FLOWERS POST 9337

Carl Wayne Barr, pitcher, age 15, son of Mr. and Mrs. C. O. Barr, 503 Seacrest Avenue, Belmont.

William Harvey Broome, Jr., third base, age 15, son of Mr. and Mrs. W. H. Broome, 2701 Club Drive, Gastonia.

James Luther Cook, Jr., second base, age 15, son of Mr. and Mrs. James L. Cook, 105 3d Street, Mount Holly.

Daniel Leroy Denton, pitcher, age 15, son of Mr. and Mrs. James L. Denton, Box 56–A, Route 3, Gastonia.

Barry Daniel Farmer, catcher, age 15, son of Mr. and Mrs. J. C. Farmer, Hickory Grove Road, Belmont.

Warren Evan Garrett, pitcher, 15, son of Mr. and Mrs. Claude Garrett, 107 Georgia Belle Avenue, Belmont.

Kenneth Wayne James, pitcher, age 15, son of Mr. and Mrs. C. R. James, Box 37, Route 1, Bessemer City.

Douglas Spencer Lanham, outfield, age 15, son of Mrs. Gladys Lanham, 2701 Thomas Trail Drive, Gastonia.

Alvah Dewayne Moore, pitcher, age 15, son of Mr. and Mrs. Walter A. Moore, 201 Madora Street, Mount Holly.

John Calvin Rudisill, shortstop, age 15, son of Mr. and Mrs. Jon C. Rudisill, Box 175, Stanley.

Thomas Gene Steele, outfield, age 15, son of Mr. and Mrs. Joe Steele, Box 28, Route 1, Bessemer City.

Terry Steven Stroupe, catcher, age 15, son of Mr. and Mrs. R. J. Stroupe, 539 Brooklyn Street, Cramerton.

Daniel Lee Suggs, first base, age 15, son of Mr. and Mrs. W. H. Suggs, Route 2, Gastonia.

Edward Asbury Thompson, outfield, age 15, son of Mr. and Mrs. Dick Thompson, Box 433, Stanley.

Norris Eugene Thornburg, shortstop, age 14, son of Mr. and Mrs. Howard Thornburg, 510 East Georgia Avenue, Bessemer.

Manager, Roy Payton Warren, Jr., age 14, son of Mr. and Mrs. R. P. Warren, 401 Armstrong Park Road, Gastonia.

Scorer, Miss Sharon Bergmann, 502 Beverly Drive, Gastonia, N.C.

Coach, J. V. McGinnis, Jenny Street, Gastonia, N.C.

Assistant coach and youth director of post 9337, Russell Bergmann, 502 Beverly Drive, Gastonia, N.C.

Commander of Post 9337, VFW, Ernest Hubbard, Jr., Belmont, N.C.

STATEMENT OF HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER BEFORE DEMOCRATIC PLATFORM COMMITTEE IN SUPPORT OF A PLANK OFFERING GUARANTEES TO ISRAEL

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. MULTER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I was privileged today to testify before the Democratic Platform Committee meeting here in Washington at the Sheraton-Park Hotel in support of a plank in the platform offering a renewal of our guarantees to Israel on its independence and expressing the determination of our party to continue efforts toward a negotiated peace in the Middle East.

My remarks at the platform hearing follow:

STATEMENT OF HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER BEFORE DEMOCRATIC PLATFORM COMMITTEE

Mr. Chairman, through the years, we Democrats have adhered to the tenets of the

founding fathers of our party who, with foresight and astuteness, created the embryo of the structure which governs it today. Moreover, our party has sought, with perseverance and determination, to uphold the democratic principles upon which our great country is based, not only when dealing with national interests, but also as applied to international affairs.

Because we as Americans and Democrats believe in the principle of self-determination, it has become a national policy to aid those people in the world who have desired independence and freedom. Under a democratic government, the United States paved the way for other nations to follow in the liberation of former colonial lands by proclaiming the sovereign independence of the Philippine Islands. It was Harry S. Truman who led the fight for the creation of a homeland for the Jewish people, decimated by the holocaust of World War II. It was this same courageous Democratic President who was the first to recognize the independence of Israel.

Peace, stability, and economic advancement, however, have persistently been denied to the people of the Middle East. Israel, constantly on guard against attack by its Arab neighbors, has repeatedly been forced to call upon our Government for assurance and protection. With the production of missiles of destruction by the United Arab Republic, our guarantee for the maintenance of the independence of Israel must be reissued as a deterrent to any overt action.

That Israel is the strongest, most stable government and the only democratic nation in the Middle East has been recognized by our Government. That the people of Israel constitute our stanchest supporters and allies in that area is also understood by all Americans. We must not let these friends be destroyed by the concerted efforts of militant neighbors.

The Arab States must be made to see how beneficial a lasting peace in the Middle East would be to their own people, how stability would encourage development, how cooperation between the Arabs and Israel would increase mutual trade benefits. If the Democratic Party adopts a strong resolution condemning aggression and supporting Israel, the Arab States would perhaps realize the folly of attempting to use hostile action and may be persuaded that peace is more advantageous than war.

To offset the obvious hostile intent constantly reiterated and boasted of by President Nasser, of Egypt, it is imperative that we include in the platform of the Democratic Party the pledge to the Israeli people and to their friends in the United States that we are determined to maintain the independence of Israel against armed aggression. Furthermore, it is the intention of this Democratic Party to encourage the Arab States and Israel to settle their differences, either through direct negotiations or through the mediation of others. Thank you.

FEDERAL FEE TO FISH AND PICNIC?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. DORN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, I am opposed to charging the people of this country a fee to fish in Government reservoirs such as Clark Hill and Hartwell in my congressional district. I am opposed to the Federal Governmnet charging a fee to use the recreational areas around these Government lakes. I am opposed to Government agents charging the people a fee to use the public picnic areas or to visit their own national forests.

Hundreds of thousands of acres of land have been taken by the Federal Government from the people of my congressional district. Thousands of acres have been flooded by the Clark Hill and Hartwell Reservoirs. Vast areas have been taken for national forests. For some of this land, the Federal Government paid as low as $3 or less per acre. Now for the Federal Government to charge these people to visit this land and to fish would be incredible and to me unthinkable. To charge any taxpayer a fee whose money has been taken by the Federal Government to build these reservoirs and buy these Federal forests would be a great injustice.

Thousands of my people were forced off the land by the Government and they or their children are now employed in industry. My congressional district is largely industrial and the largest industry is the textile industry. Under the stretchout system in the textile mills, 40 hours now is hard, grueling, exhausting employment. These people need recreation. To charge them a fee after having their hard-earned wages withheld in taxes would be an outrage.

Many of us in the House opposed this land and water conservation bill because it would permit the Federal Government to charge a fee to use our national forests and the facilities at Federal reservoirs for boating and fishing. This would be a cruel blow to the industrial people of my district and throughout the United States who cannot afford country club membership and lakeside cottages.

Mr. Speaker, I will again oppose this bill when it comes back to the House from the other body unless that provision is eliminated which would permit Federal Government agents to charge my people a fee to fish or boat on Clark Hill, Hartwell, and picnic in our national forests. I urge and plead with the House and Senate conferees to bring back a bill without this Federal power to charge every citizen a fee.

ERNEST MARTIN HOPKINS

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. MONAGAN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MONAGAN. Mr. Speaker, on August 13, there died in Southwest Harbor, Maine, one of the great figures in American education, Ernest Martin Hopkins, president of Darthmouth College from 1916 to 1945.

President Hopkins did more than any single man to change Dartmouth from a provincial, sectarian institution to a college of national significance. Under his leadership, there took place at Hanover the physical development and intellectual broadening that were essential prerequisites to the creation of a great college.

President Hopkins' achievement in becoming one of the foremost educators in the United States was unique because he had only an average background of scholarship. His highest degree was that of Master of Arts and the major portion of his activity prior to assuming the presidency of the college was in the field of college and business administration. Nevertheless, he took hold with a firm hand and his contribution to free inquiry and unrestricted scholarship was noteworthy.

An intellectual, who was passionately fond of football; an administrator who loved the wild spaces of northern New Hampshire, Mr. Hopkins enthralled alumni audiences for years by refusing to talk down to them and by discussing abstruse intellectual problems in sentences of fantastic complexity.

His emphasis on the importance of individual self-reliance; his plea for the formation of an elite of the intellectual; his advice on the importance of alumni sharing in the life of a moderate-sized as well as a metropolitan city, and his conviction of the importance of the privately endowed liberal college have as great an importance today as when he originally enunciated them.

Perhaps the most endearing trait of President Hopkins was the interest with which he followed the careers of the men who went forth from Dartmouth to take their places in the life of the country, and the warmth with which he greeted them whenever he met them.

Dartmouth has lost a noble son and, this country one of its outstanding citizens, a solid man in the truest American tradition.

REPORT OF ACTION MEETING OF CIAP—INTER-AMERICAN COMMITTEE ON THE ALLIANCE FOR PROGRESS

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Florida [Mr. FASCELL] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, on August 13, the Subcommittee on Inter-American Affairs of the House Foreign Affairs Committee, had the pleasure of meeting with the distinguished Dr. Sanz de Santamaria, the Chairman of the Inter-American Committee on the Alliance for Progress (CIAP) and Mr. Walt W. Rostow, the U.S. Representative on that Committee.

The CIAP is engaged in assessing the extent to which the member countries of the Alliance are mobilizing in their own behalf and in assisting these countries to assess and obtain the external financial assistance necessary to their development.

The two gentlemen reviewed the progress of CIAP to date and reported on the recent first substantive meeting of CIAP at Mexico City last month. I was much impressed by the progress which has been made by CIAP in the short time it has been in existence.

Although, as Mr. Rostow stated to us that the ultimate worth of CIAP must await final assessment, the direction being taken under the leadership of Dr. Sanz and the other most distinguished members is the proper one.

Most heartening were the comments by Dr. Sanz and Mr. Rostow that there is growing realization that the Alliance for Progress is a multilateral effort and that the Latin American members are increasingly becoming aware that their own social and economic development is principally their own responsibility, and that the external assistance from the United States and elsewhere must be marginal compared to their own efforts.

On August 7, Mr. Rostow spoke at West Point and described the action program which arose from the first meeting of the CIAP in Mexico City. This speech is an excellent statement of the purposes and progress of CIAP, and I ask unanimous consent to insert it in the RECORD, together with a summary of the action program which was adopted at the first meeting in Mexico City.

ADDRESS BY THE HONORABLE W. W. ROSTOW, COUNSELOR AND CHAIRMAN OF THE POLICY PLANNING COUNCIL, U.S. MEMBER OF THE INTER-AMERICAN COMMITTEE ON THE ALLIANCE FOR PROGRESS, DEPARTMENT OF STATE, AT THE 1964 CONFERENCE OF AMERICAN ARMIES, HELD AT THE U.S. MILITARY ACADEMY, WEST POINT, N.Y., FRIDAY, AUGUST 7, 1964

I—THE ALLIANCE FOR PROGRESS: AUGUST 1964

I have the privilege of serving my Government in two capacities: as chairman of the Policy Planning Council in the Department of State and as U.S. member of the Inter-American Committee on the Alliance for Progress—called CIAP, after its title in Spanish.

