

Total Federal employment in civilian agencies for the month of December was 1,466,349, a decrease of 4,004 as compared with the November total of 1,470,353. Total civilian employment in the military agencies in December was 1,019,422, a decrease of 4,062 as compared with 1,023,484 in November.

Civilian agencies reporting larger decreases were Agriculture Department with 2,349 and Interior Department with 1,009. The largest increase was reported by Post Office Department with 673.

In the Department of Defense the larger decreases in civilian employment were reported by the Department of the Army with 3,175 and the Department of the Navy with 672.

Total employment inside the United States in December was 2,325,845, a decrease of 7,666 as compared with November. Total employment outside the United States in December was 159,926, a decrease of 406 as compared with November. Industrial employment by Federal agencies in December totaled 542,218, a decrease of 2,331.

These figures are from reports certified by the agencies as compiled by the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures.

FOREIGN NATIONALS

The total of 2,485,771 civilian employees certified to the committee by Federal agencies in their regular monthly personnel reports includes some foreign nationals employed in U.S. Government activities abroad, but in addition to these there were 133,283 foreign nationals working for U.S. agencies overseas during December who were not counted in the usual personnel reports. The number in November was 135,079. A breakdown of this employment for December follows:

Country	Total	Army	Navy	Air Force
Ciefe.....	81			81
England.....	2,566	107	91	2,368
France.....	15,166	11,847	9	3,310
Germany.....	66,839	56,154	70	10,615
Greece.....	314		38	276
Japan.....	41,890	14,325	12,412	16,153
Korea.....	5,450	5,450		
Morocco.....	557		557	
Netherlands.....	53			53
Trinidad.....	307		367	
Total.....	133,283	87,883	13,544	31,856

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

As in executive session, The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

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

Maurice M. Bernbaum, of Illinois, a Foreign Service officer of the class of career minister, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to Venezuela; and

Wymerley DeR. Coerr, of Connecticut, a Foreign Service officer of the class of career minister, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to Ecuador.

By Mr. MAGNUSON, from the Committee on Commerce:

John D. Crowley, to be a member of the permanent commissioned teaching staff of the Coast Guard Academy, as an assistant professor, with the grade of lieutenant commander;

Thomas H. Rutledge, and sundry other officers, to be permanent commissioned officers in the Coast Guard;

Otto E. Graham, Jr., and sundry other officers for promotion on the teaching staff of the Coast Guard Academy; and

Ellis P. Ward (retired), to be recalled to active duty for promotion to the grade of lieutenant commander.

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEE ON COMMERCE

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, from the Committee on Commerce, I report favorably sundry nominations in the Coast Guard. Since these names have previously appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, in order to save the expense of printing them on the Executive Calendar, I ask unanimous consent that they be ordered to lie on the Secretary's desk for the information of any Senator.

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

The nominations are as follows:

Walter R. Goldhammer, and sundry other officers, to be permanent commissioned officers in the Coast Guard; and

Douglas D. Vosler, and sundry other officers, for promotion in the Coast Guard.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS INTRODUCED

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

By Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota (for himself, Mr. MUNDT, Mr. CARLSON, and Mr. ALLOTT):

S. 939. A bill to provide for a voluntary wheat domestic parity program; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

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

By Mr. TOWER:

S. 940. A bill to increase benefits under the Federal Old-Age, Survivors, and Disability Insurance System, to provide child's insurance benefits beyond age 18 while in school, to provide widow's benefits at age 60 on a reduced basis, to provide benefits for certain individuals not otherwise eligible at age 72, to improve the actuarial status of the trust funds, to extend coverage, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

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

By Mr. LAUSCHE:

S. 941. A bill for the relief of Marija Pust; S. 942. A bill for the relief of Evpraksija A. Paunovic; and

S. 943. A bill for the relief of Frantisek Vohryzka; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MAGNUSON (for himself, Mr. BARTLETT, Mr. BREWSTER, Mr. KUCHEL, Mr. GRUENING, Mr. HART, Mr. PELL, Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey, Mrs. NEUBERGER, Mr. PASTORE, Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts, Mr. SMATHERS, and Mr. SALTONSTALL):

S. 944. A bill to provide for expanded research in the oceans and the Great Lakes, to establish a National Oceanographic Council, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce.

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

By Mr. BARTLETT (for himself and Mr. GRUENING):

S. 945. A bill creating a joint commission of the United States and the State of Alaska to make administrative determinations of navigability of inland nontidal waters in the State of Alaska for State selections; to the Committee on Commerce.

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

By Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey:

S. 946. A bill to make certain expenditures made by the city of New Brunswick, N.J., eligible as local grants-in-aid for purposes of title I of the Housing Act of 1949, as amended; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

S. 947. A bill 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; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

(See the remarks of Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey when he introduced the last above-mentioned bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey (for himself, Mr. JAVITS, Mr. YOUNG of Ohio, Mr. RANDOLPH, Mr. MONDALE, Mr. SCOTT, Mr. MCCARTHY, Mr. BURDICK, Mr. HART, Mr. KENNEDY of New York, Mr. DOUGLAS, Mr. RIBICOFF, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. NELSON, Mr. CASE, Mr. KUCHEL, Mr. GRUENING, Mr. PASTORE, and Mr. MORSE):

S. 948. A bill to amend section 2 of the Export Control Act of 1949; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

(See the remarks of Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey when he introduced the above bill which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. MAGNUSON (for himself, Mr. BYRD of West Virginia, and Mr. RIBICOFF) (by request):

S. 949. A bill to promote economic growth by supporting State and regional centers to place the findings of science usefully in the hands of American enterprise; to the Committee on Commerce.

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

By Mr. HART (for himself, Mr. DIRKSEN, Mr. DODD, and Mr. HRUSKA):

S. 950. A bill to make the antitrust laws and the Federal Trade Commission Act applicable to the organized professional team sports of baseball, football, basketball, and hockey and to limit the applicability of such laws so as to exempt certain aspects of the organized professional team sports of baseball, football, basketball, and hockey, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

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

By Mr. BENNETT:

S. 951. A bill to authorize and direct the Secretary of Agriculture to survey the recreation and conservation needs in the Wasatch Front area of the Cache, Wasatch, and Uinta National Forests in Utah; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

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

By Mr. COOPER:

S. 952. A bill to authorize the Secretary of State upon certain prescribed conditions to deliver to an officer or employee of the United States any decoration, order, medal, present, or other thing conferred or presented to such officer by a foreign government, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

S. 953. A bill for the relief of Dr. Yuen Zang Chang;

S. 954. A bill for the relief of Ailsa MacIntyre; and

S. 955. A bill for the relief of Hanna Ibrahim Hanna Aby Elias; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. YOUNG of Ohio (by request):

S. 956. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to provide better facilities for the enforcement of the customs and immigration laws," to extend construction authority for facilities at Guam and the Virgin Islands

The VICE PRESIDENT. The joint resolution will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the joint resolution will be printed in the RECORD.

The joint resolution (S.J. Res. 48) to provide for Bennett Place commemoration, introduced by Mr. ERVIN (for himself and Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina), was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas a profound spirit of unity among Americans underlies this Nation's greatness; and

Whereas a striking and memorable example of that spirit of unity pervaded the negotiations between General William T. Sherman and General Joseph E. Johnston when those opposing commanders in their search for peace met at the Bennett House, near the City of Durham, North Carolina, in April of 1865; and

Whereas through the diligent and unselfish labors of the Bennett Place Memorial Commission over long years, the Bennett House, together with its grounds and appurtenant buildings, has been carefully preserved and now comprises an official State Historic Site, administered by the State of North Carolina, so that the Bennett Place today stands as a permanent symbol of the Nation's unity; and

Whereas the people of North Carolina, imbued with the same sense of unity and concord that characterized the Johnston-Sherman Bennett Place conferences a century ago, and wishing to commemorate the Centennial of those conferences, will hold appropriate ceremonies at the Bennett Place, near the City of Durham, on April 24, 1965; and

Whereas the Governor of the State of North Carolina, the City of Durham, and Bennett Place Memorial Commission have invited the people of the United States to attend those ceremonies: 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 issue a proclamation, on or before April 1, 1965, reminding the American people of the spirit of national unity that is symbolized by the Bennett Place, near the City of Durham, North Carolina, and urging those who can do so to attend the commemorative ceremonies to be held by the people of North Carolina at the Bennett Place on April 24, 1965.

Sec. 2. Departments and agencies of the government of the United States, including the Civil War Centennial Commission, are hereby requested to cooperate with the Governor of the State of North Carolina, with other public officers and with governmental agencies of said State, and with the City of Durham, and the Bennett Place Memorial Commission in planning and carrying out the aforementioned commemorative ceremonies.

IMPROVEMENT OF EDUCATIONAL QUALITY AND OPPORTUNITIES IN THE NATION'S ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY SCHOOLS—AMENDMENTS (AMENDMENT NO. 23)

Mr. NELSON submitted amendments, intended to be proposed by him, to the bill (S. 370) to strengthen and improve educational quality and educational opportunities in the Nation's elementary

and secondary schools, which were referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare and ordered to be printed.

LOWER COLORADO RIVER BASIN PROJECT—EXTENSION OF TIME FOR BILL TO LIE ON THE DESK

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, earlier this week I introduced S. 1019, to authorize the construction, operation, and maintenance of the Lower Colorado River Basin project, and for other purposes, and asked that it remain at the desk to receive cosponsors until the middle of next week. I now ask unanimous consent that it may lie on the desk for further cosponsorship until February 24.

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

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF BILLS, JOINT RESOLUTION, AND RESOLUTION

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that at its next printing the name of the junior Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PELL] be added as a cosponsor to the joint resolution (S.J. Res. 29) to authorize and direct the Bureau of Commercial Fisheries to conduct a survey of the marine and freshwater commercial fishery resources of the United States, its territories, and possessions.

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

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, on behalf of the senior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. McCARTHY], I ask unanimous consent that at its next printing, his name be added as a cosponsor of the bill (S. 788) to designate the new Veterans' Administration Hospital in Washington, D.C., the Melvin J. Maas Memorial Hospital.

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

CLOSING OF VETERANS' FACILITIES—ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF BILLS

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that at the next printing of the bill (S. 969) to amend the title 38, United States Code, so as to require the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to give 6 months' advance public notice of the planned closing or relocation of any veterans' facility, and to provide for at least one veterans' service center in each State, and for other purposes, the names of Senators PROUTY, COTTON, JORDAN of Idaho; BURDICK, McGOVERN, MURPHY, SCOTT, SIMPSON, CANNON, MUNDT, MILLER, and McGEE be listed as cosponsors.

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

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that at its next printing the name of the Senator from Idaho [Mr. JORDAN] be added as a cosponsor of Senate Resolution 30, a measure to broaden the legislative authority of the Select Committee on Small Business.

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

Mr. MONTOYA. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that, at its next printing, the name of the Senator from Utah [Mr. MOSS] be added as a cosponsor of the bill (S. 1037) to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act to provide for the adjustment of inequities, and for other purposes.

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

Mr. MONTOYA. Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent that, at its next printing, the name of the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. BURDICK] be added as a cosponsor of the bill (S. 1034) to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to make and insure loans to certain public bodies and nonprofit associations for the acquisition, construction, improvement or extension of waste disposal and fuel distribution systems and other community services and to make construction grants with respect to certain water systems and waste disposal systems serving rural areas, and for other purposes.

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

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF BILLS

Under authority of the orders of the Senate, as indicated below, the following names have been added as additional cosponsors for the following bills:

Authority of January 26, 1965:

S. 753. A bill to implement the constitutional rights of military personnel by providing appellate review of certain administrative board decisions, and for other purposes: Senators BAYH, FONG, JOHNSTON, and WILLIAMS of New Jersey.

Authority of February 2, 1965:

S. 948. A bill to amend section 2 of the Export Control Act of 1949: Senators BIBLE, BURDICK, CANNON, CASE, CLARK, DOUGLAS, GRUENING, HART, KENNEDY of Massachusetts, KENNEDY of New York, KUCHEL, MAGNUSON, McCARTHY, McGOVERN, METCALF, MONDALE, MORSE, MOSS, NELSON, PASTORE, PELL, PROUTY, RANDOLPH, RUBINOFF, SCOTT, SYMINGTON, YARBROUGH, and YOUNG of Ohio.

NOTICE OF HEARINGS ON REAPPORTIONMENT OF STATE LEGISLATURES

Mr. BAYH. Mr. President, as chairman of the Senate Judiciary Subcommittee on Constitutional Amendments, I wish to announce forthcoming hearings on constitutional amendments relating to the reapportionment of State legislatures. We have scheduled these hearings to begin at 10 a.m. on March 3, 4, 5, and 9, 10, 11, 1965, in room 318, Old Senate Office Building.

Due to the great amount of interest surrounding this question, we anticipate a great number of Senators and Congressmen will wish to make their opinions known on this matter. Therefore, we plan to confine the testimony given on the first day or so of these hearings to that testimony given by Members of Congress. Following the testimony of Senators and Representatives, we plan to receive the testimony of State officials and constitutional scholars and such other persons who indicate an interest.

S. 1314. A bill to amend the Street Re-adjustment Act of the District of Columbia so as to authorize the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to close all or part of a street, road, highway, or alley in accordance with the requirements of an approved redevelopment or urban renewal plan, without regard to the notice provisions of such act, and for other purposes;

S. 1315. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to create a Board for the Condemnation of Insanitary Buildings in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes," approved May 1, 1906, as amended;

S. 1316. A bill to authorize the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to enter into joint contracts for supplies and services on behalf of the District of Columbia and for other political divisions and subdivisions in the National Capital region;

S. 1317. A bill to authorize the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to prescribe penalties for the handling and collection of dishonored checks or money orders;

S. 1318. A bill to provide for the mandatory reporting by physicians and institutions in the District of Columbia of certain physical abuse of children;

S. 1319. A bill to authorize a work release program for persons sentenced by the courts of the District of Columbia; to define the powers and duties in relation thereto, and for other purposes;

S. 1320. A bill to amend certain criminal laws applicable to the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; and

S. 1321. A bill to amend section 501(e) of title 16 of the District of Columbia Code relating to bond requirements in connection with attachment before judgment; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. BREWSTER:

S. 1322. A bill to establish the Chesapeake & Ohio Canal National Historical Park in the State of Maryland, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

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

By Mr. BARTLETT (for himself and Mr. GRUENING):

S. 1323. A bill to amend section 2634 of title 10, United States Code, so as to authorize the military departments, in certain cases, to ship automobiles to and from the State of Alaska by commercial motor carrier via the Alaska ferry system and other surface transportation; to the Committee on Armed Services.

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

By Mr. JAVITS:

S. 1324. A bill for the relief of Ante Dunator; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SYMINGTON:

S. 1325. A bill for the relief of Dr. Oton Socarraz; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FONG:

S. 1326. A bill for the relief of Baltazar Ganade; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BAYH:

S. 1327. A bill for the relief of George Sgouritsas;

S. 1328. A bill for the relief of Fotios G. Milonas;

S. 1329. A bill for the relief of Ioannis Metanias;

S. 1330. A bill for the relief of Konstantinos Roumeliotis and Panagiota Roumeliotis; and

S. 1331. A bill for the relief of Dr. Adriano A. Agana and Consuelo R. Agana; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROBERTSON (by request):

S. 1332. A bill to provide for continuation of authority for regulation of exports, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

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

By Mr. HARTKE:

S. 1333. A bill to amend the adjustment assistance provisions of the Trade Expansion Act of 1962 with respect to determinations by the Tariff Commission of injury or threatened injury to firms or groups of workers; to the Committee on Finance.

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

By Mr. YARBOROUGH:

S. 1334. A bill for the relief of Patsy J. Darby; and

S. 1335. A bill conferring jurisdiction upon the U.S. Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of Colvern D. Henry; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

RESOLUTION

TO CREATE A SELECT COMMITTEE TO STUDY GOLD PRODUCTION IN THE UNITED STATES

Mr. BARTLETT submitted a resolution (S. Res. 83) to create a Select Committee To Study Gold Production in the United States, which was referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

(See the above resolution printed in full when submitted by Mr. BARTLETT, which appears under a separate heading.)