As planners in the field of foreign policy, we in the Council must concern ourselves with problems in every corner of the world, many of them with an important military element. On CIAP we are wholly concerned with the great creative challenge of bringing to life the solemn collective commitment of the governments of the hemisphere made at the Punta del Este conference of August 1961: a commitment to bring to the peoples of Latin America in this decade sustained economic development under conditions of increasing social justice and political democracy.

There is one major theme of U.S. foreign policy which binds together much of our work around the world and our commitment to the Alliance for Progress; and it is a theme which bears directly on the military profession which you here represent with such distinction: it is our aim to help nations and peoples remain independent and to help them build the long run economic, social, and political foundations for that independence. From the enunciation of the Truman doctrine and the launching of the Marshall plan in 1947 down to the present we have honored the requests of governments which have sought our military and economic assistance to these ends. And from Berlin to southeast Asia, from the Caribbean to the Middle East, we remain engaged in this historic mission, on every continent.

We understand that the military in other countries of the free world are the trustees of national independence, just as we know that those who have gone forth from this military academy at West Point have been for more than 160 years, along with their colleagues in other services, the trustees of the independence and security of the United States.

It is also clear that in the developing nations of the contemporary world the military are coming increasingly to accept the fact that independence requires more than military defense. In the world of modern science and technology—of communications which make of this whole planet a relatively small interconnected community—independence requires that each nation build its own version of a modern society, bringing to its people the fruits of modern science and technology in ways which conform to its own history and traditions, its own culture and aspirations.

This link between national independence and the modernization of societies is no stranger to the American military tradition—indeed, to this very institution; for West Point was our first school of engineering in the United States. The men trained here in the first half of the 19th century not only protected and extended our continental frontiers, but they also helped to lay our arteries of transportation and helped to build and even operate them. President Lincoln recalled General McClellan in 1861, from the presidency of the Illinois Central Railroad, to take command of the Union armies.

We were, perhaps, the first developing nation to have what would now be called a civic action program run by the military, owing something however to the 18th century tradition of the French; and that role of construction continues in our services to the present day. In fiscal year 1963 the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, for example, carried out some $1.1 billion in public works on behalf of the Nation. I know that many of the services you represent are contributing—in construction as well as in defense—to the building of that modern independent Latin America which is rapidly emerging on the world scene. The armed forces in at least sixteen Latin American countries are engaged in civic action programs—programs of road building, public health and education, among others, which not merely advance their nations' development but also tend to bind up in common effort the military and civil elements in their separate societies.

It is, therefore, wholly appropriate that I talk to you today—in this place—about the Alliance for Progress—where it now stands, its problems and its prospects.

II

I speak to you at a particular moment in the history of the Alliance for Progress. We have passed, I believe, a critical turning point in its affairs.

At Sao Paulo last November 15 the governments of the hemisphere decided to create in CIAP a kind of steering committee or board of directors for the Alliance for Progress. The Chairman of CIAP is Dr. Carlos Sanz de Santamaria, a distinguished Colombian who, I predict, will emerge in this hemisphere as Mr. Alliance for Progress. Under his chairmanship there are seven members of CIAP. Six are Latin Americans. Each is chosen by a group of Latin American countries. Their job—like mine—is to think in terms of the enterprise as a whole and to set policy for the Alliance for Progress, as defined by the letter and spirit of the Charter of Punta del Este. We are advised by three distinguished Latin American leaders: the Secretary General of the OAS, Dr. Mora; Dr. Felipe Herrera, President of the Inter-American Bank; and Dr. Jose Antonio Mayobre, Executive Secretary of the United Nations Economic Commission for Latin America. In addition there are the nine wise men—mainly Latin American economists of the greatest distinction, who advise the Latin American governments on planning and development policy and participate fully in the deliberations of CIAP.

Behind the creation of CIAP lay these fundamental perceptions shared by our governments.

First, the Alliance for Progress cannot and should not be viewed as a bilateral aid program between individual Latin American countries and the United States. It is, as I said earlier, a common commitment by the governments to their peoples that this is the decade in which we shall all work together to bring about in this hemisphere sustained economic growth under conditions of increasing social justice and political democracy. The Alliance for Progress is, in its essence, therefore, a collective and not a bilateral program.

Second, the primary responsibility for conducting the Alliance must lie with the nations and peoples of Latin America themselves. No outside power or international institution can bring about the transformations required to yield sustained economic growth, along the social and political lines desired by a nation. Only the human beings within a nation, working together toward a common goal, building and improving their own institutions, can do the job. Moreover, more than 80 percent of the material resources now being invested in Latin America are the resources of the Latin American nations themselves. President Johnson has made it quite clear that the commitment of the United States to the Alliance for Progress has never been stronger than it is today. And I am confident that this is also true of the international institutions—notably the World Bank led by Mr. George Woods and the Inter-American Bank led by Dr. Felipe Herrera who contributed so much to the CIAP meetings in Mexico City last month. But all of us working to generate and contribute resources from outside Latin America can only be junior partners in the enterprise. The heart of the task lies in the nations of Latin America themselves.

Third, the Alliance for Progress is a multilateral effort in a different sense. There is a strong impulse in Latin America to break out of the traditional national approaches to development, which have marked the last generation, and to work toward increased economic unity in Latin America. That impulse takes many forms, among them efforts to organize the Central American Common Market, the Latin American Free Trade Area, and to carry forward a growing list of development projects which involve more than one country and which would bind the nations of Latin America closer together. There is a desire among the Latin American nations and peoples to give increasing economic substance to the elements of common history, common tradition, and common culture to the region; and there are good technical and economic reasons which support this powerful sentiment.

Finally, those who met at Sao Paulo and created CIAP also perceived that the Alliance for Progress must be multilateral in the sense that all the agencies committed to assist Latin American development should concert their efforts on a team basis in support of the national and multinational plans, programs, and projects which are its substance.

All these insight and judgments lay behind the decision to multilateralize the Alliance for Progress and to create CIAP as an instrument for this purpose.

There was a second strand of thought present at the Sao Paulo meetings. Taking stock after some 3 years of practical experience with the Alliance for Progress, our governments had every reason to reaffirm the goals and principles of the Punta del Este Charter. But they felt it was time to identify

the specific problems that were delaying forward movement and to attack those problems on a practical basis with great energy. They judged that what was required was machinery to move the whole enterprise forward at a faster pace.

Thus, as the members of CIAP gathered in Mexico City last month at our first meeting, we were inspired and guided by these two principles: first, by the desire of our governments to reafirm the Alliance as a multilateral enterprise and to build it in a framework of true hemispheric partnership; and, second, by the need to get on with the job at an accelerated pace. It was in this collective and pragmatic spirit that we worked and wrote our report.

III

I believe you will find our report a somewhat unusual international document. It does not consist of resolutions. It is a statement of a series of problems, followed by specific assignments of responsibility for dealing with them. It is strictly an action document.

The tasks of the Alliance are broken down under four major headings: the domestic effort of the Latin American nations; foreign trade; problems of external assistance to Latin America; and Latin American economic integration. Under each heading we tried to isolate quite specific problems which have to be solved if the Alliance is to reach its targets. We considered how these problems might be tackled; and we assigned action to those elements within the whole machinery of the Alliance for Progress, which are most capable of bringing about solutions.

As a result of this method I can tell you we made a lot of work for ourselves, for our governments, and for the various institutions committed to the Alliance for Progress.

Between now and the next meeting of CIAP in October of this year we shall have to address ourselves to more than 20 specific tasks, including an intensive country-by-country review of the state of Alliance for Progress plans and programs. A good many of the problems we pose will, of course, not be finally solved between now and October; but, in the wake of this CIAP meeting, I can report to you that, throughout the hemisphere, in the international institutions of the Alliance connected with it, and in the Government of the United States, there is not merely great activity but a fresh determination to grapple with these problems and to get on with the job.

Let me briefly list some of these tasks.

We agreed that we must accelerate the formulation of national development plans and programs. Nine countries of the hemisphere have already completed such plans. It is our hope that in the year ahead all the others will do so. As we indicated in our report, we do not believe that such national programing is a panacea for economic development. We need national plans because they offer a useful and essential method for establishing priorities, for achieving balance in the process of economic growth, for identifying critical bottlenecks, and for providing a clear and rational basis for the allocation of external aid.

We agreed that it was necessary to launch a concerted program in Latin America designed to break down the market barriers between the cities and the countryside. Inefficient marketing arrangements not merely make agricultural products in the cities more expansive than they should be, but they also inhibit that expansion and diversification of agriculture which Latin America urgently requires. Moreover, the sluggishness of Latin American agriculture limits the size of industrial markets and prevents more rapid industrial development.

We agreed that the governments of Latin America should urgently seek greater efficiency in government-owned corporations. Large deficits in certain of these corporations in certain countries are not merely a drain on public revenues but also a major cause of inflation.

We agreed that, quite aside from the work going forward in the United Nations and other international bodies to expand Latin American trade, CIAP should take a hand, especially, in ironing out trade problems within the hemisphere and, if possible, in helping our colleagues in LAFTA get on with their mission.

We agreed that a major effort should be made to generate more projects for external financing in Latin America; and that both Latin American resources and the resources of the governments and agencies engaged in external assistance should be mobilized for that purpose, since it is a fact that there are more resources available, particularly in the international banking institutions, than are now being fully exploited for the financing of projects.

We examined candidly what all the governments of the hemisphere, including the U.S. Government, could do to speed the flow of external assistance and streamline the methods for granting such assistance.

We launched a new effort to establish guidelines for the role of foreign private investment in Latin America that would reconcile the legitimate interests of the investor and the country concerned.

We examined a catalog of multinational projects now on the drawing boards, or further advanced, which, if completed, would tend to bind Latin America closer together; and we set up machinery to help push these along.

We made arrangements to refine and complete by October an overall review of Latin American economic requirements and the availability of external resources to meet them for the years 1956–65.

We made arrangements to try to help Costa Rica and Honduras, where, as you know, natural phenomena—the eruption of Irazu in Costa Rica and the forestry plague in Honduras—bear heavily on the economic life of these two nations.

The first CIAP action list is even longer than this. But we are under no illusion that defining problems and assigning men and institutions to work on them automatically insures success. CIAP will be judged by the governments and peoples of the hemisphere—and it should be judged—by the concrete results achieved in the months and years ahead.

What I can tell you now is simply this: working together as brothers, we approached our task, not as representatives of nations engaged in negotiation or bargaining, but as the board of directors of a great common enterprise. To carry forward that enterprise will require the highest degree of cooperation, not only among the governments of the hemisphere, but among the various agencies seeking to assist in Latin American development. Both at the meeting in Mexico City and subsequently there has been heartening evidence of the willingness of all to work together on that team basis to a large common end.

As I said on a public occasion at the end of the CIAP meeting, I believe the Alliance for Progress has grown up; and it has grown up in the only way it could—through the assumption of responsibility and leadership by our Latin American friends.

There are no miracles in economic development. There is no easy way or cheap shortcut to restructuring a society so that it may absorb and apply the fruits of modern science and technology in ways which provide for all the people greater prosperity, greater social justice under conditions of human freedom. It is because the task is so inherently complex that we have always thought of the Alliance for Progress in terms of at least a decade's purposeful common effort.

IV

In concluding let me draw back, for a moment, from these details of the program and say a word, if you would permit me, as an historian.

The nations of Latin America fall, broadly speaking, into two groups.

There is one group of Latin American nations which, in the last generation, have experienced their first major surge of industrialization. Great modern cities have been built—some of them among the most handsome in the world. Skills in government administration have been acquired. Competence has been developed not merely in textiles but in metalworking, chemicals, electronics, and other sophisticated branches of modern industry. A working force has been developed in these sectors with skills that match any in North America, Europe, or Japan. Engineers, industrial managers, and bankers have been trained. In the vocabulary of the Stages of Economic Growth, a takeoff has occurred in these Latin American countries; but the takeoff has been centered, as has always been the case in the past, around a narrow group of sectors.

In the case of modern Latin America, the leading sectors of the takeoff have been in industries producing goods in substitution for imports. These have often been the kinds of luxury products which the more well-to-do groups in Latin America earlier purchased from abroad; for example, automobiles, refrigerators, radios, etc.

These import substitution takeoffs have given to the more advanced countries of Latin America critically important new assets. But the whole process has also created certain major distortions in the structure of these nations. Although much work has been done in the countryside of Latin America, it is clear that, relative to the cities, rural life has been neglected. Agricultural production has not expanded in such a way as to take advantage of the possibilities not merely for providing food for the rapidly growing cities but for providing agricultural raw materials for industry and exports. Nor has the countryside, where most Latin Americans still live, become a vital market for manufacturers.

Thus, with limited markets, the pace of industrialization has not been sufficient to absorb the families who have come from the villages and now live in poverty and semi-unemployment around the edge of the cities.

Working behind high tariff barriers, Latin American industrialists have not yet developed the habits and disciplines of that efficiency which only the winds of competition can bring. And, as we noted at the CIAP meeting, certain government-owned corporations operate on deficits which weigh down the public budgets and either inhibit public investment or force governments into inflationary finance.

It is the existence of these distortions which explains the relatively slow rate of growth in some of the more advanced Latin American nations. In these nations the great historical task of the months and years ahead is to move to correct the structural distortions that came about in this first takeoff phase of industrialization and to open the road to a progressive spreading out from the cities of the methods, techniques, and advantages of modern industrial life. The task in these Latin American countries is to move from the takeoff into a sustained drive to industrial maturity. What this involves is a simultaneous movement toward national integration within Latin American countries and toward regional integration of the whole area. The surge of industrialization begun over a narrow front—in a few sectors, in a few cities—must now be extended to become a national and regional phenomenon.

With a sustained and purposeful effort by all elements in their populations and assisted

by all of us in the international community. I believe these more advanced countries in Latin America could, in a few years of hard and concerted work, recover from the distortions which developed during their takeoff phase and launch themselves along the path to technological maturity on a broad front.

There are other countries in Latin America which are at earlier stages of industrialization. They have not yet begun, or are just beginning, the takeoff process; for example, the countries of the Central American Common Market. In these cases our common task in the Alliance is to help devise with them a takeoff process that moves them forward into the family of industrial and modernized nations in ways which avoid, if possible, the acute and sometimes painful economic and social distortions that have marked industrialization in Latin America over the past generation.

Looked at in this way, the Alliance for Progress should emerge as an instrument capable of assisting all the nations of Latin America to move forward, whatever their present stage of development, and to do so in ways which tighten the bonds of association and sense of communal destiny throughout the hemisphere.

All of us connected with the Alliance for Progress understand well that many problems lie ahead. But I, for one, have never been more confident that this effort will succeed. It will succeed because our friends in Latin America wish it to succeed, and because they are acting with increased determination to make it succeed.

I have no doubt that this generation of Latin American leaders in every walk of life—civil and military—is determined to see emerge a Latin America which has mastered and applied the arts of modern science and technology and made their fruits available to all their peoples. They intend to do so in ways which preserve and enlarge the great Latin American cultural heritage. And they intend to bring the nations and peoples of this remarkable continent onto the world stage in a role of dignity and increased responsibility.

In that effort they will have the steady support of the Government and peoples of the United States. We are happy and privileged to be partners of our neighbors in this—the most important decade of Latin American history since the liberation.

SUMMARY OF MEXICO CITY MEETING OF CIAP JULY 10–21, 1964

The Inter-American Committee on the Alliance for Progress (CIAP) made certain important recommendations for changes in policies and methods of development financing and of plan and project preparation during its meeting held in Mexico City, July 10–21, 1964.

The changes are aimed at accelerating the flow of external and internal funds to development projects that meet self-help criteria. In this connection the Committee drew attention, among other needs, to that of reducing losses of government enterprises as a means of increasing public funds available to finance the local costs of development projects.

CIAP also took steps to speed up development projects in Costa Rica, ravaged by volcano damage, and in Honduras, stricken by a plague of its forests. In addition, it specified measures to help find financing for a number of multinational integration projects, and recommended the creation of a new multilateral Development Assistance Fund to finance the Committee's technical assistance activities.

In its final report the Committee outlined and approved a system for the continuous review and evaluation of national development efforts by special subcommittees of CIAP. On the basis of subcommittee reports, CIAP will make recommendations on external assistance to international lending institutions. Representatives of the lending agencies will serve as advisers to the subcommittee. From country by country reviews, and from data submitted by other agencies, CIAP will be able, for the first time, to draw up an over-all estimate of Latin America's financial needs for development, and a projection of external resources available. At its next meeting, scheduled for October in Washington, CIAP expects to present a global estimate of Latin American needs and of resources available under the Alliance for the fiscal years 1965–66.

The review method drawn up by CIAP is an adaptation of the system used under the Marshal plan to promote European economic recovery. Provisions for evaluation on the basis of performance of countries are key parts of both plans.

CIAP emerged from its Mexico meeting as the focal point of economic policymaking within the Alliance. It combines, under one roof, the functions of evaluating country plans and performance with those of drafting recommendations for financial assistance.

Other action programs developed by the Committee in its 9-day meeting include:

DEVELOPMENT ASSISTANCE FUND

To provide a flexible instrument to finance feasibility studies, technical assistance programs and related activities, CIAP recommended to member governments the creation of a special, multilaterally financed fund. The proposed fund will begin operations early next year if approved by member countries.

NATIONAL MARKET INTEGRATION

To close the growing gap between expanding urban economies and stagnating rural areas, CIAP outlined a program for diversification of manufacturing activity, promotion of mass consumption goods, improvement of distribution systems and overall of agricultural production and marketing.

Specific actions recommended in this field included: Dissemination of information on the national market concept through Alliance for Progress Committees in each of the member nations; incorporation of national market projects in national development plans; establishment of an OAS office on national market affairs; and consultation with national and international agencies on further action.

PRIVATE PARTICIPATION

Noting that the full potential of private capital investment is not being utilized, CIAP authorized its Chairman to undertake studies on means of creating a more favorable investment climate, including a code of behavior for private companies and governments.

INTERNATIONAL TRADE

The Committee examined problems of international trade. After hearing a report by the Executive Secretary of the United Nations Economic Commission for Latin America concerning results of the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development, CIAP created a special committee to report specific action recommendations to the next Committee meeting.

ECONOMIC INTEGRATION

The Committee recognized that it had a particular mandate to promote Latin American economic integration and instructed its Chairman to appoint a group of experts to study ways and means by which CIAP could be instrumental in accelerating such integration in cooperation with other inter-American agencies primarily responsible for action in this field. It also established a permament committee to promote multinational projects.

FOREIGN DEBTS

The Committee noted that rigid short-term debt repayment schedules threaten to disrupt some national development programs. It instructed its Chairman to offer his good offices to facilitate consultations with creditors with a view to exploring possibilities for refinancing the more pressing obligations and to work with member countries toward sounder long-term methods of financing. In this connection the Committee recommended that member nations take steps to control effectively the rate at which short-term obligations are incurred.

PUBLIC IMAGE OF THE ALLIANCE

To increase awareness of the multilateral nature of the Alliance, CIAP ordered a reorientation of the work of National Alliance for Progress Committees, and called for the establishment of a National Alliance for Progress Committee in the United States. It urged expansion of Pan American Union information activities in support of Alliance goals.

The CIAP report has been transmitted to all Alliance member governments and to international agencies participating in the program. The Inter-American Development Bank, the United Nations Economic Commission on Latin America, the OAS and the Panel of Nine Experts are represented in CIAP by permanent advisers. The U.S. Agency for International Development and the Export-Import Bank have ties through the U.S. representative on the Committee. The World Bank and the International Monetary Fund have recently entered into cooperative relations with the Committee.

IMMIGRATION

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. BOLAND] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, the House Judiciary Subcommittee on Immigration is now considering changes in our immigration, as proposed to Congress last year by our late beloved President John Fitzgerald Kennedy. The Kennedy proposal would eliminate the present discriminatory national origins quota system, now based on the 1920 census, over a 5-year period, and thereafter would place all quota numbers in one pool. President Johnson has firmly endorsed this proposal of the late President. Attorney General Robert Kennedy, in a letter to the editor of the New York Times, August 14, also advocates enactment of this legislation by Congress and urges every American to support the change in our immigration law.

Mr. Speaker, under permission granted, I include Attorney General Kennedy's letter at this point:

KENNEDY ASSAILS VISA BAN—ATTORNEY GENERAL ADVOCATES END TO NATIONAL ORIGINS SYSTEM

To the EDITOR:

In a letter to the editor published August 10 William A. Turner deplores the pending administration bill to eliminate the national origins system from our immigration laws. Mr. Turner says he believes the present system is satisfactory and that in 36 years as a Foreign Service officer of the State Depart-

ment he has never heard foreigners criticize the national origins provision of our immigration laws.

It is my firm conviction that this national origins system causes our Nation great harm both at home and abroad, and that it should be eradicated from our law.

This national origins system was conceived in a spirit of mistrust of certain racial groups, in southern and eastern Europe and elsewhere. Its original stated purpose was bald discrimination—to preserve what was believed to be the racial and ethnic composition of our population in 1924.

This system is a blot on our relations with other countries. It violates our basic national philosophy because it judges individuals not on their worth, but solely on their place of birth—or even where their ancestors happened to be born. I know from my own experiences abroad how deeply this system hurts us. I have been asked how a country which professes that all men are equal could permit a system which treated immigrants so unequally. It is a different criticism to answer.

UNFILLED NEEDS

This system fails to fulfill our own needs at home. An unskilled laborer from a northern European country can come here without delay or difficulty. But a particularly well-qualified scientist, or engineer—or chef—from one of a number of other countries experiences great difficulty and long delay. Thus there are no visas now available for a Korean radiation expert, a Japanese microbiologist, a Greek chemist, a skilled teacher of the deaf from the Philippines—and many others like them. Yet all want to come here, all are needed, and all are wanted. The time has come for us to insist that the quota system be replaced by the merit system.

This system inflicts cruel and unnecessary hardship on the families of many American citizens and resident aliens. Again and again they are deprived of the chance to bring brothers and sisters or other close relatives to this country because quotas in their native countries are oversubscribed. The national origins quota system makes it easier for a man to bring a maid to this country than to bring his mother; a system which can so distort human values must be revised.

Finally—and ironically—the national origins system does not even achieve its own purposes. It assigns an overwhelming number of quota visas to the countries of northern and western Europe—which do not use them all. For example, out of about 83,000 numbers assigned annually to the British Isles, only about 32,000 visas are used.

The 51,000 unused numbers cannot be reassigned; they are lost. Meanwhile, the quotas of many other countries are oversubscribed with the names of thousands of eligible immigrants eager to come to this country. Thus the ratio of immigration sought by the national origins system is not maintained, nor can it be.