DUTY ON ORNAMENTED FABRICS AND FABRICS WITH TUCKS

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I am today introducing a bill designed to correct a loophole in the tariff schedules of the United States relating to the duty on ornamented fabrics and fabrics with tucks.

In the last Congress I sponsored legislation to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 to close the loophole under which certain ornamented or tucked fabrics were allowed to enter the United States at a duty rate about one-half of that ordinarily applicable to such fabrics.

Action on that bill was delayed, partly because it was hoped that the new tariff schedules for the United States, which went into effect in the summer of 1963, would take care of the situation. Unfortunately, the new schedules did not close the loophole, and attempts to avoid the higher duty rate have continued.

Congress last year considered general legislation to correct certain errors in the new TSUS. This bill, which included a provision similar to the legislation which I had filed, relating to ornamented and tucked fabrics, was approved by both the House and Senate. However, because of problems which arose over certain other sections of the bill, it died in conference, and final action was not taken.

The bill I am introducing today will amend items 353.50 and 357.60 of the tariff schedules of the United States to provide that the duty on "ornamented" or "tucked" fabrics will be no less than that applicable to fabrics without ornamentation or tucks.

I am hopeful that the Congress will take action on this bill. It would be of immeasurable assistance to our belea-

guered domestic textile industry, which is already suffering adverse competition from imported textile products. By passing this bill, we could help to lessen the injurious effect of imports.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 1301) to amend the tariff schedules of the United States with respect to the duties on ornamented fabrics and fabrics with tucks, introduced by Mr. SALTONSTALL, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Finance.

UTILIZATION OF FUNDS RECEIVED FROM STATE AND LOCAL GOVERNMENTS FOR SPECIAL METEOROLOGICAL SERVICES

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, by request, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to authorize the Secretary of Commerce to utilize funds received from State and local governments for special meteorological services. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a letter from the Secretary of Commerce, requesting the proposed legislation, together with an enclosed statement of purpose.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the letter and statement of purpose will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 1302) to authorize the Secretary of Commerce to utilize funds received from State and local governments for special meteorological services introduced by Mr. MAGNUSON, by request, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

The letter and statement of purpose, presented by Mr. MAGNUSON, are as follows:

THE SECRETARY OF COMMERCE,
Washington, D.C., February 10, 1965.
Hon. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY,
President of the Senate,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: There are enclosed four copies of a draft bill "To authorize the Secretary of Commerce to utilize funds received from State and local governments for special meteorological services" and four copies of a statement of purpose and need in support thereof.

We are advised by the Bureau of the Budget that, from the standpoint of the administration's program, there would be no objection to the submission of this proposed legislation to the Congress.

Sincerely yours,
JOHN T. CONNOR,
Secretary of Commerce.

STATEMENT OF PURPOSE AND NEED FOR LEGISLATION TO AUTHORIZE THE SECRETARY OF COMMERCE TO UTILIZE FUNDS RECEIVED FROM STATE AND LOCAL GOVERNMENTS FOR SPECIAL METEOROLOGICAL SERVICES

The Weather Bureau has often been requested by various State and local governments to provide or undertake special meteorological investigations, tests, and services which the personnel and facilities of the Weather Bureau are specially capable of carrying out. It has become increasingly difficult for the Weather Bureau to perform such functions, which ordinarily cannot be effectively undertaken by any other organizations, because of the lack of adequate statutory authorization to utilize funds for these

I also ask unanimous consent to file individual views to be printed with the report.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

APPOINTMENT BY THE VICE PRESIDENT

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. TYDINGS in the chair). Pursuant to Public Law 301 of the 78th Congress, the Chair, on behalf of the Vice President, announces the appointment of the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. WILLIAMS] to the Board of Visitors to the Merchant Marine Academy.

REPORT ON MANAGEMENT OF AUTOMATIC DATA PROCESSING IN THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT (S. DOC. NO. 15)

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, the President of the United States has submitted to the Congress a report to the President by the Director of the Bureau of the Budget on the management of automatic data processing in the Federal Government, which has been referred to the Committee on Government Operations for consideration. The report contains a number of recommendations for legislative action, along the general lines of a bill, H.R. 5171, which was approved by the House of Representatives and referred to the committee during the 88th Congress.

In view of the interest that has been manifested in this report and in the proposed legislation, I ask unanimous consent that the report be printed as a Senate document for use by the Committee on Government Operations, and other committees of the Congress which have an interest in ADP procurement, operations and management.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

AUTHORIZATION FOR SECRETARY OF THE SENATE TO RECEIVE MESSAGES, ETC., DURING ADJOURNMENT FOLLOWING TODAY'S SESSION

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that during the adjournment of the Senate following today's session until March 8 the Secretary of the Senate be authorized to receive messages from the President of the United States and the House of Representatives; that committees be authorized to file reports; and that the Vice President or President pro tempore be authorized to sign duly enrolled bills and joint resolutions.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF BILLS

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL], I ask unanimous consent that, at its next printing, the name of the Senator from Arizona [Mr. FANNIN] be added as a cosponsor of the bill (S. 22)

to promote a more adequate national program of water research.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MOSS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the distinguished Senator from Nevada [Mr. CANNON] and the Senator from Idaho [Mr. JORDAN] be added as cosponsors of S. 602, a bill to amend the Small Reclamation Projects Act of 1956, and that the names be listed in the next printing of the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that at the next printing of S. 948 and S. 1165 the name of the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS] be added as cosponsor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senator from Delaware [Mr. BOGGS], I ask unanimous consent that at the next printing of the bill (S. 969) to amend title 38, United States Code, so as to require the Administrator of the Veterans' Affairs to give 6 months' advance public notice of the planned closing or relocation of any veterans facility, and to provide for at least one veterans service center in each State, and for other purposes, the names of Senators WILLIAMS of Delaware, BARTLETT, COOPER, and MUSKIE be added as cosponsors.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the name of the junior Senator from New Jersey [Mr. WILLIAMS] may be added as a cosponsor to my bill, S. 1091, to provide a program of marine exploration and development of the resources of the Continental Shelf, at the next printing of the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, at its next printing, I ask unanimous consent that the name of the junior Senator from Colorado [Mr. DOMINICK] be added as a cosponsor of the bill (S. 1098) to amend section 1(14) (a) of the Interstate Commerce Act to insure the adequacy of the national railroad freight car supply, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that at the next printing of the bill (S. 1160) to amend section 3 of the Administrative Procedure Act, chapter 324, of the act of June 11, 1946 (60 Stat. 238), to clarify and protect the right of the public to information, and for other purposes, the name of the junior Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS] be added as a cosponsor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MOSS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the senior Senator from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT], and the junior Senator from Texas [Mr. TOWER] be added as cosponsors of the bill (S. 1276) to amend the Federal Crop Insurance Act, as amended, so as to permit the Federal Crop Insurance Corporation

to continue to make insurance available to farmers in high-risk counties or areas, and for other purposes, and that their names be listed in the next printing of the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, at its next printing, I ask unanimous consent that the name of the Senator from Texas [Mr. YARBOROUGH] be added as a cosponsor of the bill (S. 1140) to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act to authorize retirement without reduction in annuity of employees with 20 years of service involuntarily separated from the service by reason of the abolition or relocation of their employment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent that, at its next printing, the name of the Senator from Idaho [Mr. JORDAN] be added as a cosponsor of the bill (S. 1184) to provide for judicial review of certain actions of the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare concerning public assistance programs established pursuant to title I, IV, X, XIV, or XVI of the Social Security Act.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, on February 11 I introduced a bill, S. 1124, to extend child benefits under social security from the age of 18 to the age of 22, provided the child during that period continued to be a student. I was later joined by Senator PELL as a cosponsor by unanimous consent. I now request unanimous consent that the name of the distinguished Senator from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH] may also be added, so that his name may appear as a cosponsor at the next printing of the bill. I am happy to have this further support from my esteemed colleague.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

TEMPORARY RELEASE OF CERTAIN COPPER FROM THE NATIONAL STOCKPILE TO DOMESTIC PRODUCERS—ADDITIONAL COSPONSOR OF BILL

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that at its next printing my name be added as a cosponsor of S. 296, authorizing the temporary release of 100,000 short tons of copper from the national stockpile to domestic producers.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, this is a measure of great importance to the economy of my State. Many of our industries have felt the adverse effects of the short supply of copper in the commercial market and I have received many appeals for assistance in securing release of the metal from the national stockpile.

S. 296, which was introduced by the distinguished Senator from Montana would release a significant supply of copper on a temporary basis. I note with interest that the Federal stockpile inventory for December 1964, released by

By Mr. CLEVINGER:

H.R. 7096. A bill to provide grants for public works and development facilities, other financial assistance, and the planning and coordination needed to alleviate conditions of substantial and persistent unemployment and underemployment in economically distressed areas and regions; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. COOLEY:

H.R. 7097. A bill to maintain farm income, to stabilize prices and assure adequate supplies of agricultural commodities, to reduce surpluses, lower Government costs and promote foreign trade, to afford greater economic opportunity in rural areas, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. DENT:

H.R. 7098. A bill to amend section 302(c) of the Labor-Management Relations Act, 1947, to permit the participation of retired employees of employers, employees of certain labor organizations and employees of certain trust funds as well as certain self-employed persons to participate as beneficiaries of welfare and pension trust funds; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. FLOOD:

H.R. 7099. A bill to provide grants for public works and development facilities, other financial assistance, and the planning and coordination needed to alleviate conditions of substantial and persistent unemployment and underemployment in economically distressed areas and regions; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. FOGARTY:

H.R. 7100. A bill to provide for the establishment and operation of a National Technical Institute for the Deaf; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. JOELSON:

H.R. 7101. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide an additional income tax exemption for a taxpayer supporting a dependent who is mentally retarded; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. McDOWELL:

H.R. 7102. A bill to amend the Interstate Commerce Act to impose certain additional conditions on the discontinuance of passenger train operations; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. MORRIS:

H.R. 7103. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to contract with the Middle Rio Grande Conservancy District of New Mexico for the payment of operation and maintenance charges on certain Pueblo Indian lands; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. MOSS:

H.R. 7104. A bill to require the payment of interest for delinquent mineral leasing obligations; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. PATMAN:

H.R. 7105. A bill to provide for continuation of authority for regulation of exports, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. RONCALIO:

H.R. 7106. A bill to repeal section 14(b) of the National Labor Relations Act, as amended, and section 705(b) of the Labor-Management Reporting and Disclosure Act of 1959 and to amend the first provision of section 8(a)(3) of the National Labor Relations Act, as amended; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. ROONEY of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 7107. A bill to amend title 37, United States Code, to increase the rates of basic pay for members of the uniformed services; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. RYAN:

H.R. 7108. A bill to establish a Department of Housing and Urban Development, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. SLACK:

H.R. 7109. A bill to provide grants for public works and development facilities, other financial assistance, and the planning and coordination needed to alleviate conditions of substantial and persistent unemployment and underemployment in economically distressed areas and regions; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. TUNNEY:

H.R. 7110. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide that a survivor beneficiary shall not lose his or her entitlement to benefits by reason of a marriage or remarriage which occurs after he or she attains age 62; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KING of Utah:

H.R. 7111. A bill to amend the Federal Coal Mine Safety Act so as to provide further for the prevention of accidents in coal mines; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. McCULLOCH:

H.R. 7112. A bill to guarantee the right to vote under the 15th amendment to the Constitution of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. OLSEN of Montana:

H.R. 7113. A bill to provide for the utilization of professional services of qualified consulting engineers in private industry in connection with public works and other projects undertaken by the Federal Government; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 7114. A bill to repeal the provisions of law relating to the fixing by the Postmaster General, with the consent of the Interstate Commerce Commission, of rates of postage on fourth-class mail, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. SENNER:

H.R. 7115. A bill to amend the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended, to promote the welfare of the Indian tribes by making available to them surplus personal property; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. BROWN of California:

H.R. 7116. A bill to amend title 38 of the United States Code to permit the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to correct certain physical defects of veterans during the course of their hospitalization in a Veterans' Administration facility; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 7117. A bill to provide a realistic cost-of-living increase in rates of subsistence allowances paid to disabled veterans pursuing vocational rehabilitation training and to the sons and daughters of deceased or permanently and totally disabled veterans pursuing a program of education under the war orphans' educational assistance program; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 7118. A bill to amend title 38 of the United States Code to make the children of certain veterans having a service-connected disability rated at not less than 50 percent eligible for benefits under the war orphans' educational assistance program; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 7119. A bill to amend title 38 of the United States Code to provide increases in the rates of disability compensation to reflect the increase in the cost of living from the year 1933; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 7120. A bill to amend chapter 31 of title 38, United States Code, to extend to all totally disabled veterans the same liberalization of time limits for pursuing vocational rehabilitation training as was authorized for blinded veterans by Public Law 87-591, and to clarify the language of the law relating to the limiting of periods for pursuing such training; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. BURKE:

H.R. 7121. A bill to provide grants for public works and development facilities,

other financial assistance, and the planning and coordination needed to alleviate conditions of substantial and persistent unemployment and underemployment in economically distressed areas and regions; to the Committee on Public Works.

H.R. 7122. A bill to amend section 5051(a) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to aid small business and discourage continued concentration in the brewing industry; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CARTER:

H.R. 7123. A bill to amend section 1498 of title 28, United States Code, to authorize the use or manufacture, in certain cases, by or for the United States of any invention described in and covered by a patent of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN:

H.R. 7124. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to exchange land with the county of Del Norte, Calif., and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. GERALD R. FORD:

H.R. 7125. A bill to guarantee the right to vote under the 15th amendment to the Constitution of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HOLIFIELD:

H.R. 7126. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide that a survivor beneficiary shall not lose his or her entitlement to benefits by reason of a marriage or remarriage which occurs after he or she attains age 62; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. McVICKER:

H.R. 7127. A bill to repeal the excise tax on amounts paid for communication services or facilities; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MATSUNAGA:

H.R. 7128. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide that a survivor beneficiary shall not lose his or her entitlement to benefits by reason of a marriage or remarriage which occurs after he or she attains age 62; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PHILBIN:

H.R. 7129. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide that a survivor beneficiary shall not lose his or her entitlement to benefits by reason of a marriage or remarriage which occurs after he or she attains age 62; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BOB WILSON:

H.R. 7130. A bill to amend the Assignment of Claims Act of 1940, as amended, with respect to priority of assignments; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 7131. A bill to amend section 217 of the Social Security Act to provide that certain military or naval service not now creditable toward benefits under title II of such act may be counted toward such benefits if such service is not used in determining entitlement to, or the amount of, military retired pay; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. McDADE:

H.R. 7132. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to increase the amount of outside earnings permitted each year without any deductions from benefits thereunder; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MOORHEAD (by request):

H.R. 7133. A bill to amend the Federal Reserve Act, the Federal Deposit Insurance Act, and section 5155 of the Revised Statutes, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. SENNER:

H.R. 7134. A bill to authorize Federal assistance for the construction by public school districts of classroom facilities needed for the education of Indian children who reside outside the boundaries of the district;

By Mr. HARTKE:

S. 1895. A bill to amend the Consolidated Farmers Home Administration Act of 1961 so as to increase the purposes for which emergency loans may be made under subtitle III of such act; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

S. 1896. A bill to amend section 3 of the Export Control Act of 1949; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

(See the remarks of Mr. HARTKE when he introduced the above bills, which appear under separate headings.)

By Mr. DOUGLAS:

S. 1897. A bill for the relief of Michael Blagach (also known as Marin Blagaic); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FONG:

S. 1898. A bill for the relief of certain aliens; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LONG of Louisiana:

S. 1899. A bill to prescribe a national policy with respect to the acquisition, disposition, and use of proprietary rights in inventions made, and in scientific and technical information obtained, through the expenditure of public funds, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

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

By Mr. MAGNUSON (by request):

S. 1900. A bill to authorize the President to appoint Gen. William F. McKee (USAF, retired) to the office of Administrator of the Federal Aviation Agency; and

S. 1901. A bill to authorize appropriations for procurement of small patrol cutters for the Coast Guard; to the Committee on Commerce.

(See the remarks of Mr. MAGNUSON when he introduced the above bills, which appear under separate headings.)

By Mr. RANDOLPH:

S.J. Res. 76. Joint resolution to provide for the formulation, adoption, administration, and periodic updating of a long-range land use plan for the U.S. Capitol Grounds and contiguous related and influencing areas; to the Committee on Public Works.

AMENDMENT OF SMALL BUSINESS ACT AND SMALL BUSINESS INVESTMENT ACT OF 1958

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, the administration's bill to amend the Small Business Act and the Small Business Investment Act of 1958.

Section 1 of this bill would amend section 4(c) of the Small Business Act to increase the total of SBA's revolving fund to \$1,836 million, an increase of \$170 million. This increase includes an increase of \$50 million for use of SBA's regular business loan program, the disaster loan program, the loan program authorized by title IV of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964, and the program empowering SBA to enter into prime contracts. This latter authority has never been used. SBA estimates that this increase in authorization will be sufficient authorization to enable it to continue these programs through June 30, 1968—3 years from the end of the current fiscal year.

The bill would delete from the Small Business Act the Saltonstall amendment, which requires reports from SBA to the Appropriations Committees and Banking and Currency Committees of the House and Senate whenever the aggregate amount outstanding for business loans

and disaster loans exceeds specified limitations.

The bill would also increase the amount of the authorization for SBA's revolving fund which may be outstanding at any one time for the programs under the Small Business Investment Act of 1958 by \$120 million. It is estimated that this will enable SBA to continue these programs through June 1966—1 year from the end of the current fiscal year.

Section 2 of the bill would amend section 5(c) of the Small Business Act to eliminate the existing \$50 per day limitation which SBA is authorized to pay for the temporary services of experts and consultants and to provide, in substance, that compensation for such services is to be governed by the compensation schedule established by the Classification Act of 1949, as amended.

This section would permit SBA to conform to travel and subsistence expenses allowable to such personnel to the general Government standards established under the Administrative Expenses Act of 1946.

Section 3 of the bill would amend section 7 of the Small Business Act to increase the maturity of disaster loans made for the purpose of replacing, reconstructing, or repairing dwellings under 7(b)(1) of the Small Business Act from 20 to 30 years. However, section 7(c) of the Small Business Act, which permits an additional 10-year renewal of the loan for orderly liquidation, would not apply to any disaster loan under subsection 7(b) of the act with a maturity of over 20 years.

Section 4(a) would amend section 201 of the Small Business Investment Act of 1958. The 1958 act provides that all authority conferred on SBA under the act shall be administered by the Small Business Investment Division. This amendment would exempt from this requirement title V of the 1958 Act, which authorizes SBA to make loans to State and local development companies. The power to administer title V of the 1958 act would revert to the Administrator of SBA.

Section 4 (b) and (c) of the bill would repeal section 501 of the Small Business Investment Act of 1958, which authorizes SBA to make loans to State development companies. SBA would continue to be able to make loans to State development companies under section 502 of the act.

Mr. President, this bill contains increases in authorizations to SBA's revolving fund needed for the continuing operations of its lending programs. SBA is coming dangerously close to exhausting its authorization for its programs under the Small Business Investment Act of 1958.

It also contains some needed house-keeping changes in both the Small Business Act and the Small Business Investment Act of 1958.

As chairman of the Small Business Subcommittee of the Senate Banking and Currency Committee, I plan to hold hearings on this bill in the near future. There are several provisions of the bill which will require careful examination.

For example, I intend to thoroughly explore the justification behind the SBA's estimate that an additional authorization of \$120 million for their Small Business Investment Act revolving fund will be sufficient for only one additional year of operations. I also believe the suggested deletion of the Saltonstall amendment should fully be justified in view of the fact that it has never been necessary to use this provision, which, consequently, would not seem to impose an unusually onerous requirement. Finally the proposed repeal of section 501 of the Small Business Investment Act, raises serious questions of policy which the Small Business subcommittee will go into during hearings.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the Record, the text of the bill and a section-by-section analysis of the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HARRIS in the chair). The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill and section-by-section analysis will be printed in the Record.

The bill (S. 1882) to amend the Small Business Act and the Small Business Investment Act of 1958, introduced by Mr. PROXMIRE, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency, and ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

S. 1882

A bill to amend the Small Business Act and the Small Business Investment Act of 1958

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 4(c) of the Small Business Act is amended—

(1) by striking out "\$1,666,000,000" and inserting in lieu thereof "\$1,836,000,000";

(2) by striking out the fourth sentence and inserting in lieu thereof "Not to exceed an aggregate of \$1,375,000,000 shall be outstanding at any one time for the purposes enumerated in the following sections of this Act: 7(a) (relating to regular business loans), 7(b) (relating to disaster loans), and 8(a) (relating to prime contract authority)."; and

(3) by striking out "\$341,000,000" and inserting in lieu thereof "\$461,000,000".

Sec. 2. Section 5(c) of the Small Business Act is amended to read as follows:

"The Administrator is authorized to procure services in accordance with section 15 of the Administrative Expenses Act of 1946, as amended (5 U.S.C. 55(a)). While any individual providing such services is away from his home or regular place of business, he may be allowed transportation expenses and per diem in lieu of subsistence and other expenses, as provided in section 5 of the Administrative Expenses Act of 1946, as amended (5 U.S.C. 73 b-2)."

Sec. 3. Section 7 of the Small Business Act is amended—

(1) by striking out the period at the end of the second sentence of subsection (b) and by adding to such sentence the following: "except that loans made for the purpose of replacing, reconstructing, or repairing dwellings may, in cases deemed necessary or appropriate by the Administration, have a maturity of up to thirty years."

(2) by adding to subsection (c) the following sentence:

"However, the provisions of this subsection shall not be applicable to any loan made, pursuant to subsection (b), for a term of more than twenty years."

**BILL PRESENTED TO THE
PRESIDENT**

Mr. BURLERSON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that the committee did on this day present to the President, for his approval, a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 821. An act for the relief of the town of Kure Beach, N.C.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. SWEENEY. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 6 o'clock and 1 minute p.m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, June 2, 1965, 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:

1175. A letter from the Chairman, Legal Aid Agency for the District of Columbia, transmitting the fifth annual report of Legal Aid Agency for the District of Columbia for period ending May 31, 1965, pursuant to Public Law 86-631; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

1176. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report of overprocurements resulting from ineffective supply management in Korea under the military assistance program, Department of Defense; to the Committee on Government Operations.

1177. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report of observations on program designed to evaluate effectiveness of controls over highway construction, Bureau of Public Roads, Department of Commerce; to the Committee on Government Operations.

1178. A letter from the Chairman, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, transmitting reports of visa petitions approved, pursuant to provisions of section 204(c) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, as amended; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1179. A letter from the Secretary of State, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to implement the Agreement on the Importation of Educational, Scientific and Cultural Materials, opened for signature at Lake Success on November 22, 1950, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1180. A letter from the Secretary of State, transmitting the President's determination pursuant to the International Coffee Agreement Act of 1965; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

**REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON
PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLU-
TIONS**

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, pursuant to the order of the House of May 25, 1965, the following bill was reported on May 29, 1965:

Mr. PATMAN: Committee on Banking and Currency. H.R. 7105. A bill to provide for continuation of authority for regulation of exports, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 434). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

[Submitted June 1, 1965]

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. ROGERS of Texas: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. S. 1000. An act to amend the act of July 29, 1954, as amended, to permit transfer of title to movable property to agencies which assume operation and maintenance responsibility for project works serving municipal and industrial functions; with amendment (Rept. No. 435). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. DELANEY: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 404. Resolution for consideration of H.R. 8371, a bill to reduce excise taxes, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 436). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. HALEY: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H.R. 8660. A bill to amend the law relating to the final disposition of the property of the Choctaw Tribe; with amendment (Rept. No. 437). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. MILLS: Committee on Ways and Means. H.R. 8464. A bill to provide, for the period beginning on July 1, 1966, and ending on June 30, 1966, a temporary increase in the public debt limit set forth in section 21 of the Second Liberty Bond Act; without amendment (Rept. No. 438). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. RODINO: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 8400. A bill to enforce the 15th amendment to the Constitution of the United States; with amendment (Rept. No. 439). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. FEIGHAN:

H.R. 8662. A bill to establish a selective immigration system and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. OLSEN of Montana:

H.R. 8663. A bill to adjust the rates of basic compensation of certain officers and employees in the Federal Government, to establish the Federal Salary Review Commission, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. MILLS:

H.R. 8664. A bill to implement the Agreement on the Importation of Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Materials, opened for signature at Lake Success on November 22, 1950, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FARNSSTEIN:

H.R. 8665. A bill to require Federal inspection of slaughter for human food purposes of animals used for research purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. FINO:

H.R. 8666. A bill to amend title 39, United States Code, to place the key position of foreman, mails, salary level 7, in salary level 8 of the postal field service schedule, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 8667. A bill to amend title 39, United States Code, to increase the rate of extra compensation of postal field service employees for each hour of night work from 10 to 15 percent of their hourly basic compensation; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 8668. A bill to amend title 39, United States Code, to provide intervals of 1 year

between steps for purposes of automatic advancement by step increases for postal field service employees; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 8669. A bill to amend title 39, United States Code, to correct certain inequities with respect to promotions of postal field service employees; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. GRAY:

H.R. 8670. A bill to incorporate the 6th U.S. Infantry Association Auxiliary; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MACHEN:

H.R. 8671. A bill to amend Public Laws 815 and 874, 81st Congress, in order to make permanent the authorization for certain payments under the provisions of such laws, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. MIZE:

H.R. 8672. A bill to amend the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 relating to bills and resolutions introduced in the Congress; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. MULTER:

H.R. 8673. A bill to amend section 5 of the Home Owners' Loan Act of 1933, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. POAGE:

H.R. 8674. A bill to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act, as reenacted and amended by the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act of 1937, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. REDLIN:

H.R. 8675. A bill to amend the Federal Power Act, as amended, in respect of the jurisdiction of the Federal Power Commission over nonprofit cooperatives; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina:

H.R. 8676. A bill to establish and prescribe the duties of a Federal Boxing Commission for the purpose of insuring that the channels of interstate commerce are free from false or fraudulent descriptions or depictions of professional boxing contests; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. BENNETT:

H.R. 8677. A bill to provide assistance in training State and local law enforcement officers and other personnel, and in improving capabilities, techniques, and practices in State and local law enforcement and prevention and control of crime, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CLEVINGER:

H.R. 8678. A bill to establish in the State of Michigan the Pictured Rocks National Lakeshore, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. DENT:

H.R. 8679. A bill to establish a selective immigration system and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GRIDER:

H.R. 8680. A bill to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937 to eliminate the provisions which reduce the annuities of the spouses of retired employees by the amount of certain monthly benefits; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HAMILTOW:

H.R. 8681. A bill to amend section 3 of the Export Control Act of 1949; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. PATTEN:

H.R. 8682. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to improve the educational quality of schools of medicine, dentistry, and osteopathy, to authorize grants under that act to such schools for the awarding of scholarships to needy students, and to extend expiring provisions of that act for student loans and for aid in construction of teaching facilities for students in such schools and schools for other health

REGULATION OF EXPORTS

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up the resolution, House Resolution 412, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. Res. 412

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 7105) to provide for continuation of authority for regulation of exports, and for other purposes. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and shall continue not to exceed two hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Banking and Currency, the bill shall be read for amendment under the five-minute rule. It shall be in order to consider the substitute amendment recommended by the Committee on Banking and Currency now in the bill and such substitute for the purpose of amendment shall be considered under the five-minute rule as an original bill. At the conclusion of such consideration the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and any member may demand a separate vote in the House on any of the amendments adopted in the Committee of the Whole to the bill or committee substitute. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Florida is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the able gentleman from California [Mr. SMITH] and I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 412 provides an open rule with 2 hours of general debate, making it in order to consider the substitute now in the bill as an original bill for the purpose of amendment, for consideration of H.R. 7105, a bill to provide for continuation of authority for regulation of exports, and for other purposes.

The Export Control Act furnishes the basic authority for the control of exports to Communist bloc countries. It furnishes authority for restricting the outflow of scarce materials, as well as authority to regulate exports in furtherance of the foreign policy of the United States. The enactment of H.R. 7105 will extend the Export Control Act for 4 additional years.

Under the act as now in effect, there are no civil or administrative sanctions available for the punishment of violations other than the suspension or revocation of export licenses. Offenders may be prosecuted criminally, but this is a procedure which may not be appropriate to the circumstances. The bill to be considered would authorize the administrative imposition of a civil penalty not exceeding \$1,000 for any violation of the act or any regulation, order, or license issued under it. The bill clarifies the rights of persons who wish to contest in court the imposition of any such penalty.

The bill as reported will furnish the administration with clear legal author-

ity to protect American business firms from competitive pressure to become involved in foreign trade conspiracies against countries friendly to the United States.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the adoption of House Resolution 412 in order that H.R. 7105 may be discussed and voted on.

Mr. SMITH of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 412 will provide, upon adoption, for the consideration of H.R. 7105 on a 2-hour open rule.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 7105 seeks to amend the act in three instances: First, to extend the act for another 4 years, until June 30, 1969; second, to authorize the administration imposition of civil, monetary penalties of up to \$1,000 for violations of the act; third, to furnish the administration with clear, legal authority to protect American firms from pressures to become involved in trade boycotts or conspiracies against countries friendly to the United States.

At present, there are no civil penalties for those trading under the act other than a suspension or revocation of their export license. Available criminal penalties are often not appropriate. There is a need for a penalty, sharp enough to be a deterrent, but not so severe that a sense of fairness would cause it not to be employed in cases of less than major violations. The committee felt that the figure of \$1,000 meets the need. Export privileges may be suspended up to 1 year as a means of collection, but no longer.

The third amendment apparently was due to the efforts of Arab countries to boycott or blacklist firms which dealt with Israel. The bill adds a new section, section 2(4), which reads in full:

The Congress further declares that it is the policy of the United States to oppose restrictive trade practices or boycotts fostered or imposed by foreign countries against other countries friendly to the United States.

The legal powers of the President to regulate exports, conferred by section 3 of the act, are expressed in terms which limit their exercise to the effectuation of policies set forth in section 2. It is therefore questionable whether the administration would have the legal power to fully protect American firms without such an amendment.

The final amendment to the act is in section 3(a), empowering the President to prohibit or regulate exports of "any articles, materials, or supplies, including technical data." The amendment replaces "technical data" with "information," a much broader term.

The supplemental views, signed by 17 members from both parties, finds no fault with any of the amendments discussed above. Rather, the complaint is that the declaration of policy is not implemented by any language contained in the bill. These views point out that the witnesses of both the Departments of State and Commerce have testified that their policy of a case-by-case study of each complaint, and doing what they think indicated, will not be changed by the declaration of policy presently

written into the bill. Testimony before the committee indicated that major firms with complaints are assisted while smaller ones get no help.

On page 14 of the report, the implementing language to accompany the policy declaration is set out. It requires only that the rules and regulations to be adopted pursuant to the policy declaration shall prohibit the furnishing of information or the signing of agreements inconsistent with the policy declaration.

The supplemental views hold that since the Departments of State and Commerce will not change their policy and actively protect American firms unless directed to do so by legislation, that such legislation should be enacted to enforce the policy declaration.

The language which I understand will be offered as an amendment will read:

Such rules and regulations shall prohibit the furnishing of information or the signing of agreements inconsistent with the section 2(4) hereof.