SPECIAL LAWS

Further, the pressures which result from this system have forced Congress to enact special laws from time to time in recent years authorizing visas for people waiting in oversubscribed countries. The result is a further departure from the ratio which the national origins system was designed to continue.

This system damages America in the eyes of the world. It deprives us of able immigrants whose contributions we need. It inflicts needless personal cruelty on large numbers of American citizens and residents. And it doesn't work. Certainly, no plainer or more compelling arguments could be made for changing this system.

The administration's pending immigration bill seeks to change that system and establish a system that works in the national interest. It would increase the amount of authorized immigration by only a fraction—from 157,000 to 165,000. But it would, at the same time, gradually eliminate the present system and provide us with the flexibility necessary to deal with problems of fairness and of foreign policy.

Both major parties and four successive Presidents have urged a revision of the immigration laws. President Kennedy recommended this legislation to Congress and President Johnson has firmly endorsed it. Every American should support the change.

ROBERT KENNEDY,
Attorney General.

WASHINGTON, *August 11, 1964.*

HON. JOHN E. FOGARTY RECEIVED HONORARY DOCTOR OF LAWS DEGREE FROM THE UNIVERSITY OF NOTRE DAME

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. BOLAND] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, our esteemed and distinguished colleague from Rhode Island, Congressman JOHN E. FOGARTY, has again been honored by an outstanding American university, this time by the great Catholic institution, the University of Notre Dame of South Bend, Ind. Mr. FOGARTY received an honorary doctor of laws degree from the University of Notre Dame during the 119th commencement exercises on June 17.

The honors, awards, and citations that JOHN FOGARTY has received to date from colleges, schools, societies, and associations number more than 125, including the 1963 International Award in the field of mental retardation by the Joseph P. Kennedy, Jr. Foundation, and a decree from the President of Italy on February 1, 1964, conferring on him the title of "Commendatore al Merito della Repubblica Italiana."

Mr. Speaker, I know that all the Members of the House are proud of Congressman FOGARTY and congratulate him on his most recent honor. I take this opportunity to read the University of Notre Dame's citation conferring this great honor on JOHN FOGARTY:

University of Notre Dame Du Lac at the 119th commencement, the June exercises, the University of Notre Dame confers the degree of doctor of laws, honoris causa on an enlightened and effective legislator who, throughout his 23 years in the House of Representatives, has been sensitive to the growing national importance of health and education, and also has been successful in securing appropriate congressional action in these areas. During his past 13 years as chairman of the Appropriations Subcommittee, which provides funds for the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, he has helped us all to see that the health and education of our citizens involve the national interest and are not of private and local concern only. He has initiated or sponsored legislation which has led to rehabilitation programs for the handicapped, to instructional programs for the blind and the deaf, to expanded research in medicine, dentistry, and the field of the mentally retarded, and to a National Institute for International Health and Medical Research. He also has introduced a bill which looks to the welfare of our older citizens, the so-called "Older Americans Act of 1963," and he has sponsored legislation which would establish a National Institute of Arts and Humanities to encourage artistic and cultural activities. For his high achievements, he has been honored by foreign governments, by national organizations, and by many of our sister colleges and universities, as we are proud to honor him now. On the Honorable JOHN E. FOGARTY, U.S. Representative, Second Congressional District of Rhode Island.

Very Rev. THEODORE M. HESBURGH C.S.C.,
President.

NORTH ATLANTIC TREATY FOR COOPERATION REGARDING ATOMIC INFORMATION

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KASTENMEIER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. KASTENMEIER. Mr. Speaker, tomorrow a subcommittee of the Joint Atomic Energy Committee will conduct a public hearing on an agreement entitled "Agreement Between the Parties to the North Atlantic Treaty for Cooperation Regarding Atomic Information," submitted to Congress on June 30 of this year. Under the provisions of the Atomic Energy Act this agreement will automatically become effective 60 days after June 30, omitting those days on which one or both Houses are in adjournment for more than 3 days. Automatic approval can be averted under the act only by a concurrent resolution stating in substance that Congress does not favor the proposed agreement.

Today I am introducing such a concurrent resolution, together with Messrs. ROSENTHAL and BURTON of California. Although we have individual differences on the subject of NATO nuclear policy, we share common misgivings over the need for the proposed agreement and the purposes which it may serve.

We oppose this agreement because it foretells an increase in the desire and capability of the other NATO countries to have nuclear weapons systems. We feel this agreement should be viewed and discussed for what it is—a possible step in the direction of nuclear weapons proliferation, whether under national or multilateral control. Because of its enormous significance, it should be considered by the Joint Committee and Congress against a background of a resolution of disapproval. Without this resolution there is no alternative to tacit approval of this agreement, and little possibility that the agreement will receive any measure of the full and open debate it should have.

We have many questions about this agreement. The principal one is: "Why is it necessary?" There is already a 1955 accord with the NATO organization providing for the transfer of atomic information which the United States deems

necessary for first, the development of defense plans; second, the training of personnel in the employment of and defense against atomic weapons; and third, the evaluation of the capabilities of potential enemies in the employment of atomic weapons.

This 1955 agreement with the NATO organization is supplemented by nine bilateral agreements between the United States and the United Kingdom, Germany, France, Italy, Canada, the Netherlands, Belgium, Turkey, and Greece. These bilateral agreements were made on the authority of the 1958 amendments to the Atomic Energy Act, which provided for the first time that atomic information and nonatomic parts of weapons systems could be transferred to individual allied countries.

The proposed agreement is described as an updating of our 1955 NATO agreement to reflect the 1958 amendments. It calls for multilateral transfers of atomic information, including design information for the nonnuclear parts of atomic weapons systems—in short, a multilateral version of the nine bilateral agreements already in effect.

What purpose, we may ask, is a new agreement to serve? The bilaterals were designed to integrate the weapons systems of various NATO countries with the American-controlled nuclear stockpile which we introduced into Europe beginning in 1957. According to State Department officials these agreements have been used for this purpose with great restraint. We have transmitted only such information and parts as the individual countries required to make their NATO-related weapons systems compatible with the stockpiled warheads. The full scope of these agreements has never been explored or employed. They are not outmoded.

If there is a new and different purpose to be served by the proposed agreement, I think it should be more clearly spelled out to the Congress now. Without fuller explanation, we can only assume that a new NATO nuclear policy is in the offing, one under which the United States and other NATO countries will engage in multilateral transfers of information not now covered by the previous agreements. Until that fuller explanation is given, the potential uses of this agreement must carry as much weight with us in our evaluation of it as the actual intent of its draftsmen.

Clearly, one use of this agreement is the negotiation for and implementation of the much-rumored but inadequately discussed multilateral force agreement.

We share the doubts of many, here and abroad, about the usefulness and wisdom of an MLF. We also strongly believe that additional transfers of the weapons design information contemplated in this agreement accelerates the pace at which other countries develop a capability to produce and deploy the weapons systems which will carry nuclear warheads. Nothing convinces us that this capability does not breed its own desires for nuclear weapons, desires which may or may not be satisfied by the participation in a jointly owned and controlled weapons system. If they are not satisfied by that prospect, then our efforts to stimulate and direct the nuclear policies of our allies will have been worse than fruitless. If the MLF is initially attractive to would-be atomic powers, there is still no guarantee that it will be enduringly satisfactory to them, just as there is no assurance at all that it will not be provocative to our adversary.

Mr. Speaker, I introduce, for an appropriate reference, a concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress that this agreement should not be adopted, and under permission granted, I include the text of the resolution at this point in my remarks:

H. CON. RES. 354

Concurrent resolution expressing the disapproval of Congress of the agreement entitled "Agreement Between the Parties to the North Atlantic Treaty for Cooperation Regarding Atomic Information", submitted to Congress by the President on June 30, 1964

Whereas on June 30, 1964, the President submitted to Congress an agreement entitled "Agreement Between the Parties to the North Atlantic Treaty for Cooperation Regarding Atomic Information", concluded under authority of section 144(b) of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended by Public Law 85–479; and

Whereas section 123(d) of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended by Public Law 85–479, provides that the agreement shall go into effect without further action by Congress after a period of sixty days (as defined by the Act) from the date on which it was submitted to Congress and referred to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, unless during that period Congress passes a concurrent resolution stating in substance that it does not favor the proposed agreement; and

Whereas it has not been demonstrated to the satisfaction of Congress that this agreement, superseding a 1955 agreement with the same parties and supplemented by bilateral accords with nine NATO countries, is essential to the military mission of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization; and

Whereas it has not been demonstrated to the satisfaction of Congress that this agreement would not aid and abet the development of an independent nuclear capability by NATO member countries which do not now have such a capability; and

Whereas it has not been demonstrated to the satisfaction of Congress that this agreement would not contribute to the negotiation, conclusion, and execution of a multilateral agreement establishing a nuclear weapons system jointly owned and controlled by some or all NATO member countries; and

Whereas it is the sense and understanding of Congress that said multilateral nuclear weapons system should be undertaken by the United States only after full and open debate and with the affirmative concurrence of Congress or two-thirds of the Senate; and

Whereas it is the sense of Congress that any and all of the above considerations are paramount to the objective of bringing the 1955 NATO nuclear information agreement into conformity with the amendments to the Atomic Energy Act of 1954 made by Public Law 85–479; and

Whereas Congress is mindful of the resolution by the United Nations General Assembly in its 1959 session, calling on the atomic powers to avoid further dissemination of nuclear weapons: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That Congress does not favor the adoption of the agreement entitled "Agreement Between the Parties to the North Atlantic Treaty for Cooperation Regarding Atomic Information", submitted to Congress by the President on June 30, 1964.

Mr. Speaker, in closing let me direct the attention of the Members to the RECORD of July 23, at page 16693, where the text of the proposed agreement, the 1955 agreement it would supersede, and the various letters of transmittal are set out. The declassified transcript of the executive hearings held July 30 on this agreement is, unfortunately, unavailable to those not members of the Joint Committee.

VIOLATION OF PASSPORT REGULATIONS TO CUBA

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. MURPHY] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MURPHY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I have written to the Attorney General today asking him to prosecute to the maximum all 84 students who violated our passport regulations by traveling to Cuba. I pointed out in my correspondence that passports clearly state that they are not valid for travel in Communist China, Korea, or Vietnam, or in Albania or Cuba. The passports further state that a person who travels to or in the listed countries may be liable to prosecution under section 1185, title 8, United States Code, and section 1544, title 18, United States Code.

I note that 3 of this group of 84 are being called before the House Un-American Activities Committee to investigate the source, intentions, and instigations of this trip. It may be noted that the group was invited by the Federation of University Students in Cuba, coordinated by an American organization called the Students Committee for Travel to Cuba.

It is my sincere hope that the U.S. press, TV, and radio does not extend excess coverage to these traitors to the principles of America. It seems that lately these pink martyrs are clamoring for newspaper and TV exposure as part of their clarion call to communism.

Upon the conclusion of the trials in Brooklyn of the students who visited Cuba last year and who are now awaiting trial for "conspiring illegally to promote a Cuban trip" I will introduce legislation to bring home the lesson learned in all of our grammar schools of the "Man Without a Country."

Let us never lose sight of the fact that we are in a state of national emergency at the present time and that to permit this type of cold war treason is to deny those Americans who have fought and died for our democracy on the hot war battlefields.

LET'S WIN THE COLD WAR

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, the New York Daily News carried an excellent editorial in its Monday, August 17, 1964, edition entitled "Let's Win the Cold War." The editorial praises the new book published by the American Security Council entitled "Peace and Freedom Through Cold War Victory."

I have read this excellent 128-page book and I heartily recommend it to everyone who is interested in a change in policy which will stop the Communist advances throughout the world. It can be obtained from the American Security Council Press, 320 North Dearborn, Chicago, Ill., 60610. The editorial follows:

LET'S WIN THE COLD WAR

"Our central recommendation is that the United States adopt a national objective of victory in the cold war. Unless the United States adopts an affirmative cold war policy, it will continue to lose the cold war in the same way that a football team would lose if it were prohibited from crossing the 50-yard line."

The quotation is from a remarkable book published a few days ago by the National Strategy Committee of the American Security Council: "Peace and Freedom Through Cold War Victory"; American Security Council Press, 320 North Dearborn, Chicago, Ill., 60610; 128 pages, $1.95.

This American Security Council is a highly impressive privately financed outfit, with a distinguished list of members, officers, and cooperating universities and organizations.

The strategy committee which got out this book, after 2 years' study, includes such men at Gen. Mark W. Clark, Adm. Ben Moreell, Robert Morris, Dr. Edward Teller, Gen. Albert C. Wedemeyer, and Gen. Robert E. Wood.

These men and their colleagues realize that communism is out to enslave the entire human race, and never has dropped or watered down that determination. Hence, any idea of a free-world compromise with communism is idiotic.

The comrades don't compromise. They merely wiggle and wangle, bemuse and befuddle, in hope of so weakening the free world that it will eventually fall of its own flabby weight into their hands.

So, says the American Security Council, let's fight the cold war with the realization that you can't compromise with Reds, and let's get cracking without further delay.

Some concrete first steps are outlined most appetizingly in this book.

CRACKDOWN ON CASTRO

For one, the Security Council urges what it calls affirmative action on Castro-Khrushchev Cuba.

The United States, it says, should "declare the entire Western Hemisphere to be a peace zone, with all Communist war material, including fuel, declared to be contraband."

This would mean a real blockade of Cuba, and a sudden cutoff of the great bulk of its trade with both our friends and our enemies.

After that, the Security Council says, we should help in setting up a free Cuban government, to mount a massive guerrilla war against Castro inside Cuba, with the United States furnishing a lot of the war material.

This country is urged, too, to adopt a positive policy in South Vietnam, with the object of winning the war against the Viet Reds as soon as possible. That would call primarily for bombing the sources and supply lines for war material in North Vietnam and Laos.

President Johnson made a stab at this with the North Vietnam air strikes of August 5, but then he pulled back.

The American Security Council also wants to strengthen NATO enormously, by treating the combined European nations of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization "as a full partner rather than as a satellite."

WHY NOT VICTORY?

That would mean giving this partner possession and control of nuclear weapons for its own self-defense, and for cracking back swiftly if attacked by Soviet Russia (or anybody else).

These are only a few of the win-the-cold-war measures outlined and powerfully urged in this striking, dramatic and deadly earnest book sponsored by a crowd of Americans who are fed up to the teeth with seeing their beloved country lose round after round in the cold war—and lose unnecessarily.

It isn't as if we were a weak nation that had to knuckle under to bullies. We are the most powerful nation on earth today, and by acting our size and strength we can stay strong and almost invulnerable indefinitely.

By acting small and playing weak, we invite conquest and enslavement.

For the book discussed herein, we wish a circulation mounting rapidly into the millions—and a swift adoption in official Washington of most of the plans blueprinted by the book's backers.

Let's stop losing the cold war, and stop in a hurry.

ANNOUNCEMENT OF ADDITIONAL PROGRAM FOR TOMORROW

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that it may be in order tomorrow that the atomic energy bill under discussion a few minutes ago, S. 3075, may be brought up under a suspension of the rules.

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

There was no objection.

THE MONETARY POWERS MUST BE SUBJECT TO THE WILL OF THE PEOPLE

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, when the Founding Fathers drew up our Constitution, they wisely placed the monetary powers, along with the taxing and spending powers, squarely in the hands of Congress, where they could be directly controlled by the people. History has taught many times that the power to regulate and control money, like the power to declare war and to levy taxes, is fundamental to the public welfare. The only proper safeguard is to keep this vast power subject to the will and vigilance of a free and alert citizenry.

The Congress has failed to bear this responsibility, although it is clearly imposed upon us by the Constitution. We have farmed out this fundamental sovereign power to the Federal Reserve System, an institution which is not a truly public agency at all and has many close ties to private commercial bankers. The Federal Reserve is answerable neither to the President nor to the Congress. In fact, it has become a fourth branch of Government, in violation of basic constitutional principles.

The Federal Reserve and commercial banks have been delegated by the American people probably the greatest responsibility in the free world next to control of the hydrogen bomb. They have been given the power to create the people's money and to fix both its volume and its cost.

RECENT INVESTIGATION REVEALS NEED FOR BASIC REFORM

The Domestic Finance Subcommittee of the Banking and Currency Committee has just completed the most exhaustive study of our Federal Reserve System that has even been held. And the majority members of the subcommittee have unanimously concluded that basic reforms are needed to restore to the people of this Nation control over their monetary affairs.

Moreover, it is obvious to me and the majority of the subcommittee that the violation of constitutional principles involved here is not merely a question of empty legal right. Quite the reverse. A high price is being exacted from the people of this country, day in and day out, because Congress has been asleep at the switch and permitted the big bankers of the Nation to dominate the Federal Reserve System, and thereby to control our money supply, in secrecy, and completely apart from the regular conduct of the U.S. Government. And that high price can be measured in terms of tight money and unnecessarily high interest rates, and, in turn, higher Government spending and debt, lower private investment, slower economic growth, and higher unemployment in all population groups and especially among persons not readily employed because they lack skills. This is tribute exacted from the American public to maintain this expensive anachronism.

I say "anachronism," Mr. Speaker, because, although a big word, it is the most appropriate. It means a carry-over from times past, something out of keeping with the present. The Fed is anachronistic because there is no room in a modern democracy for private exercise of public power. In more primitive and less democratic days, and even today in less democratic countries, great power—including power over money—has been wielded by small private groups and dictators, and always with bad results. But it is unsound and actually dangerous that in the United States today we permit the volume of money and interest rates, and thereby the course of our economy, to be controlled by essentially a private institution not answerable to the people.

The Federal Reserve is above the Government and above the people. I do not know if this state of affairs is communistic. I do not know if it is fascistic but, Mr. Speaker, I do know it is not the way of a democracy in the world of today.

FEDERAL RESERVE AND COMMERCIAL BANKS HAVE MONOPOLY POWER TO CREATE MONEY

The Congress has given a monopoly of the power to create money to the Fed and the commercial banks. They, and they alone, exercise this power and it is the creation and management of money that determines, in large measure, wages prices, employment, the Government's

deficit and debt, and the prosperity and well-being of the entire Nation. Immediately, monetary policy controls interest rates. Higher interest is the constant companion of tighter money. The two go together like the sides of a coin, and with the coming of tighter money and higher interest rates, the economy slumps. We have had three recessions since the Fed declared its independence of the U.S. Government in 1951, and each one was preceded by tighter money and higher interest rates. In our economy the creation of money is tied to the creation of debt, and when people cannot borrow—or have to pay too high a price to borrow—they cut down their business operations and production shrinks. There is less spending, and so, less work. Employment falls, deficits and debts rise at all levels of government, business prosperity wants and our overall economic growth and well-being are diminished.

The only people who benefit from tighter money and higher interest rates are certain bankers. This is not strange, for while interest is everyone else's expense, it is a banker's income, and they are just like wage earners and storekeepers—they would like to make as much as possible. The only difference, and it is a tremendous one, is that bankers do not have the competition that the storekeepers and manufacturers and wage earners have that keeps down their take. Entry into the banking business is franchised and, furthermore, bankers have a monopoly on the creation of money. To top it off, being able to dominate the Federal Reserve System, they have had things all their own way, particularly for the last 12 years.

HOW CONTROL IS EXERCISED

You see, the bankers, particularly the big ones in New York who run the show, have found the pot of gold at the end of the rainbow. They found it many years ago when they finally succeeded in getting control of that secretive and powerful little organization that controls the shutoff valve on the money supply and therefore interest rates. I mean the Open Market Committee. It is this group, operating in secret every 3 weeks, that decides our economic fate. The Federal Reserve's Open Market Committee, which might more appropriately be called the Closed Market Committee, because it meets in secret, has tremendous power over every man, woman, and child in America. It can halve or double the spending power of every American with one blow. And who controls the policy of this Open Market Committee? Bankers, especially the big New York Wall Street banks, influence the decisions of the Open Market Committee, and especially its day-to-day actions right there in the New York money market where the Committee's orders are actually carried out.

Central in that controlling group is a New York banker, Mr. Alfred Hayes, president of the Federal Reserve Bank of New York. It is he, in his dual role as a permanent member of the Open Market Committee and president of the Federal Reserve Bank of New York, who acts as the kingpin. The organization that controls the money supply through its day-to-day buying and selling of Government bonds works directly under Mr. Hayes of the New York bank. The law provides that the president of a Federal Reserve bank shall be its chief executive officer and that all other executive officers and all employees of the bank shall be directly responsible to him. And this tremendous authority of President Hayes extends to the employees who actually conduct the open market operations in the New York Federal Reserve Bank for the entire System. I do not have any personal grievance against Mr. Hayes. He is an intelligent and gracious gentleman. But I don't think any one human being ought to have that kind of power in this country.

We did not always have this self-designated, independent, banker-dominated monetary authority. It developed over the course of many years, and it was not until the early 1930's, when the country was flat on its back, that the banking interests were able to put the clincher on the Fed. I have described this development in a speech delivered before this House 2 weeks ago and will not repeat it here except to remind you again that we have with us here and now a central bank dominated by the private money market bankers. Even the President of the United States has to come and ask for their cooperation, and while they claim they are ultimately responsible to Congress, in all my 36 years here, I have never seen the Congress depend upon their cooperation, particularly in the last 12 years.

Let us see, Mr. Speaker, what is the cost of maintaining both the authority of the Federal Reserve to act independently of the President and its ties to the banking community and especially the big New York bankers.

1. BAD ECONOMIC EFFECTS OF THE FED'S POLICIES

When the Open Market Committee wants to increase the volume of money, it instructs the New York Reserve bank to buy Government securities. This adds to the reserves of commercial banks and induces them to increase their lending and investing which they do by creating checkbook or deposit money. If the Open Market Committee does not allow enough money to be created, people will not have enough money to buy the goods and services business produces, and business will not have enough to invest; the economy stagnates and unemployment grows. Only if the Fed allows enough money to be created do people and businesses have enough to spend and thereby insure adequate economic growth and full employment. The Federal Reserve's monetary policy—its decisions about how much money to create or destroy—determines whether times are good or bad.

Nor can the Federal Reserve just stand still. As the economy grows and more goods are produced, it must print more and more money just to keep up. This is not necessarily inflationary. Monetary growth is needed to keep up with our growing labor force and technology.