I know of no objection to the rule, Mr. Speaker, I urge its adoption and reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time.

Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

EXTENSION OF THE EXPORT CONTROL ACT

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 7105) to provide for continuation of authority for regulation of exports, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H.R. 7105, with Mr. DENTON in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] will be recognized for 1 hour, and the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. WIDNALL] will be recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, H.R. 7105, which would amend the Export Control Act of 1949, was considered by your Banking and Currency Committee over a period of the equivalent of 7 days of hearings. The full Committee and Subcommittee on International Trade had before them the Secretary of Commerce, the Acting Secretary of State, a number of Members of Congress, and outside witnesses.

The main purposes of the bill as it was reported out of your committee are as follows:

First. It would extend the Export Control Act of 1949 for 4 additional years.

Second. It would authorize the administrative imposition of civil monetary

penalties not exceeding \$1,000 for violation of the act.

Third. It would furnish the administration with clear legal authority to protect American business firms from competitive pressures to become involved in foreign trade conspiracies against countries friendly to the United States.

The Export Control Act of 1949 furnishes the President with the basic authority necessary to control exports from the United States to our enemies such as the Communist bloc countries. In addition it furnishes authority for restricting the export of scarce commodities, and finally it provides authority to regulate exports to further the foreign policy aims of our country. There was no controversy during the hearings before the full committee over the need for extension of this act. The original request called for an unlimited extension of the act but your committee felt that the extension should be limited to a period of 4 years in order to afford the Congress an opportunity for periodic review.

Regarding the civil penalties provision of the bill, under the act as now in effect there are no civil or administrative sanctions available for the punishment of violations other than the suspension or revocation of export licenses. Offenders may be prosecuted criminally, but this procedure may not be appropriate in the circumstances. There was a real need to be met for a penalty which would be serious enough to act as a deterrent but not so severe it would preclude its use in cases not involving a serious offense.

This is the reason, Mr. Chairman, why your committee in this bill authorized the administrative imposition of civil monetary penalties not exceeding \$1,000 for violations of the act.

Most of the time of your Banking and Currency Committee's Subcommittee on International Trade was taken up in hearing testimony from administration witnesses, Members of Congress, and outside witnesses on the so-called Arab boycott. Basically, the purpose of those desiring legislation as contained in a number of bills introduced on this question want to prevent U.S. business firms from being allowed to comply with the requests for information demanded by the Arab League. In furthering the Arab League boycott against Israel, the League requires, for example, U.S. business firms to state among other things that they do not do business with Israel, that they do not employ Jews, that the majority ownership of their firm is held by others than Jews, and so forth.

All witnesses before your committee fully agreed that such requirements were deplorable, onerous, and contrary to the public policy of the United States both domestic and foreign. There was no disagreement by any of the witnesses that this situation poses extremely difficult problems for our Government and that thus far no truly satisfactory solution had been found to the situation except to attempt to deal with the problem on a case-by-case basis.

In view of the very understandably strong emotions aroused by the Arab

boycott, there naturally has developed a feeling by some that the Congress should do something.

Mr. Chairman, your committee, as has been indicated, gave lengthy and careful study to this issue and the amendment which your committee recommends is in my judgment the appropriate action which this body should take. This amendment states:

The Congress further declares that it is the policy of the United States to oppose restrictive trade practices or boycotts fostered or imposed by foreign countries against other countries friendly to the United States.

In addition, in section 3(a) the term "technical data" was omitted and the word "information" substituted. The word "information" was used so that there would be no doubt that, if and when appropriate, the granting of any information by U.S. firms to foreign countries or their representatives enabling them to carry out a boycott against nations friendly to the United States would be a violation under the act.

As has been indicated, Mr. Chairman, your committee has recommended an amendment to the Export Control Act which clearly and precisely states a policy declaration on this matter. No doubt the argument will be made that policy statements have been declared by the Congress many times in the past and all too often they have been honored more in the breach.

But the fact must not be overlooked that in this most delicate area of foreign policy a lot of factors have to be weighed before a decision is made. Your committee did not believe it was wise to go beyond this declaration of policy statement and adopt legislative language which would make mandatory an explicit course of action by the executive branch. It was not thought that this sort of restriction on the President's authority in the most critical area of foreign policy and international trade would be wise or necessary.

Since original enactment of the export control legislation 25 years ago, the President has had administrative discretion under the statutory language to enable him to administer a complicated control program in the light of changing economic and political situations throughout the world. This system of export control has served our Nation well for a quarter of a century and we should not now—in response to the emotional pressures of the moment—undertake to write into the law detailed administrative directions to apply to a specific, narrow situation. If we should require the President to issue specific regulations against "boycotts and restrictive trade practices" as has been suggested, those regulations would have to be carried out regardless of the countries involved and regardless of any adverse impact on other far more important aspects of our foreign policy and national security.

The plain fact of the matter is that no one can possibly foresee the consequences of such mandatory, administrative detail-type legislation. That is why the Congress has in the past very wisely written the Export Control Act so as to leave

administrative discretion in the hands of of the President—and that is exactly the way we should continue this law.

In their testimony before the Subcommittee on International Trade, witnesses for the administration stressed that, although the administration is very strongly opposed to restrictive trade practices against countries friendly to the United States, they could not support an amendment to the Export Control Act which would require the President to take specific administrative action regardless of the circumstances that may actually develop in the future.

We must keep in mind that the proposed amendment to require specific regulations be put into effect is directed against American businesses who are engaged in international trade in the Middle East area. The amendment would prohibit American businessmen from doing certain things. This amendment would not prevent the Arab nations from continuing their boycott efforts. This amendment would not penalize the Arab nations for continuing their efforts. The only ones to be penalized would be Americans.

Aside from the very important and fundamental policy consideration that the President of the United States should continue to have broad discretion in administering the Export Control Act, I should like to emphasize that even if this policy consideration were not involved the suggestion now before you would still be most unwise. If we could assume that it would result in terminating the Arab boycott efforts against Israel, then we might be justified in experimenting with it. If we could assume that adoption of this suggestion would in net result be better for America's economic interests, better for America's foreign policy interests, then we could take a chance on experimenting with this suggestion.

But the truth of the matter is that one cannot assume any of these things. The House is urged to approve this bill in the form recommended by your committee. Extension of the Export Control Act in this form will give the President of the United States sufficient authority to deal with all matters relating to export control, including the Arab boycott situation, in such manner as he deems most appropriate. This is as it should be.

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Chairman, at this time I yield such time as he may require to the gentleman from New York [Mr. HALPERN].

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Chairman, the only question of controversy in this legislation, H.R. 7105, is the provision adopted by the committee relative to the Arab boycott. On this section of the bill before us we deliberated the issue at length—the subcommittee held extensive hearings and there was no question of the committee's position opposing this boycott.

The only question was on how this can be effectively accomplished through amendment of the bill extending the Export Control Act.

I had hoped the committee would adopt stronger language than that contained in a declaration of policy.

The subcommittee's hearings convinced me more than ever of the need for language not only expressing our opposition to boycotts, but to provide means to prevent American firms from participating in any boycott carried out by a foreign nation to further its own political objectives aimed at a country friendly to the United States.

I feel, and I am sure each of you feels, we have an obligation to protect the American businessman. We have an obligation to prevent American business from being used as pawns in a foreign political situation. We have an obligation as Members of Congress to prevent harassment, intimidation, and blackmailing of American business by a foreign nation.

The subcommittee did approve language setting forth a declaration of policy. This was well and good as far as it went. In fact, it was virtually the same language as the first part of the legislation that I offered in the subcommittee, which was identical with the legislation introduced by 30 of our colleague in this House and by 30 Members of the other body.

But our amendment had a second part—and that is the part that had teeth, and that is the part that was left out of the committee amendment. Just to say we oppose boycotts is like saying we oppose sin. But what do we do about it?

True, the committee also included the word "information" in the Presidential authority section of the act—in other words, they included information as part of the jurisdiction the President may act on.

But to leave this to the President—with due respect—is not enough. Little if anything has been done for the past 15 years to thwart this boycott. I do not think we can hold out much hope for executive action without stronger language.

We have had declarations of policy in other instances written into legislation before. For example, our foreign aid bill contains antibias clauses, antiaggression clauses, and so forth. But it is left up to the administration to implement—and we all know that this has never been done.

So, it is one thing for Congress to express its sense. In this case, to set forth, in the declaration of our trade policy, our opposition to boycotts, and in turn ask that rules be promulgated to implement the declaration.

I feel we should leave no question in this legislation. Let us say we do not like this intimidation and blackmailing of American business and back it up by providing means to eliminate it. And that is all the advocates of this amendment would do.

True, we cannot legislate as to what a foreign power can or cannot do in regard to its own nationals, but we certainly can and should legislate in regard to establishing standards for American business to follow. That is all we who associated ourselves with the supplemental views want.

I should point out—and this is important—that a majority of the committee signed the supplemental views sup-

porting this position. This is unheard of. Although the vote was 14 to 11 in committee, and the amendment did not prevail, there were 7 absentees and 1 who abstained from voting at the time. This position was reversed in the report with 17 members actually signing the supplemental views, with 1 additional member not available at the time but who has since declared his agreement with these views, making it a total of 18 members—a clear majority favoring this supplemental language.

Aside from the immorality and injustice involved with the existing Arab boycott practices which, in themselves, should be ample basis for this type of corrective legislation, the amendment can be fully justified as being in keeping with U.S. trade policy to promote free trade, to improve balance of payments, and to eliminate unwarranted trade barriers.

The testimony at the hearings fully convinced me that trade with the Arabs would not be seriously affected. To the contrary, I think in the long run effective legislation enacted here will ultimately improve our trade picture in the Middle East.

Incidentally, as a final note, I should point out that the testimony brought out that there was not a single known instance of opposition on the part of American business to the provision prohibiting participation in this boycott practice.

The major objection voiced by administration spokesmen was that the adoption of stronger language would place the United States in the inconsistent position of opposing economic boycotts in the Middle East while at the same time fostering an economic boycott in the Western Hemisphere against Cuba. But there is an essential difference between the two, for the Arab boycott is a secondary boycott, while our economic deprivation program against Cuba is not. We may discourage other nations from supplying Cuba with critically needed goods, but if, for example, a British firm decides to sell buses to Cuba, we do not boycott that firm. Under the Arab boycott—the secondary boycott—such a firm would be subject to the boycott. I think this is a very important distinction to keep in mind.

I strongly believe that we need the definitive language in this bill to protect the American businessman, to promote free trade, and to show the world that the U.S. Government will not be bullied or intimidated. And I ask all who are interested in fostering these causes to vote today for effective action.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. ASHLEY].

Mr. ASHLEY. Mr. Chairman, the bill before us, H.R. 7105, is essentially a very simple proposition. It is a bill which seeks simply to extend the Export Control Act of 1949 for a period of 4 years. This act, as we have come to know over the years, furnishes the basic authority for control of exports to Communist bloc countries, for restricting the outflow of scarce materials and for regulation of exports in furtherance of U.S. foreign policy.

Mr. Chairman, there was, as might be expected, no controversy whatever of the need for the extension of the Export Control Act. It is an unfortunate fact of life that this legislation continues to be very urgently needed as a weapon in the cold war in which we continue to be engaged.

It was the consensus of the committee that a 4-year period would afford the Congress adequate opportunity for periodic review.

The bill contains two amendments which are worthy of mention; one of which is completely noncontroversial, and the other of which, as has been mentioned, raises a very difficult and delicate issue.

The simpler amendment would authorize civil monetary penalties not exceeding \$1,000 for violation of the Export Control Act as a supplement to other penalties, some of which are more lenient and some more severe than those already in the act.

The more difficult amendment seeks to be responsive to the problem raised by pressures put upon American businessmen and business concerns in an effort to facilitate or implement boycotts or restrictive trade practices against countries friendly to the United States.

As we have heard, this situation, in its most graphic form, is illustrated by the Arab boycott against Israel.

The committee heard witnesses from the Department of State and the Department of Commerce, and witnesses from industry, and Members of Congress. Each and every one of the witnesses who testified deplored the fact of the Arab boycott.

There was no disagreement as to how this boycott is being implemented by the Arab League. Very simply, what happens is that an American concern seeking to do business in one of the Arab States receives a questionnaire insisting upon certain information as to the origin of the materials going into the product which the American firm seeks to sell and information as to whether or not the American firm also does business with Israel. If the American firm refuses to answer, it runs the risk of being boycotted by the Arab State in question.

As I say, this situation, which is not a new one, is one which was deplored by each and every one of the witnesses heard by the committee. The Department of State and the Department of Commerce witnesses indicated very strongly that it was the policy of the United States to resist such boycott efforts aimed at third party countries friendly to the United States.

The real issue that presented itself was how this resistance should be implemented.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ASHLEY. I yield to my friend from Illinois.

Mr. YATES. If, as the witnesses testified, the policy of the United States is to resist the effort to compel adherence to the boycott, would it not make the task of such officials easier if it were written into law? The act has not been

administered well under provisions which permit the exercise of discretion. I believe the Congress ought to give direction to the officials, make specific their task so that there is no doubt of congressional intent.

Mr. ASHLEY. I appreciate very much the question of my illustrious friend from Illinois, because this is exactly the conclusion at which the committee arrived.

As a matter of actual fact, at the present time there is no policy statement to the effect that the United States does oppose such boycotts and restraints of trade. For this reason the broad consensus of the committee was to put this into writing and to make it a part of our law, not merely for the purpose of better defining the policy of the United States but really, which is much more important, to strengthen the hand of the President by giving him new, added authority as a basis for his actions to implement the policy.

Let me put it this way: At the present time the President is limited in the actions that he can take to register the opposition of the United States to boycotts and restraints of trade aimed at third-party countries friendly to the United States. With the added language written into the bill that is before us, the President then would have authority to take specific action. It was the feeling of the committee, at least at the time that the vote was taken, that it would be better to leave the specific acts aimed at implementing this statement of policy to the President who, after all, under the Constitution, is charged with the responsibility for the conduct of foreign affairs. In all deference to my good friends on the committee on both sides of the aisle, a very difficult problem was raised as to whether this action on the part of the committee of simply writing in the increased power, namely, the expanded authority given to the President, was sufficient. The amendments that have been proposed by my distinguished friends, the gentlemen from New York [Mr. CELLER, Mr. MULTER, and Mr. HALPERN] and by the gentleman from California [Mr. ROOSEVELT] and many others, would have the committee go further and would have this body go further by prohibiting American business concerns from responding to the requests for information from the Arab League. I can only say this: The witnesses appearing before the Department of Commerce and the Department of State set forth in very unequivocal terms that this kind of action would jeopardize our own information denial programs; would interfere with the conduct of foreign affairs in the Middle East, particularly at a time when that situation is becoming more and more delicate and more and more volatile; would almost surely adversely affect our balance of payments; and, as a matter of fact, might very well result in hurting rather than helping the gallant new nation of Israel. This was the testimony of the top official in the Department of State.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman has consumed 10 minutes.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 3 additional minutes.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. ASHLEY. Yes. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. YATES. Does not the gentleman find an inconsistency with the testimony of the witnesses to the effect that it would interfere with our policy in the Middle East and with their other testimony to which he referred in which they said they were resisting the Arab boycott? In practice, I find no such resistance. That is why I favor the supplemental views in the report of the 17 members of the committee. I will support the amendment they propose to offer.

Mr. ASHLEY. The real question that presented itself in that connection was with respect to the method used by the Department of State to meet this type of effort on the part of the Arab League in implementing its boycotts. The State Department witness, Mr. Ball, felt quite strongly that it could be more successful in coping with the boycott on a case-by-case basis rather than by outlawing or prohibiting American businessmen from responding to questionnaires.

The thrust of his testimony was to the effect that we really cannot expect the Arab States to respond to the suggested amendment other than by finding new ways of securing the same information; only then it would be less reliable information. And it was his thought that although the motive behind the amendment is beyond question, its result might be very injurious to the very country that we seek to assist in so many ways.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, if my distinguished friend will yield further, did the witnesses who advanced that contention delineate in any respect the manner in which it would be injurious to the country of Israel, which is the country, I assume, the gentleman is referring to?

Mr. ASHLEY. Let me say to the gentleman that there are many hundreds of American firms that are generating enormous trade with the Arab States and with Israel. Last year the U.S. exports to the Arab States amounted to approximately three-quarters of a billion dollars. This in turn resulted in a net favorable balance of trade for the United States of about half a billion dollars.

The volume of export business the United States did with Israel last year was approximately \$130 million, and something approximately half of that resulted in a net favorable balance of trade. Many American businesses have succeeded through the effort of the State Department and through the efforts of their own representatives abroad in doing business both in Israel and the Arab States.

It was the testimony of Secretary Ball that if the prohibition suggested in the amendment were to become law, the Arab League would find ways of adducing information necessary for further punitive steps against American firms, both those that presently do business with Israel and in the Arab States and those which simply seek to do business with the Arab States.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, if my distinguished friend will yield further, what could the Arab League do under

those circumstances that they are not now attempting to do? I believe we must call a halt to surrendering to the effrontery of the Arab League. It has no right to demand the information which they have demanded. We should have refused long ago to permit the subjection of our business community to such questions.

Mr. ASHLEY. Again I refer to the testimony of men experienced in our State Department who feel quite strongly about this, and I must say as chairman of the subcommittee that conducted the hearings, and for the membership of the subcommittee, we were inclined to agree with Mr. Ball, that this proposed legislation would be regarded by the Arab States as being pro-Zionist and anti-Arab and would result in a worsening of relationships between the United States and the Arab countries; and that the Arab States might perfectly well turn to our European competitors for the goods and services we now provide and which are so important to us as a trading nation.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, if my distinguished friend will yield further, I assume the European competitors to whom they refer are competitors who are not dealing with Israel presently; if they were, they would be in the same position, would they not?

Mr. ASHLEY. Let us suppose that they are. I would say to the gentleman this, that the proposed amendment is the first effort on the part of any country to respond to the boycott in this manner.

There have been efforts to counter the boycott on the part of our sister nations throughout the world, but on the same informal basis, the same case-by-case basis, that our State Department has been using.

In some respects, Mr. Chairman, what I have said is, perhaps, somewhat beside the point although I believe it is well to give to the members of the Committee the background as to the considerations with which our committee has been concerned. I say that perhaps it is not entirely in point because I am happy to report that there may be agreement on an amendment that will be offered by one of our colleagues to bring together in acceptable compromise the conflicting positions that I have outlined.

This amendment does not take the form suggested by the language read by our distinguished chairman, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN]. It is new language that has been drafted only in recent hours and I hope that the Committee will pay particular attention to it when it is offered. It does represent a means of solving a delicate, difficult situation, hopefully to the satisfaction of those who have been on opposing sides.

Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the generous amount of time which has been yielded to me by the distinguished gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN].

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may require.

Mr. Chairman, over a period of years, we, as members of Congress, have given to the Executive much authority with respect to the operations of foreign affairs and many times have succumbed to the

position that the White House wanted to take in order to provide what we called a more flexible position for the Executive and not to interfere with our foreign policy.

Mr. Chairman, I believe this has been very wise in most instances. However, unfortunately, I believe a number of times we have abandoned a position that the American people wanted us to take to express forcibly to the world and to the Executive what the people of the United States felt was meaningful with respect to our own position of leadership in the free world and our own desires for freedom and liberty for others.

Now, Mr. Chairman, this bill encompasses something that I feel is a perfect example of what has taken place in the past where the pressures are for Congress to keep its hands off as we move into a new phase of export control and the continuation of the present act. However, we are faced with the facts of life with reference to the Middle East, where there is an Arab boycott that has been going on to some extent as a result of our own action or inaction, however you want to term it. In other words, we have condoned, in effect, that boycott.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to read for the RECORD the supplemental views that were signed by 17 of the 33 members of the House Committee on Banking and Currency with respect to restrictive trade practices and boycotts:

We compliment the committee for adopting a very clear declaration of policy against restrictive trade practices and boycotts. The language as added to the bill by the subcommittee amendment is the exact language of the declaration of policy contained in about 60 bills that were introduced in both Houses of Congress.

Unfortunately, the bill, as reported to the House, does not go far enough because it fails to implement this declaration of policy.

It is important to keep clearly in mind that the State Department and the Commerce Department both testified before committees in both Houses of Congress that the declaration of policy is in accord with American principles and they went so far as to say they deplored the Arab boycotts and the restrictive trade practices indulged in by some of the Arab countries and that such conduct is to be condemned.

Nevertheless, they have also indicated that on their so-called case-by-case review of complaints against this boycott and these restrictive trade practices, they have done little or nothing. Their testimony before the committees of both Houses indicates that even if we adopt this declaration of policy, they do not intend to change their practice, but will continue to review these matters on a case-by-case basis, doing what they think may be indicated should be done in each case.

This will be deliberately flying in the face of the intent of the Congress and of the best American practices. The testimony clearly indicates that when a large bank or a large company applies to the State Department or the Commerce Department for help in connection with these boycott practices, representations are made on their behalf to the Arab governments concerned and relief is obtained. But when small merchants make complaints to the departments and seek help, they get a lot of doubletalk and are told either to comply or to lose their right to do business in these other countries.

This is a double standard that the Congress must not permit to exist. The only way we

can stop it is by adopting implementing language.

The language as contained in the various bills seeking to amend the Export Control Act was quite broad. The amendment offered in the committee, which was defeated by a vote of 14 to 11 with 1 member voting present and 7 members being absent, is not as broad as that contained in the original amendments. It now meets the objection raised by the executive departments, that if the language as originally proposed were adopted, it would possibly prohibit Americans from even courteously responding to requests and indicating that the American law prohibits their giving any detailed information.

The amendment as offered in the committee and which will be offered on the floor takes that possibility into account and requires only that the rules and regulations to be adopted pursuant to the declaration of policy, in order to implement the declaration of policy, shall prohibit the furnishing of information or the signing of agreements inconsistent with the declaration of policy. No one can or should object to that.

As a matter of fact, as has been repeatedly pointed out, an American employer or an American firm is prohibited by law from asking what one's religion is, what his race is, what his place of origin may be or that of his ancestors. Despite such prohibitions in existing law, the practices of the State Department and the Commerce Department give permission, if not direction, to Americans to answer to foreigners the very questions which they are prohibited from asking of or answering to other Americans.

This is an intolerable situation and it should be stopped at the earliest possible moment.

It could be stopped by action of the Commerce Department or of the State Department without this legislation.

Obviously, they have not stopped doing it and have no intention of stopping this practice, unless we direct it by appropriate legislation. We urge the enactment of such appropriate legislation.

The language of the amendment, which we will offer and support on the floor of the House, will simply read: "Such rules and regulations shall prohibit the furnishing of information or the signing of agreements inconsistent with the section 2(4) hereof."

Section 2(4) is the declaration of policy adopted by the committee which reads: "The Congress further declares that it is the policy of the United States to oppose restrictive trade practices or boycotts fostered or imposed by foreign countries against other countries friendly to the United States."

Mr. Chairman, the opponents of straightforward congressional action against the Arab League economic boycott of Israel are intoning the shopworn phrases "flexible foreign policy" and "tying the President's hands."

In the past these expressions have always carried the day against congressional efforts forcefully to deal with the Sukarnos, Nassers, and others who delight in ridiculing and opposing U.S. foreign policies.

To those who bow at the altar of a so-called flexible foreign policy, forever sterilized against congressional exposure, let me say this:

Is it not better for Congress to tie the hands of the executive than to have the job done for us by dictators of Nasser's ilk?

Is it not better for the people's representatives in Congress assembled to correct a policy whose inflexibility has rewarded those who would pursue a policy

of economic and military strangulation of a nation we helped to create?

Mr. Chairman, there is only one matter at issue, and that is, Shall we or shall we not continue to tolerate the Arab League economic boycott?

Shall we merely legislate a statement of congressional intent and policy that we know will be ignored by the executive branch?

Shall we, as a nation, continue tacitly to support a vicious economic boycott?

Shall we grant to American businessmen the means by which they legally can escape compliance with Arab League questionnaires which defy every principle upon which this country was founded?

Or shall we, in the high sounding name of "Presidential discretion" and "flexible foreign policy," once again turn the other cheek to foreign interests.

The choice, Mr. Chairman, is that simple.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WIDNALL. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. YATES. I want to commend the gentleman for his very fine speech. Does not the gentleman believe that both the Department of State and the Department of Commerce can be rightfully criticized for having knuckled under to the Arab League by condoning this intolerable practice at the same time saying they condemn it? Is that not what their practice has been over the years?

Mr. WIDNALL. It has been a beautiful case of walking the fence without taking a position so far as I can see.

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WIDNALL. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. LINDSAY. I should first like to congratulate our colleague, the gentleman from New Jersey, for the very clear, logical, and moderate talk that he has just given. Indeed, I think he has outlined the case for congressional action very clearly and very simply.

I think it is time for the United States to do everything it can to foil the Arab boycott.

It is argued that for the United States to bear down on this boycott would undercut our efforts with nations cooperating in the U.S.-sponsored boycotts of North Vietnam and Cuba. I say there is no similarity between the Arab boycott and ours, and I am shocked at the suggestion. The situations are not parallel in the slightest. Israel under no circumstances can be called an aggressor nation. Cuba and North Vietnam fall into the category of direct or indirect aggressors. Furthermore, even in the case of Cuba or North Vietnam, our Government does not impose secondary boycotts. We do not blacklist any British firm, for example, which is doing business with Cuba; this is the offense which I think is chiefly to be struck down and which should be struck down by the Congress if we are to do what is right in this area.

I think there is another reason to demand stronger action by the United States in dealing with the Arab boycott, and that is its discriminatory basis. We have a strong policy in this country

against inquiring about a person's race, religion, or national origin. Yet it is precisely by asking questions such as these of American companies that the Arab League effectuates its boycott. This is an intolerable situation and one which requires a firm rule designed to assist American companies in resisting these outrageous demands. Therefore, Mr. Chairman, I endorse the gentleman's statement and support him in the amendment that he is preparing to offer.

Mr. WIDNALL. I thank the gentleman for his remarks.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER].

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Chairman and Members of the Committee, I do not believe I say to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. ASHLEY] that foreign policy is ever consistent. Different methods are always used with respect to different countries. Cuba and China, for example, cannot be placed on a par with little Israel or placed on a par with any of the Arab States.

I would say, certainly, that holding a trigger at the heads of American firms, demanding that they answer these questionnaires, is most obnoxious, as obnoxious as an alligator. For the United States to acquiesce in this malpractice to me is most repulsive and to most businessmen is most distressing.

The State Department and the Department of Commerce, with cavalier complacency, lend support to this Arab arrogance. Unfortunately, I fear, there are quite too many "Arabophiles" in the lower echelons of the State Department. To get there one must speak Arabic. How does one usually learn to speak Arabic? One goes to Roberts College or to the American College at Constantinople and Beirut, stays there 6 years, and learns Arabic. One then takes on the color of his surroundings in Arabia and becomes more Arab than the Arabs. There are too many of such kinds in the lower echelons of the State Department, and that is where policy originates. They influence those above them.

I would say that this man, Nasser, who was the chief engineer of these questionnaires and the Israel boycott, as the guiding spirit of the so-called Arab League, is a so-called megalomaniac. We should give him scant attention. He is as pleasant as a wart on one's nose.

The Arab League leaders themselves are a pusillanimous lot. If we show strength and courage to them, they quail.

We saw what the Chase National Bank did. It said, "We will have nothing to do with the questionnaires." It lost no business. There was no boycott thereafter against the Chase National Bank.

The Hilton Hotels thumbed their nose at the Arab League leaders. What happened? Nothing. They prospered in the Arab League countries.

When Nasser and his cohorts threatened Erhard, Chancellor of the Federal German Republic, and said, "If you recognize little Israel diplomatically, we will recognize East Germany," Erhard recognized Israel, and Nasser and the Arab countries did not recognize East

Germany. The threat was sound and fury and signified nothing.

So we see that when one shows a bit of courage to these Arabs, they withdraw.

I will say that the Arabs would continue to trade wherever it is useful and advantageous for them to trade—regardless of answering questionnaires. We would not lose an iota of trade with the Arab countries if we passed the amendment which I shall support, sponsored by the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. MULTER].

I have been to Israel a number of times. I wish you could go there yourselves and see for yourselves the wonderful things that little country has done, surrounded as it is by enemies who want to plunge it into the sea. That is a country where the flame of democracy burns brightly, and we must nurture that flame wherever it burns. We will not nurture it by insisting that American firms in this cowardly manner truckle to the Arabs. That will hurt little Israel.

Such action will not nurture of the Israel flame of democracy.

I said this before the subcommittee of the Committee on Banking and Currency, and those who have heard me will forgive repetition. If you go to Israel you see a determination among those people in little Israel, a determination as firm as a rock you hold in your hands.

You see an exaltation there that is as fierce as a streak of lightning.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. PATMAN. I yield the gentleman 2 additional minutes.

Mr. CELLER. And you see a wondrous courage and, above all, a tremendous faith, a faith in their flag, a faith in themselves, and a faith in their country. They do not wear their faith as one would the fashion of a hat. Theirs is the faith, in the language of Browning, that can move mountains. In that faith, in that exaltation, and in that courage they will go far and they will worst the Arabs eventually, despite the fact that there are 40 million Arabs against 2 million Jews. Therefore, I say that the Multer amendment will strengthen and not weaken American commerce and at the same time help little Israel. Now, to state that our State Department is friendly to Israel, will not help. As to Israel our State Department is long on preachment and promises and short on performance. Somebody once said, "Sometimes our friends are more troublesome than our enemies."

Mr. KREBS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CELLER. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. KREBS. Mr. Chairman, I wish to compliment our eminent dean of the House for his most excellent statement, and I wish to be associated with his remarks.

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

Mr. CELLER. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mrs. KELLY. Mr. Chairman, I want to associate myself with the remarks of my colleague from New York. He has discussed the principle involved with his

usual eloquence, expressing the need for legislation against the boycotting Americans of Jewish faith by the leaders of the Arab States. I will support the Multer amendment. I urge the chairman of the committee to accept this amendment. My only sorrow is that it is not stronger and is not mandatory on our Government. I have long sought this legislation in previous legislation and welcome any amendment to recognize the right of all Americans.

I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CELLER. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Chairman, when the gentleman refers to supporting the Multer amendment, do you mean the Multer amendment referred to in the committee report?

Mr. CELLER. No. I do not know whether it is in the committee report, but I think his amendment will soon be read to the House.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has again expired.

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. MULTER].

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Chairman, I think and, in fact, I know that the distinguished dean of the House, the gentleman from New York, [Mr. CELLER] in referring to the Multer amendment, was referring to the Multer amendment which I will read in a moment. It is not the same as that in the supplemental views that has been read by the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. WIDNALL]. It is much stronger and adds a great deal of strength to the bill. I think that it will do what the gentlewoman from New York [Mrs. KELLY] referred to, that is, it will make mandatory that which we declare here as policy.

I think it is the unanimous opinion of this House that the declaration of policy as contained in this bill is good and should be implemented. I trust that the implementation will be found in the amendment which I will offer after the bill is read and open for amendment. I refer to this amendment not as the Multer amendment but as the Multer-Halpern amendment. We struggled over this language long and arduously, and I think we have come up with an excellent result. I think all who are concerned will agree that this new language, if this amendment is adopted—and I trust it will be—does the full job.

Let me direct your attention first to page 5 of the bill, please. There on lines 16 to 19 you find the declaration of policy which is precisely the language of the declaration of policy in the 30-odd bills which were introduced in this House and some 30-odd bills which were introduced in the other body. That declaration of policy reads as follows:

The Congress further declares that it is the policy of the United States to oppose restrictive trade practices or boycotts fostered or imposed by foreign countries against other countries friendly to the United States.