The Fed has failed to provide a steadily growing money supply. In fact, it has often done just the opposite and strangled our venturesome and growing economy by tighter money, higher interest rate policies. In 1953 and 1957 the Fed reduced the growth of the volume of money to zero. In 1959–60 the Fed actually caused the stock of money to fall. Because of tighter money and its constant companion—higher interest rates—we had recessions in 1953–54, 1957–58, and 1960–61.

The Federal Reserve's policy of tighter money and higher interest rates not only caused our economy to suffer these three manmade recessions, but also turned unemployment into an acute national problem for the first time since the 1930's and slowed our economy's growth. We had to increase Government spending and debt to make up the "spending gap" and prevent economic catastrophe. From 1950 to 1962, the Federal Government's debt increased about 18 percent. The Eisenhower regime, which had flatly promised balanced budgets at all cost, ran large deficits in 1958 and 1959.

Mr. Speaker, these unplanned deficits were unnecessary. As I pointed out before on this floor, at least $35 billion of public debt might have been saved if we had an adequate monetary policy in the period 1952–62.

What aggravates the tragedy of all this is that because of the steady rise in interest rates caused by the Fed's policy, the burden of interest has just about doubled. The annual burden of the national debt on the taxpayer jumped from $6 billion to $11 billion, and I repeat, Mr. Speaker, unless we in this Congress are extremely vigilant, the burden will keep rising and rising until it chokes off the other programs of the Government like social welfare, public health, agriculture, and veterans' benefits.

The root of these problems is the Fed's tightwad monetary policy, and to solve them we need a money supply that grows adequately. Recent events prove this. As a result of the expansionary monetary policy the Fed followed, from the fall of 1962 to the beginning of this year, unemployment has decreased among all groups, including teenagers, persons over 60 years of age, and minority groups, and in all areas, including Appalachia. Also, private investment in plant and equipment, dormant since 1957, increased by more than 15 percent.

To keep this employment and investment upsurge going, we need continuing monetary expansion. This means we need a monetary authority which is a truly Government instrument and one whose policies are coordinated with those of all other Government agencies through the Office of the President of the United States. This is required by the Constitution as well as commonsense and sound economics. We will have adequate and stable monetary policy only if we make the Fed a genuine public monetary authority.

But we can only do this if the public becomes aware of the price they pay for the faults in the existing system. It is at the grassroots that the facts must be understood and the renovation begun.

2. FEDERAL RESERVE TIES TO BANKERS

The trouble with past and current monetary policy lies in the Federal Reserve's self-asserted independence of Government and ties to bankers. More important, as long as these defects exist we have to expect long-term monetary policy to be a tightwad which slows our future economic growth, and short-term monetary operations to be destabilizing and cause periodic recessions in future years. The Fed's miserly and erratic policies can only be explained by its links to the banking community and insulation from the people.

As pointed out in my speech 2 weeks ago, the 12 presidents of the Federal Reserve district banks are chosen by boards of directors; 6 out of 9 of these directors, in turn, are selected by private bankers. Remember, these banker-selected Federal Reserve officials serve on the Open Market Committee, the Committee which determines the volume of money and interest rates. Naturally, these men will look at the economy with the same biases and operating concepts that are held by private bankers.

Chairman Martin told our subcommittee we benefit because the Open Market Committee is loaded with people "with technical experience in banking and with their broad contacts with current credit and business developments, both indirectly and through their boards of directors." Without impugning anyone's motive, I would point out that this is a source of the basic trouble.

Consider, for example, the fact that the Federal Reserve's deepest prejudice is that inflation is a threat to our economy. Now, no one wants inflation. But it is simply not a serious threat now, nor has it been in recent years. Why, then, is the Fed, as Chairman Martin has said, "always fighting inflation"? The reason—plain and simple—is that this is a moneylender's, or banker's prejudice. Furthermore, the Fed fights inflation by pushing up interest rates and bankers benefit from higher interest rates, and this kind of medicine is very pleasant for them to take. Higher bank profits result from higher interest rates. The profits of New York banks are especially enhanced. This was recognized by the authoritative trade journal, Bank Stock Quarterly, when it observed in a recent issue:

> Tighter credit conditions and resulting higher lending rates would have the greatest effect on earnings of New York banks because their assets, by reason of character and maturity, are most sensitive to interest rate changes.

Since the inflations the Fed fought in the postaccord period were more imagined than real, the banks seem to have been the only beneficiaries of higher interest rates. And the price that our citizens paid for this is a high one: higher Government deficits and debts, low private investment, a slowdown in economic growth and higher long-term unemployment.

The Fed's prejudices are only half of the harmful policies that stem from its ties to bankers and banking. The Fed's ties to the banking community also are the source of mistaken operating methods. Bankers are experts in managing banks. This means they know all about such things as judging the soundness of commercial paper, the safety and other prospects of all variety of possible investments, the character of the borrowers to whom they make, or might make, loans, the level of excess and free reserves they desire, and so forth. These are questions about which we would expect bankers to be expert. But expertise in these and other banking matters makes it difficult, if not impossible, to understand and solve the monetary problems of the economy.

Men whose training and experience and contacts are in banking naturally will overemphasize the importance to the economy of problems peculiar to banks. Thus, it is not surprising that the Federal Reserve tries to control such things as the quality and quantity of bank credit, excess and free reserves, and the loan rate to dealers in Government securities.

It is not surprising, but it is unfortunate. It would be better for the agency which is supposed to be our country's monetary authority to aim at controlling the money supply. But as long as the Fed pays little attention to the money supply and instead concentrates on money market and banking variables, the money supply is going to behave erratically in the short run. And this mistake is going to be repeated as long as the Fed is banker and banking oriented. This is an important point borne out by our investigation.

3. THE BALANCE OF PAYMENTS

In recent years we have heard much about our balance-of-payments problems. This new situation is now the basis for the Federal Reserve's policies. The trouble with this argument is that there is no evidence that the Fed's tighter money and higher interest rate policies resulted in lower payments deficits. But there is overwhelming evidence that they have slowed our economic growth and resulted in higher unemployment. Until the Federal Reserve can demonstrate that, in fact as well as in theory, monetary stringency can cure international payments deficits, we should not allow them to justify a restrictive monetary policy on the ground that it is necessary to decrease our payments deficit.

Money must be managed to achieve domestic goals as I see it. Our international payments problem can and should be solved with more direct policies, like the tax on foreign borrowing that the Treasury is proposing. Monetary policy is the most costly and least effective way of attacking the problem. The payments problem, like the threat of inflation, has served as a convenient excuse for tighter money and higher interest rates. We must not allow ourselves to be taken in by this rationalizing in the future. Bankers may have benefited by these tighter money and higher interest rate policies, but the domestic economy and the balance of payments did not.

4. THE FED'S INABILITY TO CHANGE ITS WAYS

The evidence is overwhelming that the Federal Reserve is still, as President Hoover wrote in his memoirs, "a weak reed for a nation to lean on." Why? Why has the Fed not changed its ways? The answer is that there is no reason why it should. The System's ranking executives pay no penalty for their mistakes. In a free enterprise society, businessmen who err go out of business. In a democracy, politicians who make mistakes are defeated. What happens to Federal Reserve officials who make mistakes? The answer is "nothing."

The seven Governors of the System are appointed for 14 years and do not have to answer to anyone for their policies. Individuals, including Congressmen, professors, and others, may complain about their mistakes but cannot penalize them. In the same way, the 12 Reserve banks also are protected from penalty. They answer only to the directors of their respective banks and the seven independent and protected Governors. Thus, all 19 ranking executives of the Fed are insulated from all pressures including the pressure to change mistaken operating methods and harmful prejudices. And, as long as these men continue to be protected from public pressures we are not going to have a truly flexible and unprejudiced monetary policy.

THE SUBCOMMITTEE'S PROPOSALS FOR IMPROVEMENT OF THE FEDERAL RESERVE

A majority of the Domestic Finance Subcommittee of the Banking and Currency Committee, during the intensive 5-month inquiry into the Federal Reserve System, reached unanimous agreement on the existence of the defects I have described and on the need for reform. Accordingly the eight Democratic members of the Subcommittee on Finance have circulated a set of proposals to strengthen the Federal Reserve System. The five Republican members did not participate in the findings.

The proposals of the eight Democrats on the subcommittee are, in my opinion, exactly what we need to make the Fed into a genuine public and flexible monetary authority. If these proposals are to become the law of the land, as they must if we are to do away with manmade recessions, unnecessarily high interest rates and ever-increasing Government debt, you will have to make a public issue of them and show how they will help achieve full employment and economic growth without inflation and without a continually rising national debt.

A. To emphasize the public character of the Federal Reserve—

First. Provide for the retirement of the Federal Reserve stock.

Second. Vest all power to conduct open market operations in the Federal Reserve Board.

The Federal Reserve stock which is owned by the member banks cannot be transferred or sold. It is, therefore, only a fixed interest income nonproprietary asset. But it gives many the false impression that the member commercial banks own the Federal Reserve. Our hearings revealed that even Federal Reserve officials differ on whether the 12 Reserve banks are public or private institutions. The stock should be retired to make absolutely clear that the Reserve

banks are part of the Government, not merely "allied to Government," as one official put it.

The Open Market Committee, which meets in secrecy every 3 weeks in Washington, determines the volume of money and interest rates. The voting members of the Committee now consist of 7 men appointed by the President and confirmed by the Senate, and 5 of the 12 Reserve bank presidents. The other seven Reserve bank presidents participate in the Committee's discussions. The public officials who serve on the Open Market Committee are the members of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve. The Reserve bank presidents are chosen by the directors of these institutions, subject to approval of the Board of Governors. Since 6 of the 9 directors of the Reserve banks are bankers or men chosen by bankers, the present setup allows 12 representatives of the private banks to have their say, and 5 to vote on the Nation's monetary policy. Does anyone wonder why past monetary policy has reflected banker prejudices and methods? Does anyone think future policy will not reflect these same biases and ill-advised procedures if the Open Market Committee is left intact?

The above two proposals of the subcommittee are a necessary first step to rid the Fed of its overriding concern about inflation and money market conditions. They are, therefore, essential to assure that the money supply is managed in the public interest and that it is managed directly and does not, as now, emerge accidentally from operations to control strictly money market and banking variables.

B. To increase the effectiveness of monetary policy by assuring the recruitment of an outstanding Federal Reserve Board and an adequate response to advances in economic knowledge—

First. Remove the present requirement that the President in selecting Governors of the Federal Reserve Board "shall have due regard to a fair representation of the financial, agricultural, industrial, and commercial interests and geographical divisions of the country." Instead, require only that the Governors be men of integrity devoted to the public interest.

Second. Reduce to five the number of Governors of the Federal Reserve Board.

Third. Reduce to 5 years the terms of office of the Governors and allow for reappointment.

Fourth. Make the term of the Chairman of the Board of Governors coterminous with that of the President.

Fifth. Raise the salaries of the Governors.

These proposals will assure that the agency which is charged with the responsibility of managing our Nation's money, and so, indirectly, the level of our economic activity, reflects the incumbent President's thinking. Under the present arrangement, a President does not get to appoint a majority of the Board until his eighth year in office when having a majority is meaningless. He is, therefore, unable to count on the Board's being sympathetic to his program and willing to help achieve his aims. Consider, for example, that the President-elect in 1964, during the next 4 years will, unless a change is made, have to rely on the cooperation of all seven of the present Governors until January 1966, when the term of one expires, and on six of them until January 1968, when another present Governor's term expires. Furthermore, the President will have to learn to live with William McChesney Martin as Chairman until 1967, when he will be permitted to appoint his own Chairman. But even in this, the President-elect will be severely restricted for under the law he will have to pick his Chairman from among the then seven Governors.