The Multer-Halpern amendment does not touch that language. It continues that language and adds to the declaration of policy the following language:

The Congress further declares that it is the policy of the United States—

And this is the new language—

to encourage and request domestic concerns engaged in the export of articles, materials, supplies or information to refuse to take any action, including the furnishing of information or the signing of agreements which have the effect of furthering or supporting the restrictive trade practices or boycotts forced or imposed by any foreign country against another country friendly to the United States.

This gives us a very broad and complete declaration of policy. I do not know how you could adopt any language that would make it any broader or stronger; that would say that this country and American citizens are opposed to restrictive trade practices and opposed to boycotts and opposed to doing anything that would further them, that they are opposed to aiding any such boycott of a foreign country against another country friendly to the United States.

Now, for the implementation that the gentlewoman from New York [Mrs. KELLY] asked for, there is in the same Multer-Halpern amendment, this additional language. The act is further amended by adding at the end thereof the following new sentence—bear in mind, you are now extending the Export Control Act which provides for the issuance by the President of rules and regulations to implement the act—this new language will read as follows: Referring to the rules and regulations now called for by the existing act:

Such rules and regulations shall implement the provisions of section 2(4) of this act.

Section 2(4) of this act, when you adopt this amendment, will be the declaration of policy which is already in the bill and the additional language that I have read to you.

I say that this does the full job, gives us a complete declaration of policy against restrictive trade practices, against boycotts, and directs an implementation of that policy.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Chairman, I want to congratulate the gentleman on his amendment and say to him that I think it accomplishes the basic purposes of those Members of the House who introduced legislation on this subject and who feel so strongly about it. I should like to say to the gentleman that I want to express my appreciation to the chairman of the full committee [Mr. PATMAN], the chairman of the subcommittee [Mr. ASHLEY] for their great consideration and cooperation with us in getting a full record on this matter.

I think the gentleman from New York [Mr. MULTER] and the gentleman from New York [Mr. HALPERN] are to be congratulated on getting very broad support for the bill based upon the record which has been made on this matter.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Chairman, I think much of the credit is to be given to all of the members of the Committee on Banking and Currency, because they approached this subject with an open mind and with a desire to accomplish the result we had in mind. There has been a difference of opinion as to the language to be used. I do think that now we have language that does the job and everybody can be happy with it.

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MULTER. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I am privileged to associate myself with this amendment. I feel it is strong. It sets forth our opposition to restrictive trade practices and boycotts. It requests domestic firms to refuse to participate in such practices. It requires rules and regulations to be promulgated to implement the declaration.

This language, Mr. Chairman, is a big improvement over the committee language. I find it not the ultimate that all of us would like, but it certainly is acceptable. It does not equivocate. Short of better language, it has my support.

Mr. FARBERSTEIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MULTER. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. FARBERSTEIN. Mr. Chairman, I want to compliment the gentleman from New York [Mr. MULTER] upon the language of the amendment which he proposes to offer. That, Mr. Chairman, together with the statement which the gentleman has made, I presume will delineate the intent of the Congress and will, in effect, do away with this economic inquisition on the part of the Arab countries.

Of course, Mr. Chairman, we must depend upon the rules and regulations, as the gentleman has stated, to implement the language of the amendment. I know that the State Department will be governed by this language and will not, through the use of any weasel words or any weasel rules and regulations, attempt to escape from the intent of the Congress in the promulgation of this language. This should put an end to this blackmail and this boycott by the Arab countries.

Mr. Chairman, I can understand the position of the State Department. They desire to be all things to all men. Obviously this is a difficult thing to do.

Our Ambassadors in the various countries do all they can to retain the friendship of the countries to which they are accredited, irrespective of the general effect of the policies of these countries on others. The State Department very naturally is guided by the reports of the various Ambassadors in making policy. They say they oppose the boycott, but want each case treated individually. This, to me, seems an impossible task.

The State Department favored assistance to Israel to make it an economically viable state. Israel no longer receives any grant aid and is now, I believe, to a degree economically viable.

The boycott is harmful to Israel's economy, yet the State Department is satisfied to permit its continuance. This I cannot understand.

They oppose the boycott against American business, but oppose an act that would remove it. This, I also cannot understand.

It seems to me we must rescue the State Department from what I believe is an untenable position.

The Arabs can boycott whomsoever they please; but that does not mean we must assist them.

As I see it, this amendment is but putting into effect a declaration made in one of our foreign aid bills opposing boycotts and blockades against American citizens and American business.

Seventeen years ago this year a series of armistice agreements were signed between the newly created State of Israel and the Arab States which had sought, unsuccessfully, to prevent its founding. Unsuccessful in their attempt to destroy Israel by force of arms, the Arab States have contended that a state of war still exists, and have moved their campaign of action against that country onto the economic plane. In general, this has consisted of closing the Suez Canal to all Israeli ships and goods, of establishing a blacklist of companies which do business with Israel, as well as boycott threats against companies which are considering doing business with Israel.

In actual fact, the repercussions and extent of this attempted economic warfare are far wider than the above list would lead the uninitiated observer to believe. Along with those of other nations, American manufacturers, business firms, traders, importers and exporters, and companies engaged in almost every conceivable type of commerce have been subjected to a wide variety of practices which are completely contrary to the normal course of international trade.

Nearly 15 years ago, the Arab countries created the Central Arab Boycott of Israel Office, with headquarters in Damascus. Designed to coordinate the activities of the Arab States in their economic warfare against the State of Israel, it has a semi-official status within the Arab League. Its purposes and functions, however, are unlike those of any other boycotting operation. It not only sees to it that Arab countries and companies do not purchase Israeli goods and services, it extends its operations to a secondary boycott of foreign firms who have any kind of dealings with Israel whatever, and even a tertiary boycott of other foreign companies who deal with these companies.

While we as Americans cannot legally question the right of Arab companies or the various Arab States to refuse to deal with Israel if they so choose, we can most vigorously oppose the secondary and tertiary boycotts which they attempt to impose upon American firms. At the present time, it is the policy of the Arab boycott office to send out what are euphemistically termed "questionnaires" in the event a company is suspected of committing any of approximately 20 different possible actions which entail blacklisting. These "questionnaires," which have, I

think legitimately, been termed an "economic inquisition," are a very serious affront to American businessmen pursuing their legitimate interests and ends. They require an answer, for failure to do so is usually taken as prima facie evidence of guilt. They require notarized evidence that the firm is not violating any of the various conditions which lead to boycotting action. These and the many other conditions which the boycott office create for American companies are demeaning, embarrassing, and humiliating. It is my firm conviction that they should also be illegal.

The Arab boycott has as its main purpose the undermining of the economy of the State of Israel. In order to achieve this goal, it has tried to draw into its armory the operations of companies from all over the globe. As many others have pointed out, this is an incredible extension of a regional dispute; should it set a precedent, American business would become involved in every single political dispute the world over.

However, this political aspect is not the only one. It has often been charged that the boycott has not affected Israel to any great degree. Although it is true that the effect has certainly not been that intended by the Arab States, it would be false to claim that the economy of Israel has not suffered. Economists have pointed out that it forces an uneconomic reallocation of resources—not only in Israel, but actually in the Arab States as well. Both parties to this dispute have, in fact, been harmed. The Israelis are required to obtain some goods through wholly illogical and often expensive channels, while the Arab States, as a result of their operations, are similarly forced to obtain replacement goods which are often inferior in quality and workmanship from companies not on the blacklist.

Quite obviously, also, the possibilities of greater foreign investment by both American and European companies in the Middle East are seriously hampered. Many companies are simply not willing to risk large capital outlays for only a portion of what could be a vast and very profitable common market.

But, let us also consider American industry. By being unnecessarily coerced into choosing one market rather than both, American businessmen deprive themselves of additional sales. This not only deprives many of the economies of larger production and markets, it also lowers their profit potential. And, from the standpoint of the United States as a whole, this boycott artificially limits the quantity of total American exports, a factor which we have often been told is of the essence in reducing our balance-of-payments deficits.

The primary purpose of the legislation which has been introduced is to assist American business in overcoming this artificial wall to expanded trade. Some businesses have cooperated with the boycott in order not to lose their sales and markets; others have curtailed their trade or hesitated to fully exploit the potential markets which do exist; and yet others have categorically and vigorously rejected any attempt by foreign

agents to tell them in what manner they should run their own enterprises. There is no clear and meaningful reason why American businessmen should be forced to answer the various interrogations which the boycott office carries out, why they should be required to obtain special affidavits, or why American chambers of commerce or other trade organizations should be forced to certify commercial invoices as to their nature or composition of their products. The legislation which has been introduced to amend the Export Control Act of 1949 is designed solely for the purpose of protecting American businessmen and enterprises from the intimidation and harassment of the Arab boycott office.

Despite the clarity of purpose behind this amendment, and the demonstrable need for it, there have been serious misstatements of its intent, as well as misinterpretations of its applicability. It is sad to report that among those who have been guilty of such misrepresentation, and contradictory public and private utterances about the amendment are two departments of the Government: State and Commerce. Even though they have both reiterated their opposition to such restrictive practices in principle, they have consistently argued that making it illegal for American companies to respond to such questionnaires would seriously impair American economic policies with respect to Communist China and Cuba, for example. They have also claimed that it would be better for American companies to learn to live with the boycott, because altering the situation might endanger American relations with the Arab nations. I do not think it is necessary to summarize here all of their arguments—they are, I think it is fair to say, generally contradictory and seemingly unconcerned with any of the economic or moral principles which are a vital part of this question.

It has been demonstrated conclusively that there are many American and European companies which have refused to knuckle under to the kings of pressure and threats which the Arab States have brought to bear. A prime example has been the Hilton hotel chain; another has been the Chase Manhattan Bank; and, probably the most commonly known examples are the various airlines which continue to operate services to both Arab nations and Israel. Evidently, if the Arab countries feel that they have more to gain by continuing their connections with certain companies which operate both in their own territory as well as in Israel, the provisions of the boycott are overlooked or speciously explained away. Similarly, it is obvious that certain of the Arab States enforce the provisions of the boycott far less stringently than others; there are examples too numerous to detail of companies with a sales office in Israel, or an assembly plant there, or Israelis among their stockholders, or who have violated some or all of the myriad other offenses against the boycott, whose products are quite obviously a part of the local scene.

All in all, the Arab attempt to boycott Israel and seriously affect her economy by threatening foreign companies, trad-

ers, and manufacturers is not only a breach of established international trade practice, it is illogical, unreasonable, and, as I have said before, it should be illegal. Various European chambers of commerce have come out strongly against having manufacturers and businessmen in their countries subject themselves to such harassment and intimidation. I see no reason why the U.S. Government should not similarly support American businessmen. In fact, this amendment presents two very clear alternatives: either Congress approves of it, thereby protecting American businessmen from such foreign pressure, or Congress fails to approve it, thereby putting American businessmen at the mercy of any and all foreign countries who wish to extend their disputes into the arena of international trade generally, and American commerce specifically. These are the alternatives. It is Congress duty to protect and defend the interests of the United States and its citizens; unless it votes to pass this amendment, it will have been derelict in this duty.

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MULTER. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Chairman, referring to the previous speaker, I would just say that many things we have presumed to intend as to what the State Department is going to do in some of these areas are not carried out.

Mr. Chairman, I am very disappointed that this amendment is going to be offered at this time which, certainly, is not as strong as the one where 17 of the members of the committee signed supplemental views.

When you say "to encourage and request," it is far different than saying "prohibit." The word "prohibit" was the intent, because we felt this was the only way we could make it strong enough as to what the intent of the Congress was and what should be done in trying to eliminate the harmful aspects of this boycott now being conducted by the Arab nations.

Mr. Chairman, I cannot see where this will do the job. If I could, I would certainly go along with what is being proposed by the gentleman from New York right now. However, I fully intend to offer as a substitute to the amendment offered by the gentleman the original wording cited in the supplemental views of the members of this committee.

Mr. MULTER. I am sure the gentleman wants to be fair. He always is and he always has been. I am sure he is going to be fair now. However, I believe the gentleman ought to tell this body at this time that the declaration of policy as contained in the reported bill is exactly as it was in the proposed amendments. We have every word we wanted exactly as we offered it then. It is in the bill now on page 5 thereof. Now we come forward and by the Multer-Halpern amendment add to the declaration of policy.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has again expired.

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. MULTER. Now, we go further and we add to that declaration of policy additional language. As I said when someone threw out the suggestion when we were discussing this language that this additional declaration weakens the first, I said, "All right; let us take it out." He ran away. He said, "Oh, no, no, keep it in."

Obviously, it does add not just something but a great deal. If the gentleman will just look at it and bear in mind that what we are doing is not taking anything away from the present language but adding to it. In addition to the original declaration of policy there is an additional declaration that the State Department and the Commerce Department shall encourage and request American concerns to refuse to cooperate with these restrictive trade practices and with these boycotts.

However, Mr. Chairman, what is more important and what is not in the present bill is that we add, as was suggested in the supplemental views, in order to implement the declaration of policy—that is, the language I used in the supplemental views that 17 of us signed—now we will add to this bill by my amendment this language:

Such rules and regulations shall implement the provisions of section 2(4) of this Act.

And section 2(4) is the declaration now contained in the bill, plus the additional declaration.

In answer to those who suggest "implement by rules and regulations" will not do the job, let me say, you cannot implement it negatively. You have to implement it positively, and the State Department and the Commerce Department must issue rules that will implement this by saying to American firms "You cannot answer these questionnaires; it is nobody's business what your religion may be or what the religion is of anyone connected with your firm. You do not answer these questions. You may do nothing that will in any way aid these restrictive trade practices or this boycotting."

Mr. WIDNALL. I never understood the word "prohibit" to be really negative. We thought that was very positive, and that is the reason for the language.

Mr. MULTER. Let me call to the gentleman's attention what we do in all statutes. The commandment is that you shall not steal. We do not write that into a penal code. We provide that he who steals shall be punished. We declare that these trade practices are immoral, we say that these practices are wrong and bad. We say we will implement that declaration by rules which say you cannot do this and shall not do that. But bear in mind in this same statute you have criminal penalties and certainly you do not want any man, woman, or any American concern who innocently may answer an inquiry, to be indicted and found guilty of a crime because they did not know of the existence of this policy or these rules and

regulations. These rules and regulations will require that the American public be advised of the declaration of policy. They must be fully advised of all its implications and then be guided accordingly. I think this does a full job without putting any innocent American concern, or anyone, in the position of being indicted for a criminal offense when they did not have any intention of committing any crime.

Mr. JOELSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MULTER. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. JOELSON. Mr. Chairman, I want to commend the gentleman from New York who has been in the forefront of the fight against the Arab boycott.

It is the stated policy of our Government to promote trade and encourage exports, and anything inimical to such policy should be removed. Furthermore, we must protect American businessmen against pressures and harassment which will discourage trade.

The State Department, in its usual diplomatic terms, has characterized the Arab boycott as "regrettable" and "unfortunate." Not being so polite, I characterize it as reprehensible blackmail on American business.

Concern has been expressed by some that the enactment of the proposed amendments to the Export Control Act would result in the Arab states terminating their trade with the United States. I would remind those who have such misgivings that we still sell wheat to the Arab nations under Public Law 480. The Arab States would not be so foolish as to deprive themselves of the benefits of Public Law 480 by terminating trade with the United States.

Some have also expressed concern that we would be favoring one "friendly" nation as against another. The word "friendly" is hardly applicable to the United Arab Republic which is cuddling up to the Soviet Union, disrupting peace-keeping activity in the Congo, and whose leader has invited the United States to "jump in the ocean."

At any rate, the proposed amendment would not favor one nation as against another, but rather would insure neutrality so that American business would be free to trade with both Israel and the United Arab Republic.