We must remember that the 22d amendment, which limits the President to two terms, forecloses any possibilities of a President's ever appointing a Board responsive to his wishes and programs. The result is that the President is without freedom of choice in this vital area. He is in a straitjacket. Congress has given him great responsibilities under the law, yet he does not possess the necessary authority to carry them out.

Thus, through 1967 only one Governor can be appointed by the winner of the 1964 presidential election. It is just plain wrong to handcuff the President-elect in this way. It makes a mockery of the principle on which our democratic Republic is founded—the principle of accountability to the people through their elected representatives.

Under the subcommittee's proposals, an incoming President appoints the Chairman immediately. Within 30 months he appoints two additional Governors. Thus, a majority of the Federal Reserve Board will reflect the incumbent President's thinking between 15 months and 2½ years after he is first inaugurated. This is the way it should be in a democracy.

At the same time it is noteworthy that these recommendations provide for continuity. This is assured by the fact that it will be 4 or 5 years before a new President appoints all the Governors, and also by allowing for reappointment.

C. To insure public control over the expenditures of public moneys—

First. Provide for a public audit by the Comptroller General of all expenditures by the Federal Reserve Board and the Reserve banks.

Second. Provide for paying into the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts all capital gains and interest received by the Federal Reserve from U.S. Government securities.

Third. Authorize appropriations by the Congress of the expenses of the Federal Reserve banks and the Federal Reserve Board.

The Federal Reserve claims it is an arm of Congress. These proposals will lend substance to this claim. As it is now, the claim is just bureaucratic oratory. These proposals are required simply to tame a bureau that is running wild in setting its own expenditure policies. They will bring it into the public fold and let it take its place alongside the other agencies of Government, like the Defense Department, and the State Department.

D. To provide statutory guidelines for monetary policy and assure coordination of all of the Government's economic policies in achieving the goals of the Employment Act of 1946—

First. Require that the President set forth in his periodic Economic Reports, in conjunction with his recommendations on fiscal and debt management policy, guidelines concerning monetary policy, domestic and foreign—including the growth of the money supply, as defined by him—necessary to attain the goals of maximum employment, production, and purchasing power of the Employment Act of 1946.

Second. Express the sense of Congress that the Federal Reserve operate in the open market so as to facilitate the achievement of the President's monetary policy; and require that the Federal Reserve, if its monetary views and actions diverge from those recommended by the President, file with the President and the Congress a statement of reasons for its divergence, in form like the President's Economic Report.

Since 1946 this Nation has been committed to a policy of full employment. Under the law the President is required to develop and recommend to the Congress policies to promote maximum employment, production, and purchasing power.

The Fed has been in the position to defeat this objective any time it felt like it. The reason is that monetary policy is so basic to the well-being of our economy that it must come into play in order to assure the objectives of the law. But under existing conditions the Fed decides for itself just how far it wants to cooperate. This is a ridiculous situation. Moreover, it is a state of affairs that no great democracy can tolerate.

What this bill would do is to permit the President to carry out the duties that the law requires him to. It would be up to him and his advisers to issue to the Federal Reserve the guidelines to be followed in carrying out monetary policy. In other words, the President would be in a position to affect the course of interest rates and the money supply, both of which are vital determinants of our economic well-being.

From 1939 to 1951 President Roosevelt and President Truman exercised influence over the Federal Reserve in the people's interest. As a result, during those 12 years the interest rate on U.S. Government bonds never went above 2½ percent and these bonds never sold below par. This shows that it can be done if the Fed wants to do it. At that time the Fed was working in the people's interest. Then in late 1951 at the time of the so-called "accord," the Fed seceded from the Government and the interest rise began. It cost this country an unnecessary additional $40 billion increase in the national debt. If the Roosevelt-Truman rates had prevailed, our national debt would be $270 billion instead of $310 billion, and the interest charges would be $1.5 billion less on the $40 billion year in and year out.

Monetary policy cannot be formulated in a vacuum. It must be coordinated with fiscal and other governmental poli-

cies. Our proposals assure such coordination. Moreover, they assure that it will take place in the open forum of public policy debate and not in the secrecy of the Open Market Committee board room.

E. To allow for greater specialization in performing the monetary control function—

First. Permit the Federal Reserve Board to concentrate on monetary policy by transferring its present bank supervisory functions to the Comptroller of the Currency, the FDIC, or alternatively, to a newly created Federal banking authority.

This proposal is a necessary step for ridding the Federal Reserve of the banking and credit concepts and biases. The Fed's present involvement in bank supervision and regulatory matters causes a confusion between monetary policy and such supervisory questions as the quality of credit. In the past the confusion of these two quite separate fields of activity has hampered the effective exercise of monetary policy, in the opinion of the majority of subcommittee members, and separation, too, will benefit the exercise of both functions.

CONCLUSION

We must never forget that our democratic institutions are the source of this country's strength. They have permitted us to weather many storms and crises without the revolution and turmoil that affects other nations. Democratic institutions, responsibility, and accountability, force the Government to take cognizance of the needs of the people and to respond to advances in our ability to meet those needs. The Federal Reserve has not been subject to these democratic pressures, and so it has not responded to the needs of the people or to the great advances in economic knowledge that have marked the 50 years of its existence.

That is why the Domestic Finance Subcommittee, after careful evaluation of the evidence, has been persuaded to the urgency of these reforms.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. KYL (at the request of Mr. HALLECK), for the balance of this week, on account of death in family.

Mr. TOLLEFSON (at the request of Mr. ARENDS), for August 15 through August 22, 1964, on account of attending Interparliamentary Union Conference as a delegate.

Mr. SMITH of California (at the request of Mr. ARENDS), for August 15 through August 22, 1964, on account of attending Interparliamentary Union Conference as a delegate.

Mr. PIRNIE (at the request of Mr. ARENDS), for August 15 through August 22, 1964, on account of attending Interparliamentary Union Conference as a delegate.

Mr. MCCLORY (at the request of Mr. ARENDS), for August 15 through August 22, 1964, on account of attending Interparliamentary Union Conference as a delegate.

Mr. HOEVEN (at the request of Mr. ARENDS), for August 15 through August 22, 1964, on account of attending Interparliamentary Union Conference as a delegate.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE (at the request of Mr. ARENDS), for August 15 through August 22, 1964, on account of attending Interparliamentary Union Conference as a delegate.

Mr. ADAIR (at the request of Mr. ARENDS), for August 15 through August 22, 1964, on account of attending Interparliamentary Union Conference as a delegate.

Mr. BROMWELL (at the request of Mr. ARENDS), on account of illness.

Mr. MACGREGOR (at the request of Mr. ARENDS), on account of official business.

Mr. DADDARIO (at the request of Mr. ROSENTHAL), week of August 17, 1964, on account of official business.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. POOL and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. DONOHUE in four instances and to include extraneous matter.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. SHRIVER) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. PILLON.

Mr. WESTLAND.

Mrs. MAY.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. LONG of Louisiana) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. POWELL in two instances.

Mr. TUCK.

SENATE BILLS REFERRED

Bills of the Senate of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 108. An act making Columbus Day a legal holiday; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 284. An act for the relief of Ethel R. Loop, the widow of Carl R. Loop; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

S. 763. An act to amend the District of Columbia Public Assistance Act of 1962 so as to provide for the furnishing of medical assistance for the aged to eligible residents of the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

S. 1717. An act for the relief of Marie Jane Lewis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1752. An act for the relief of Lt. Robert C. Gibson; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 2208. An act granting the consent of Congress to a compact relating to taxation of motor fuels consumed by interstate buses and to an agreement relating to bus taxation proration and reciprocity; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 2392. An act to provide an additional place for holding court in the district of North Dakota; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 2588. An act for the relief of Luther D. Stull; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 2628. An act to protect the public health by amending the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to regulate the manufacture, compounding, processing, distribution, delivery, and possession of habit-forming barbiturate drugs, amphetamine, and other habit-forming central nervous system stimulant drugs, and other drugs that have a potential for abuse resulting in psychotoxic effects or antisocial behavior; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

S. 2649. An act to designate as the Graham Burke Pumping Plant the pumping plant being constructed in the State of Arkansas as a part of the White River backwater unit of the lower Mississippi River flood control project; to the Committee on Public Works.

S. 2654. An act to change the name of the canal known as the Bay Head-Manasquan Canal and as the Manasquan River-Barnegat Bay Canal to Point Pleasant Canal; to the Committee on Public Works.

S. 2856. An act for the relief of Teresa Marangon; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 3027. An act to incorporate the American Academy of Actuaries; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 3068. An act to amend the Federal Firearms Act, as amended, to authorize the Secretary of the Treasury to relieve manufacturers from certain provisions of the act if he determines that enforcement would impair the national security; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

Mr. BURLESON, 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. 946. An act to authorize the establishment of the Fort Bowie National Historic Site in the State of Arizona, and for other purposes;

H.R. 5543. An act to extend the provisions of the act of October 11, 1949 (63 Stat. 759, ch. 672; 32 D.C. Code 417), to authorize the commitment of persons of unsound mind found on Federal reservations in Loudoun County, Va., to St. Elizabeths Hospital in the District of Columbia;

H.R. 7662. An act to amend the Federal Employees' Compensation Act, as amended, to provide appeal rights to employees of the Canal Zone Government and the Panama Canal Company;

H.R. 9334. An act to amend the act of May 21, 1928, relating to standards of containers for fruits and vegetables, to permit the use of additional standard containers;

H.R. 9436. An act to amend the act of September 2, 1958, to establish a Commission and Advisory Committee on International Rules of Judicial Procedure, as amended;

H.R. 10199. An act making appropriations for the government of the District of Columbia and other activities chargeable in whole or in part against the revenues of said District for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1965, and for other purposes;

H.R. 10446. An act to permit the use of statistical sampling procedures in the examination of vouchers;

H.R. 10705. An act to amend the Government Corporation Control Act to change the General Accounting Office audit to a calendar year basis in the case of the Federal home loan banks and the Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation;

H.R. 11052. An act to declare that 80 acres of land acquired for the Flandreau Boarding School is held by the United States in trust for the Flandreau Santee Sioux Tribe;

H.R. 11211. An act to provide authority for the payment of certain amounts to offset

certain expenses of Federal employees assigned to duty on the California offshore islands, and for other purposes;

H.R. 11652. An act to exempt from taxation certain property of the United Supreme Council, 33d Degree, Ancient and Accepted Scottish Rite of Freemasonry, Southern Jurisdiction—Prince Hall Affiliation; and

H.J. Res. 1026. Joint resolution to amend section 316 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938 to extend the time by which a lease transferring a tobacco acreage allotment may be filed.

SENATE ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The SPEAKER announced his signature to enrolled bills of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 16. An act to provide for the establishment of the Ozark National Scenic Riverways in the State of Missouri, and for other purposes; and

S. 502. An act to preserve the jurisdiction of the Congress over construction of hydroelectric projects on the Colorado River below Glen Canyon Dam.

BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on this day present to the President, for his approval, bills of the House of the following titles:

H.R. 1174. An act for the relief of Elfriede Unterholzer Sharble;

H.R. 1988. An act to provide for the settlement of claims of certain residents of the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands;

H.R. 3198. An act to promote the economic and social development of the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands, and for other purposes;

H.R. 8080. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to prepare a roll of persons eligible to receive funds from an Indian Claims Commission judgment in favor of the Snake or Paiute Indians of the former Malheur Reservation in Oregon, to prorate and distribute such funds, and for other purposes;

H.R. 8334. An act to transfer to the Salt River Pima-Maricopa Indian Community certain lands within the Salt River Pima-Maricopa Indian Reservation;

H.R. 8834. An act to provide for the disposition of the funds arising from a judgment in favor of the Shawnee Tribe or Nation of Indians;

H.R. 10723. An act making appropriations for the legislative branch for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1965, and for other purposes; and

H.R. 11083. An act to amend the Public Health Service Act to extend the authorization for assistance in the provision of graduate or specialized public health training, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 7 o'clock and 21 minutes p.m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, August 18, 1964, 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:

2429. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a proposed supplemental appropriation in the amount of $390,000 for the Securities and Exchange Commission for the fiscal year 1965 (H. Doc. No. 349); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

2430. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, Department of the Army, dated June 19, 1964, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and illustrations, on an interim hurricane survey of and a review of reports on Delaware River and Bay, Pa., N.J., and Del., requested by resolutions of the Committees on Public Works, U.S. Senate and House of Representatives, adopted March 10, 1951, and April 25, 1951, and in partial response to Public Law 71, 84th Congress, approved June 15, 1955 (H. Doc. No. 348); to the Committee on Public Works and ordered to be printed with three illustrations.

2431. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting the Annual Report of the Federal Bureau of Narcotics, prepared by the Commissioner of Narcotics, for the calendar year ended December 31, 1963, pursuant to section I of the act of June 14, 1930; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Pursuant to the order of the House of August 13, 1964, the following report was filed on August 15, 1964:

Mr. MILLS: Committee of conference. H.R. 8000. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to impose a tax on acquisitions of certain foreign securities in order to equalize costs of longer term financing in the United States and in markets abroad, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 1816). Ordered to be printed.

Pursuant to the order of the House on August 14, 1964, the following report was filed on August 15, 1964:

Mr. ROONEY of New York: Committee of conference. H.R. 11134. A bill making appropriations for the Departments of State, Justice, and Commerce, the judiciary, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1965, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 1817). Ordered to be printed.

[*Submitted August 17, 1964*]

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. THOMPSON of New Jersey: Joint Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers. House Report No. 1818. Reports on the disposition of certain papers of sundry executive departments. Ordered to be printed.

Mr. RIVERS of Alaska: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H.R. 8526. A bill to amend the act of December 22, 1928, relating to the issuance of patents for lands held under color of title, to liberalize the requirements for the conveyance of the mineral estate, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 1819). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. ROGERS of Texas: Committee of conference. S. 793. An act to promote the conservation of the Nation's wildlife resources on the Pacific flyway in the Tule Lake, Lower Klamath, Upper Klamath and Clear Lake National Wildlife Refuges in Oregon and California and to aid in the administration of the Klamath reclamation project (Rept. No. 1820). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. ASPINALL: Committee of conference. H.R. 1794. A bill to authorize the acquisition of and the payment for a flowage easement and rights-of-way over lands within the Allegany Indian Reservation in New York, required by the United States for the Allegheny River (Kinzua Dam) project, to provide for the relocation, rehabilitation, social and economic development of the members of the Seneca Nation, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 1821). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. ASPINALL: Committee of conference. S. 1007. An act to guarantee electric consumers in the Pacific Northwest first call on electric energy generated at Federal hydroelectric plants in that region and to guarantee electric consumers in other regions reciprocal priority, and for other purposes. (Rept. No. 1822). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. MORRIS: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H.R. 6925. A bill to provide for establishment of the Canyonlands National Park in the State of Utah, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 1823). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. MILLS: Committee of conference. H.R. 1839. A bill to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 to provide for the free importation of wild animals and wild birds which are intended for exhibition in the United States. (Rept. No. 1824). Ordered to be printed.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. LEGGETT:

H.R. 12402. A bill to prohibit the construction of facilities in post office buildings designed to permit the secret surveillance of employees of the Post Office Department and prohibiting the use of such facilities in post office buildings now in use; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. HECHLER:

H.R. 12403. A bill to prohibit the construction of facilities in post office buildings designed to permit the secret surveillance of employees of the Post Office Department and prohibiting the use of such facilities in post office buildings now in use; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. DEROUNIAN:

H.R. 12404. A bill to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 to provide that button blanks, regardless of state of finish, shall be subject to the same duty as buttons; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GUBSER:

H.R. 12405. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to increase the amount of outside earnings permitted each year without deductions from benefits thereunder; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MOORHEAD:

H.R. 12406. A bill to provide for the establishment of the National Humanities Foundation to promote progress and scholarship in the humanities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. O'NEILL:

H.R. 12407. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, so as to authorize the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to furnish space and facilities, if available, to certain representatives of State veterans' agencies; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. ROGERS of Florida:

H.R. 12408. A bill to provide for the humane treatment of animals used in scientific investigation, experimentation or instruction, or for the testing or production of drugs or medicines, by recipients of grants or contracts from the United States and by agencies and instrumentalities of the U.S. Government, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. LENNON:

H.R. 12409. A bill to designate lock and dam 3 on the Cape Fear River, N.C., as the

"William O. Huske lock and dam"; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. ROSENTHAL:

H. Con. Res. 352. Concurrent resolution expressing the disapproval of Congress of the agreement entitled "Agreement Between the Parties to the North Atlantic Treaty for Cooperation Regarding Atomic Information," submitted to Congress by the President on June 30, 1964; to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

By Mr. BURTON of California:

H. Con. Res. 353. Concurrent resolution expressing the disapproval of Congress of the agreement entitled "Agreement Between the Parties to the North Atlantic Treaty for Cooperation Regarding Atomic Information," submitted to Congress by the President on June 30, 1964; to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

By Mr. KASTENMEIER:

H. Con. Res. 354. Concurrent resolution expressing the disapproval of Congress of the agreement entitled "Agreement Between the Parties to the North Atlantic Treaty for Cooperation Regarding Atomic Information," submitted to Congress by the President on June 30, 1964; to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

By Mr. RYAN of New York:

H. Con. Res. 355. Concurrent resolution expressing the disapproval of Congress of the agreement entitled "Agreement Between the Parties to the North Atlantic Treaty for Cooperation Regarding Atomic Information," submitted to Congress by the President on June 30, 1964; to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

By Mr. MILLS:

H. Res. 856. Resolution providing for printing as a House document the "Compilation of Social Security Laws"; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. QUIE:

H. Res. 857. Resolution to create a select committee to study the administration and operation of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964; to the Committee on Rules.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII,

The SPEAKER presented a memorial of the Legislature of the State of Idaho, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to give priority to Senate Joint Resolution No. 184 in order that the entire historic legislative processes of the 50 States be preserved and the right to apportion State legislatures as their individual States may determine shall be held inviolate, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. CORMAN:

H.R. 12410. A bill for the relief of Joseph Benudiz and his wife, Carmen Arregui Zuluaga Benudiz, and their children, Carlos Benudiz, Salomon Benudiz, and Messod Prosper Benudiz; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FINO:

H.R. 12411. A bill for the relief of Antonino Cattano; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 12412. A bill for the relief of Francesca Maria Arcuri; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LEGGETT:

H.R. 12413. A bill for the relief of the survivors of Lionel W. Johnson; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'NEILL:

H.R. 12414. A bill for the relief of Chikao George Hori; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PERKINS:

H.R. 12415. A bill to exempt from taxation certain property of the National Society Colonial Dames XVII Century in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

1013. By the SPEAKER: Petition of Henry Stoner, Avon Park, Fla., to legislate to create a new department in the Cabinet of the President of the United States, to be called the U.S. Department of Subsidies, Loans, and Tax Exemptions; to the Committee on Government Operations.

1014. Also, petition of Henry Stoner, Avon Park, Fla., requesting the defeat of the Tuck bill relating to reapportionment; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Second District, Washington, Questionnaire Results

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JACK WESTLAND

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 17, 1964

Mr. WESTLAND. Mr. Speaker, the people of my district, the Second Congressional District of Washington State, continue to feel that the need for an adequate national defense is the No. 1 problem facing this Nation today. They are also concerned over problems of foreign policy, and over problems involving Federal spending. By far the great majority of them feel that a balanced Federal budget is important.

These are some of the interesting results shown by the tabulation I have just completed of my annual questionnaire to the people I represent.

As I have in the past, I again this year circulated a questionnaire to each household in my district, using both phone books and my permanent mailing list to obtain as thorough a coverage as possible. Some 85,000 questionnaires were mailed out, and I am happy to say that 14.3 percent were returned to me, many with additional comments and views.

Because my questionnaire survey is of real help to me in my job as a Representative in Congress, careful attention was paid to the handling of each questionnaire. Each was sorted into one of six groups or categories by occupation to insure accurate tabulation. These groups were: Business, farm, labor, professional, white collar, and miscellaneous. This last group included unsigned questionnaires, and questionnaires returned by housewives, retired persons, students, and others who could not readily be classified elsewhere.

Each questionnaire also was acknowledged, and I was particularly anxious to express my appreciation for the time and effort so many persons took to tell me of their opinions. For this purpose, personal letters were used and I, of course, let it be known that those who participated would be advised of the results once all tabulations were completed.

Mr. Speaker, those tabulations are now complete. Because I think all Members of Congress will share my interest in them, I ask, under leave to extend my remarks, that the following detailed report be included in the RECORD:

1. Constituents were first asked to number "In order of importance to you, the six most important issues today."

National Defense was clearly the leader in all categories, with the overall tabulation showing a first place position of 28.8 percent. This figure compared with 19 percent last year, an indication to me, Mr. Speaker, that the people of the Second Congressional District are increasingly aware that communism is still a very real danger, and that the Communists have not forgotten their promise to "bury" us. I believe that this concern with national defense is realistic. It reflects a realization that solutions to a host of vexing domestic problems, no matter how desirable, will mean nothing if we lack the strength to conquer and destroy Communist military might should it ever be unleased against our shores.

Ranking second, with 15.6 percent, was concern over Federal spending. It seems obvious to me that the people of my district realize full well the price they pay through the pocketbook for irresponsible Federal monetary policies. Many persons, particularly those on limited incomes, told me of the problems they face because of inflation.

Rather than ask for more and more Federal spending, however, they indicated a desire for a return to sound fiscal policies that will restore the fast-diminishing purchasing power of the dollar. I believe this outlook, too, is a reasonable one.

Closely allied with the problem of national defense is American foreign policy. Not surprisingly, the people of my district also placed this high on their list, with an overall percentage of 15.4. This was the total reached when all questions involving foreign policy, including Cuba, Vietnam, and Panama, were considered together. The overall percentage of persons selecting foreign policy in general as their first choice was 10.5.

While the remaining choices speak for themselves, I should like to say something about the "Other" category, which gave constituents a chance to suggest some problem other than the 13 listed.

As a category, the "Other" group polled 3 percent for the overall tabulation, and ranged as high as 6.9 percent for farmers and 4.3 percent for those in the business classification. Concern over the Supreme Court decisions banning prayer and Bible reading from the public schools was mentioned most frequently. This was followed by concern over the possible enactment of so-called "antigun" legislation, which most said they opposed as being contrary to the right to