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. MULTER. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. WIDNALL. I think we are in the position we have found ourselves in here in the House where, as you know and I know, you march up the hill then march down again. We have reached the top of the hill in this matter, and I think the House is prepared to vote for the prohibition on the furnishing of this information. I for one, and I know many, many others on both sides of the aisle, are sick and tired of providing advisory language, then seeing the intent and the will of the House destroyed by those who are in the administrative agencies of the Government. I cannot believe that using the words "encourage and request" will do the job.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 3 additional minutes.

Mr. MULTER. Will the gentleman answer this question: Would you take out this subdivision (b) of the declaration of policy? Will you recommend that we take out "to encourage and request"?

Mr. WIDNALL. Not in the declaration of policy. It could be taken out.

Mr. MULTER. Would you recommend taking it out?

Mr. WIDNALL. I think it is the same sort of thing we have done over and over again during the years and have accomplished nothing. The gentleman will see the day when he will regret it because the State Department and the Commerce Department did not implement the legislation in the way you hoped that it would.

Mr. MULTER. My amendment says they shall do so.

Mr. OTTINGER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MULTER. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. OTTINGER. With all due respect to my colleague, the gentleman from New York, for whom I have a great deal of admiration, I think what we have in this amendment is merely a stronger statement of policy than that included in the original committee bill. With respect to that original statement of policy, the State Department testified before the committee that this has always been our policy and that they intended to continue to take each matter on a case-by-case basis and, in effect, do nothing.

The new Multer-Halpern amendment purports to strengthen the committee bill by adding a requirement that the State Department implement. But what do they have to implement? They have to implement only rules and regulations to "encourage and request" domestic concerns to refuse to cooperate in supplying information. There are no more teeth than there were in the original committee version.

Mr. MULTER. Do not omit the first part of the declaration of policy from these rules and regulations:

First, shall implement the declaration of policy which is (a) to wit—to oppose restrictive trade practices or boycotts and (b) to encourage and request domestic concerns to refuse to cooperate.

Mr. OTTINGER. Would the gentleman accept language to substitute for the words "to encourage and request" the words "to require"? I think this is what will be necessary to see that the State Department implements the policy to achieve what the gentleman seeks. What we need is mandatory language such as the gentleman from New York proposed in the supplemental views subscribed by a majority of our committee—not merely the precatory language proposed in this compromise amendment.

Mr. MULTER. I beg this House and beg this Committee—let us stop quibbling about words. The language is as inclusive as we can make it. Now to add to it a shall or must provision for the implementation of this declaration of

policy is mere redundancy. I assure you in my opinion and if you only look at this fairly, you will have to agree that this is going to do the full job and the State Department cannot run away from it.

Mr. ASHLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. ASHLEY. I want to say to the gentleman from New York quite honestly, I think from my standpoint, he has done too good a job with his amendment. I take the view that the foreign policy of the United States is the rightful prerogative of the President of the United States and it is generally a sad day when the House of Representatives seeks to insert itself into this area, particularly when the President has indicated the course he wishes to follow. The language that the gentlemen from New York [Mr. MULTER and Mr. HALPERN] have suggested, quite frankly, goes far beyond what normally would be acceptable to me. But we have sat through days and weeks of hearings. The two positions have been well established. We are not talking about an area that is easily reduced to a common denominator. There are conflicting views. Those who seek no compromise, and those who rule out as a possibility language that can bridge the two positions, I say do so at their own risk, really. I would suggest this may not be in the best interest of what they seek to accomplish. I do not like the language of this amendment because I think it goes too far in hampering the conduct of foreign affairs by the President of the United States. I accept it with reluctance because I feel, in the best interest of what we are trying to accomplish here, it provides the best means of doing so.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MULTER. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. YATES. With respect to the supplemental views that appear in the report which have the support of 17 members of the committee and which refer to an amendment which will be offered and was read by the gentleman from New Jersey, is it the gentleman's understanding that the amendment, as stated in the supplemental views, will not be offered now when the time comes for offering amendments?

Mr. MULTER. It is my intention to offer the amendment I have read and that I have been discussing here this afternoon, and it will be offered in lieu of the language that appears in the supplemental views.

Mr. YATES. Is it the gentleman's understanding as well that no Member from the other side, no matter whose name appears thereon, will offer that amendment?

Mr. MULTER. Let me put it this way. I do not intend to quibble with the gentleman. When the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. HALPERN] worked up this language with me, it was my understanding that he accepted this and I accepted it; and the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. ASHLEY] indicated he would

accept it. The distinguished chairman of our committee [Mr. PATMAN] indicated he would accept and that that would be the end of it. I hope it will be the end of it. I think we have a good compromise. But it looks now as though some of the minority Members do not wish to go along with Mr. HALPERN.

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MULTER. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. WIDNALL. In answer to the gentleman from Illinois, I intend to offer the original amendment suggested by the 17 who signed the supplemental views. It will be offered as a substitute for the amendment to be offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. MULTER]. That amendment is something which has recently been drawn. It is not printed or circulated.

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MULTER. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. PELLY. A moment ago the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. ASHLEY] said that the amendment went too far. I believe that sometimes Members of this House forget the provision of the Constitution which says the sole authority over the control of exports is placed in the legislative branch. I do not believe the language goes too far at all.

Mr. MULTER. Whether it does not go far enough, or goes too far, I hope the committee will accept it as a happy compromise.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MULTER. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. May I compliment the great statesman from New York [Mr. MULTER] and the others who have collaborated in the selection of language so plain that all can understand and so firm that none would dare to ignore. The friendship of the United States for the State of Israel is deep and enduring, and the boycott of the Arab States aimed to harm Israel is repugnant to every sense of decency and morality. I read from a telegram I have just received from Milton J. Silberman, speaking for the American Zionist Council and the Illinois Conference of Jewish Organizations: "I respectfully request that you communicate with our entire Illinois delegation our feeling that they support regardless of party the philosophies of the Multer-Halpern amendment which prohibits cooperation with boycotts."

Mr. MULTER. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. ROOSEVELT. I wish to agree with the gentleman from Washington and to say that I must disagree with my good friend from Ohio. There is a place in foreign policy for the Congress. I believe the gentleman has used restraint. I believe the amendment which he and the gentleman from New York [Mr. HALPERN] have worked out will do the job effectively and affirmatively. I hope it

will be upheld by the House. The executive branch has not always been clear in this matter.

The Department of State has always been reluctant to take firm action against the boycott and similar activities. But the Congress of the United States and the national conventions have reiterated their opposition to those practices on many occasions.

On July 25, 1956, the Senate unanimously adopted a resolution offered by Senator Herbert Lehman, which reads as follows:

Whereas the protection of the integrity of U.S. citizenship and of the proper rights of U.S. citizens in their pursuit of lawful trade, travel, and other activities abroad is a principle of U.S. sovereignty; and

Whereas it is a primary principle of our Nation that there shall be no distinction among U.S. citizens based on their individual religious affiliations and since any attempt by foreign nations to create such distinctions among our citizens in the granting of personal or commercial access or any other rights otherwise available to U.S. citizens generally is inconsistent with our principles: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That it is the sense of the Senate that it regards any such distinction directed against U.S. citizens as incompatible with the relations that should exist among friendly nations, and that in all negotiations between the United States and any foreign state every reasonable effort should be made to maintain this principle.

The Democratic Party, in 1956, at its convention declared:

We oppose, as contrary to American principles, the practice of any government which discriminates against American citizens on grounds of race or religion. We will not countenance any arrangement or treaty with any government which by its terms or in its practical application would sanction such practices.

The Republican platform read:

We approve appropriate action to oppose the imposition by foreign governments of discrimination against U.S. citizens, based on their religion or race.

In 1959, ARAMCO was under fire because it was charged that it was screening employees who might have to apply for visas for Saudi Arabia. The New York State Commission Against Discrimination permitted ARAMCO an exemption from its laws because the Department of States said that U.S. policy in the Near East might be affected. The New York State Supreme Court ruled against ARAMCO. The supreme court said:

If the enforcement of the public policy of New York State would embarrass the State Department in the Near East, then it should be said that the honor of American citizenship—if it remains for New York State to uphold it—will survive ARAMCO's fall from Arab grace.

In 1959, Congress adopted an amendment to the foreign aid appropriation which declared:

It is the sense of Congress that any attempt by foreign nations to create distinctions because of their race or religion among American citizens in the granting of personal or commercial access or any other rights otherwise available to U.S. citizens generally is repugnant to our principles, and in all negotiations between the United States and any foreign state arising as a result of funds appropriated under this act these principles

shall be applied as the President may determine.

In the summer of 1960, Congress again took action on this issue, approving an amendment which originated in the House Foreign Affairs Committee, which firmly declared American opposition to boycotts. The Mutual Security Act declared:

It is the sense of the Congress that inasmuch as: (1) the United States favors freedom of navigation in international waterways and economic cooperation between nations; and (2) the purposes of this act are negated and the peace of the world is endangered when nations which receive assistance under this act wage economic warfare against other nations assisted under this act, including such procedures as boycotts, blockades and the restriction of the use of international waterways.

A few weeks later, the Democratic platform declared:

Protection of the rights of American citizens to travel, to pursue lawful trade and to engage in other lawful activities abroad without distinction as to race or religion is a cardinal function of the national sovereignty. We will oppose any international agreement or treaty which by its terms or practices differentiates among American citizens on grounds of race or religion.

Two weeks later the Republican convention promised "to seek an end to transit and trade restrictions, blockades and boycotts."

Now at last we can together make the whole matter clear. The Multer-Halpern amendment does exactly what is needed.

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the pending bill, H.R. 7105, to amend the Export Control Act of 1949. The purpose of this proposal is to provide American exporters protection from the increasing intimidation of that notorious world troublemaker, Nasser, as he spares no savagery to wreak economic havoc on Israel, America's great democratic friend.

As my colleagues are aware, this legislation has had my sponsorship and support for some time. I am proud to be the author of H.R. 7863, a bill similar to the amendment now before the committee. Further, during hearings held by the Committee on Banking and Currency in consideration of this amendment to the Export Control Act, I was pleased to offer my views in behalf of the bill and to urge its being favorably reported.

American exporters are not immune to the effects of restrictive trade measures. Such is the case of the Arab boycott.

Nasser's cunning against Israel employs the Arab boycott in this way: Exporters in the United States and elsewhere in the world who wish to trade with the United Arab Republic find themselves subject to close control by the central Arab boycott office in Damascus, Syria. In order to conduct commerce, the exporters must file with this office voluminous information on their trade with other countries, especially Israel. Those who refuse to comply with the boycott restrictions or who indicate trade with Israel firms find themselves denied trade with the United Arab Republic. It is purely and simply a blacklist which results from the answers furnished by the exporters.

We have two principal reasons to oppose this Arab boycott: First, American business deserves protection from this harassment, and second, Israel deserves our support in helping to check the vicious effects of these restrictions.

A nation that is free is under national obligation to secure and assure that freedom for all who act in allegiance to it. Thus, Mr. Chairman, it is our responsibility to protect the rights and freedom of this Nation's export community by enacting this legislation which will allow its members to turn a deaf ear on the demands of the central Arab boycott office.

Further, and just as importantly, our belief in freedom is a belief in fostering national independence throughout the world and in doing our best to save it whenever it is threatened. Again, then, Nasser's intended victimizing of Israel must be met with our rightful wrath, and that is and will be a significant expression of the action I ask the House to take today.

For the protection of democratic rights here and abroad, we should give this legislation our overwhelming approval.

Mr. MINISH. Mr. Chairman, opponents of the mandatory antiboycott legislation now before the House have characterized it as emotional and have criticized its efficacy and wisdom. At the same time, they agree that the boycott practices are thoroughly indefensible and a flagrant violation of the rights of American business firms. It seems to me that theirs is the emotional attitude, relying upon noble declarations of policy to accomplish our objective of protecting American business against these boycott practices. It is evident that Nasser and his cohorts are not moved by words, and that a negative attitude will achieve nothing.

Mere declarations of policy will not protect American business firms from the blackmail tactics of the Arab States. What is absolutely essential, as my co-signers and I stated in our supplemental committee report, is to implement this declaration of policy against restrictive trade practices or boycotts by prohibiting the furnishing of information or the signing of agreements that would further such practices or boycotts.

Our committee hearings clearly established that the boycott measures constitute a serious problem to many American firms, particularly smaller ones, and that our citizens want relief from them. One witness, whose importing firm has been victimized by the Arab League because of its trade with Israel, testified that if restrictions of this kind had been imposed when the firm was organized 25 years ago, "we not only would not have grown, but probably could not have continued at all." It is a regrettable fact that small firms are compelled to succumb to the Arab tactics or lose their right to do business in those countries. I think our merchants have a right to expect the support of their Government in this intolerable situation.

The leader of the free world must not permit itself to be a party to these reprehensible policies. By tolerating the participation, reluctant as it is, of American

firms in the Arab boycott against Israel, we are injuring our national esteem, involving our citizens in other nations' disputes, and aiding and abetting an aggressive assault against a staunch ally.

Mr. Chairman, I submit that it is the duty of the Congress to insure that American businessmen need observe only the normally accepted practices of international commerce. The mandatory antiboycott measure is urgently needed. I am proud to sponsor it. I urge its approval.

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Chairman, I want to express my strong support for the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. MULTER] to protect American firms and American interests from the Arab boycott of Israel.

As we know, the Arab League, in attempts to further its economic boycott of Israel, has required American firms doing business with any of its member nations to state, among other things, that they do not do business with Israel, that they do not employ Jews, and that the majority ownership of their firms is not held by Jews.

These requirements are not only deplorable and onerous, they are completely contradictory to the policies and the principles of this country.

It is true, Mr. Chairman, that the committee's bill sets forth a declaration of policy against this practice. But a declaration of policy is not enough. We need language, which this amendment provides, to prevent American firms from participating in any boycott which is carried out by a foreign nation or nations to further its own political objectives and which is aimed at a country friendly to the United States.

We cannot, of course, legislate as to what a foreign power can do or cannot do in regard to its own nationals. But we certainly can and should legislate as to the standards of our own practices.

This is what this amendment seeks to do. It implements the declaration already included in the bill by giving it the teeth which can make it effective. As support for the very principles and policies of our country, this amendment should be approved overwhelmingly today.

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time. I ask that the Clerk read.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the rule, the Clerk will read the substitute committee amendment printed in the reported bill as an original bill for the purpose of amendment.

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 12 of the Export Control Act of 1949 (50 U.S.C. App. 2032) is amended by changing "1965" to read "1969".

Sec. 2. Section 5 of the Export Control Act of 1949 (50 U.S.C. App. 2025) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsections:

"(c) The head of any department or agency exercising any functions under this Act, or any officer or employee of such department or agency specifically designated by the

head thereof, may impose a civil penalty not to exceed \$1,000 for each violation of this Act or any regulation, order, or license issued under this Act, either in addition to or in lieu of any other liability or penalty which may be imposed.

"(d) The payment of any penalty imposed pursuant to subsection (c) may be made a condition, for a period not exceeding one year after the imposition of such penalty, to the granting, restoration, or continuing validity of any export license, permission, or privilege granted or to be granted to the person upon whom such penalty is imposed.

"(e) Any amount paid in satisfaction of any penalty imposed pursuant to subsection (c) shall be covered into the Treasury as a miscellaneous receipt. The head of the department or agency concerned may, in his discretion, refund any such penalty, within two years after payment, on the ground of a material error of fact or law in the imposition. Notwithstanding section 1346(a) of title 28 of the United States Code, no action for the refund of any such penalty may be maintained in any court.

"(f) In the event of the failure of any person to pay a penalty imposed pursuant to subsection (c), a civil action for the recovery thereof may, in the discretion of the head of the department or agency concerned, be brought in the name of the United States. In any such action, the court shall determine de novo all issues necessary to the establishment of liability. Except as provided in this subsection and in subsection (d), no such liability shall be asserted, claimed, or recovered upon by the United States in any way unless it has previously been reduced to judgment.

"(g) Nothing in subsection (c), (d), or (f) shall limit—

"(1) the availability of other administrative or judicial remedies with respect to violations of this Act or any regulation, order, or license issued under this Act,

"(2) the authority to compromise and settle administrative proceedings brought with respect to violations of this Act or any regulation, order, or license issued under this Act, or

"(3) the authority to compromise, remit, or mitigate seizures and forfeitures pursuant to section 1(b) of title VI of the Act of June 15, 1917 (22 U.S.C. 401(b))."

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the necessary number of words.

Mr. Chairman, we have heard a good deal this afternoon with reference to questions as to race or religion being asked of those who come under this act. I would like to call attention to the agricultural census presently being taken in the State of Iowa. The farmers of the State of Iowa are being asked, "What is your race? Mark one: white, Negro, or other." Yet when any applicant for Federal employment fills out a Form 57, and all must do so, it is prohibited by law these questions be asked. I would like to know how it is possible to ask the farmers of Iowa what their race may be when this same question cannot be asked of an individual applying for Federal employment. Are the farmers of Iowa being discriminated against? What is the story? Perhaps this committee is not the place to raise the question, but I want someone, somewhere to tell me why the asking of this question is prohibited when a person seeks employment in the Federal Government and is required to be answered in an agricultural census.

As far as this particular act is concerned, I do not think it is worth the paper it is written on. I call your attention to the story which appeared in the Washington Star on May 8 of this year. The opening paragraph of this story reads:

Faced with the threat of a boycott campaign by a conservative organization, the Firestone Tire & Rubber Co. recently halted negotiations to sell Communist Rumania a \$50 million synthetic rubber plant even though the deal had the official approval of the U.S. Government and the personal blessing of President Johnson.

What does the Export Control Act mean if it does not stop the sale of a synthetic rubber plant worth \$50 million to the Communist country of Rumania? This sale was stopped but only because patriotic citizens of this country rose up and threatened a boycott of the Firestone Tire & Rubber Co. at their retail outlets throughout the country; their various plants; and particularly at the recent Memorial Day speedway races at Indianapolis, Ind. What does this Export Control Act mean if Lyndon Johnson and his State Department give their blessing to the sale of a strategic synthetic rubber plant to the Communists? It seems to me this afternoon that the renewal of this act is tweedle-dum and tweedle-dee. I could not be less interested in whether this act is extended if the President of the United States is not interested in controlling such exports.

The CLERK. Page 5, line 8:

Sec. 3. (a) Section 2 of the Export Control Act of 1949 (50 U.S.C. App. 2022) is amended (1) by redesignating clauses (a), (b), and (c) in the first sentence as (A), (B), and (C), (2) by inserting "(1)" at the beginning of the first, "(2)" at the beginning of the second, and "(3)" at the beginning of the third typographical paragraph thereof, and (3) by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

"(4) The Congress further declares that it is the policy of the United States to oppose restrictive trade practices or boycotts fostered or imposed by foreign countries against other countries friendly to the United States."

(b) Section 3(c) of such Act is amended by changing "clause (b) or clause (c) of section 2 hereof" to read "section 2(1)(B) or 2(1)(C) of this Act".

Sec. 4. (a) The first and last sentences of section 3(a) of such Act (50 U.S.C. App. 2023(a)) are amended by changing "technical data" to read "information".

(b) Section 4(a) of such Act (50 U.S.C. App. 2024(a)) is amended (1) by changing "which articles, materials, or supplies" to read "what" and (2) by striking out "thereof".

(c) Section 5(b) of such Act (50 U.S.C. App. 2025(b)) is amended by changing "any material" to read "anything".

Mr. PATMAN (interrupting the reading of the bill). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the remainder of the committee amendment be considered as read and open to amendment at any point.

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

There was no objection.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. MULTER

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. MULTER: After the words "United States", insert "(a)" and on page 5, line 19, after the words "United States" and before the period insert: "And (b) to encourage and request domestic concerns engaged in the export of articles, materials, supplies, or information, to refuse to take any action, including the furnishing of information or the signing of agreements which have the effect of furthering or supporting the restrictive trade practices or boycotts fostered or imposed by any foreign country against another country friendly to the United States".

And at page 6, immediately after line 7, add the following: "(d) Section 3(a) of such Act is further amended by adding at the end thereof the following new sentence: "Such rules and regulations shall implement the provisions of section 2(4) of this Act."

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MULTER. Surely.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, I have conferred with a sufficient number of Members on the majority side, including the chairman of the subcommittee that conducted hearings on this bill, to justify me as chairman of the full committee in accepting the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. WIDNALL

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Chairman, I offer a substitute amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. WIDNALL as a substitute for the amendment offered by Mr. MULTER: On page 6, immediately after line 7, add the following:

"(d) Section 3(a) of such Act is further amended by adding at the end thereof the following new sentence:

"Such rules and regulations shall prohibit the furnishing of information or the signing of agreements inconsistent with section 2(4) of this Act."

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Chairman, I think it is quite clear from the debate that has taken place that the one issue with respect to continuing the Export Control Act is the way we will try to take care of restrictive trade measures or boycotts and prevent unfriendly nations from stepping in to try to accomplish their purposes under this act, as it involves our people in the United States.

As the majority of our committee said in the supplemental views in the report, who supported the amendment I have offered as a substitute—and I shall read it:

Such rules and regulations shall prohibit the furnishing of information or the signing of agreements inconsistent with the section 2(4) hereof.

That section 2(4) is the declaration of policy which was adopted by the committee that is in the bill and which is being offered to the House, where it says:

The Congress further declares that it is the policy of the United States to oppose restrictive trade practices or boycotts fostered or imposed by foreign countries against other countries friendly to the United States.

Frankly, as a member of the committee, and the ranking member of the committee, I am surprised by the offering of this amendment on the floor today by

the gentleman from New York [Mr. MULTER]. I think it definitely weakens the intent of the members of the committee, after hearing all of the testimony produced before the committee from administration witnesses and others.

Mr. REID of New York. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WIDNALL. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. REID of New York. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment which has been offered by the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. WIDNALL].

Mr. Chairman, in my judgment, the Arab boycott is odious on its face. The United States has always opposed it as a matter of policy, but our policy has lacked teeth.

Mr. Chairman, I submit to the Members of the House that certificates of origin and information of stock ownership and holders thereof requiring the identification of Jewish ownership are repugnant and are contrary to the laws of many States of this Nation. Our Government should not facilitate—in any sense—direct or indirect, the filing of these reports by American companies.

Secondary and tertiary boycotts should be opposed as a clear restraint of international trade. I further believe it is essential for the future of Israel that something be done here and now, to put teeth in a policy that has always been U.S. policy but has never been fully implemented. Some U.S. and European firms have opposed the boycott and have prevailed; some have capitulated. The loss of markets to Israel is hard to measure, but the boycott in and of itself is certainly a form of economic warfare contrary to peace in the area.

The amendment which has been offered by the gentleman from New Jersey and which uses the word "prohibit" is correct. We should not be faint-hearted here today. We should support the amendment which has been offered by the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. WIDNALL].

Mr. WIDNALL. I thank the gentleman from New York for his remarks.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to call to the attention of the members of the committee the fact that the administration admitted in testimony which they offered that they had done nothing to halt the Arab boycott. Naturally, the administration supports a weaker amendment, one which "encourages and requests," but does not prohibit. Without using the language of the substitute amendment which I have offered, we will not meet the problem.

Mr. Chairman, those who want to do something about the Arab boycott should support this substitute amendment which is set forth in the supplemental views signed by 17 members of the committee. I am offering that amendment and I feel it deserves the full support of the Members of the House on both sides of the aisle and it should be made very clear as to the position we take, which reflects the views of the American people, I am sure.

Mr. Chairman, I urge adoption of the substitute amendment.

Mr. BROCK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WIDNALL. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. BROCK. Is it not a fact that the majority of the committee, by signature, on the committee report endorsed the gentleman's substitute amendment?

Mr. WIDNALL. That is correct.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the substitute amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I do not like to say it, but it begins to look as though I have been had. By that, I mean just this: It is quite true that the majority of the members of the Committee on Banking and Currency subscribed to the views which I circulated as the supplemental views to accompany this bill and we said, in so many words, that we would support an amendment on the floor such as the substitute now offered.

But, Mr. Chairman, for days and for hours we have labored to bring to this House a better amendment than that contained in the supplemental views.

The amendment which I have offered is the Multer-Halpern amendment which has been agreed to and which has been worked out laboriously and ably and will do the full job.

Now, Mr. Chairman, to have this accepted by the majority on the Democratic side of the Committee on Banking and Currency and have the gentleman from New York [Mr. HALPERN] who was working with me on this on the Republican side to say, "This is fine," and then have the ranking minority member of the committee come along and say, "It is all right, but I am not going to be bound by it. I am going to go further" is another matter. Put it mildly, it just is not nice. Of course, that is his legislative prerogative. I did not talk to him. Maybe I should not have assumed Mr. HALPERN was acting for him. I believe I had the right to do so.

This seems like an attempt to impose what is to be labeled a Republican amendment. It is bringing partisan politics into a matter which should be bipartisan. We have always bragged about our foreign policy as being bipartisan. This is injecting partisan politics into a matter which I had every reason to believe had been worked out on a bipartisan basis.

The gentleman from New Jersey has offered a substitute which takes out at least half of the declaration of policy. That half is the guts of it, if I may use the vernacular. The declaration of policy as we brought it to the floor is only half the job. We will by my amendment add the other half to the declaration of policy. In addition it will add a requirement that that declaration of policy be implemented.

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MULTER. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. WIDNALL. As far as the supplemental views are concerned, are they the views of the gentleman from New York, or were they?

Mr. MULTER. Yes, they were.

Mr. WIDNALL. With whom did the gentleman negotiate this settlement?

Mr. MULTER. With the gentleman from New York [Mr. HALPERN].

Mr. WIDNALL. You have not discussed this with the ranking minority member of the full committee?

Mr. MULTER. There was a Multer-Halpern amendment in committee as we talked about it in committee, as we fought for it in committee, and as we put it in the supplemental views. Then the gentleman from New York [Mr. HALPERN] and I worked out this language with all others concerned. I am sure the gentleman from New York [Mr. HALPERN] was acting in good faith. I had no idea I should have inquired day by day or hour by hour, whether he was acting for the minority.

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MULTER. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. HALPERN. I repeat what I said earlier, and that is that I am privileged to associate myself with the amendment offered by the distinguished gentleman from New York. I think it is a good amendment. I worked hard with the gentleman in trying to come up with language that would be acceptable to the House. He is accurate in reporting that. However, he should realize that I can only speak for myself. I never represented myself otherwise, either to the gentleman from New York or to the committee or anyone else. Naturally I cannot speak for any other members who may have signed the report, which, incidentally, had a majority of the signatures of the members of the committee. I said this language was a big improvement over the original declaration of policy. But I also informed the gentleman from New York that I would still have preferred stronger language. I never gave the slightest indication that I could speak for any other Member. Earlier on the floor today I repeated that this was not the ultimate that we would like. But short of better language it has my support. I still think it is a tremendous blow to the Arab boycott. The language is strong; it leaves little question as to our position on the boycott and requires administration action to eliminate it. If anyone has an amendment that can improve this language, naturally, Mr. Chairman, I would like to see it; but again I repeat that this is, in my opinion, the best achievable language and I had hoped it would be accepted without opposition. But every Member of this House is entitled to his own legislative prerogative and this, obviously, is the position assumed by the ranking member of the full committee, the distinguished gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Chairman, all I can say is, as I started out by saying, I have been "had." In the future I will ask for a written statement that the man I deal with on the other side is acting for members of his party.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Is it not a fact if the amendment that is offered as a substitute were adopted, there is the greatest possibility that there might be no legislation on this matter at all? That, on the other hand, the amendment which the gentleman in the well has offered in all probability will be acted upon, and will be a tremendous step forward?

Mr. MULTER. I believe the gentleman to be correct.

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, it seems to me we have heard this debate before. The problem is that the State Department has never paid any attention to language having to do with this subject. It is perfectly clear that nothing in the record bears out or supports the argument that the State Department and the Commerce Department are likely to follow the intent of the Congress on this issue.

Again and again, year after year, Congress after Congress, this subject has come up. All kinds of language stating the view of Congress has been placed in the record and nothing is done. It seems to me that we are dealing with a question that is basically a moral question and a question of fairplay. There can be no similarity between this case and the case of the boycott of Cuba and North Vietnam as I said a moment ago in general debate. Nobody by any stretch of the imagination can make out a case that the State of Israel is an aggressor nation. The reason for the United States imposing a boycott on Cuba and North Vietnam is because those nations engage in direct and indirect aggression, and for that reason the State Department's argument, I think, falls on its face.

It is clear that the requirements that are made by Arab States that U.S. businessmen put down in writing the place of origin of goods, and the religious affiliation of officers and directors of companies, involve practices that violate national policy and, in many States, the law itself. It seems to me clear it is time that the Congress took some effective action in this area. For that reason I intend to support the substitute amendment that will be offered by the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. WIDNALL].

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LINDSAY. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Chairman, I would like to call to the attention of the gentleman from New York [Mr. MULTER] the fact that the supplemental views were signed in a bipartisan manner by eight Democrats and nine Republicans supporting the views of the gentleman from New York [Mr. MULTER]. The gentleman from New York [Mr. MULTER] just made a statement in characterizing what is going on by saying he has been had. Let me just say the change in views today on the floor of the House, if they are accepted by a majority vote, will prove once again that we have been had by the State Department and that we are not exercising the will of the Congress. I think it is about time we asserted ourselves and let them know how American people feel very deeply

about a subject that hurts and hurts badly throughout this country. It is about time we faced up to our responsibilities in connection with this.

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Chairman, what we are attempting to do here is to put an end to secondary and tertiary blacklisting practices that are odious and offensive. And it is up to the Congress to put a stop to them.

Mr. SCHWEIKER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LINDSAY. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. SCHWEIKER. Mr. Chairman, I strongly support an amendment to the Export Control Act of 1949 which would prevent Arab bloc countries or any other nation from interfering with normal trade opportunities of American businessmen. Recent events show that certain Arab nations are making it extremely difficult for American businessmen to trade with Arab countries if they choose to trade with the economically vibrant State of Israel. I oppose any measure, whether overt or clandestine, which would affect the free economy of this young state. Many American corporations and businesses are quietly and unnecessarily capitulating to the vicious pressures of the Arab boycott of Israel.

Under conditions of the Arab boycott, American businessmen who trade with Israel are blacklisted from doing business in the 12 countries of the Arab League. The Arab economic boycott of Israel differs from any other act of economic warfare of one nation against another. It is not limited to the boycott of Israel goods and Israel firms. It extends to a secondary boycott of foreign firms doing business with Israel.

To avoid this pressure against U.S. businessmen and its potential effect on the economy of the State of Israel, I have introduced a bill amending section 2 of the Export Control Act of 1949 to permit U.S. businessmen to engage in normal trade opportunities without fear of reprisals from foreign countries which object to such trade.

The Schweiker bill amends the Export Control Act of 1949 to prohibit domestic exporters from taking any action, including the furnishing of information or the signing of agreements, in furtherance of restrictive trade practices or boycotts imposed by one foreign country against another foreign country friendly to the United States.

Our country believes in cooperation and equanimity in trading with all friendly nations. And we hope and request that the same attitude of equanimity and fairness be the business policy for all American businessmen. At a time when our national efforts are bent to promoting international peace through the fostering of trade and commerce between nations, it becomes all the more desirable to enact legislation such as the Schweiker bill.

Mr. ASHLEY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ASHLEY. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Chairman, I have listened carefully to the debate. The question is really whether the House is going to implement the policy declaration by requiring that information not be furnished and agreements not be signed which further the Arab boycott. The compromise amendment which has been worked out leaves us without mandatory provisions which appear necessary if the intent of Congress is to be carried out.

The supplemental views in the report (Rept. No. 434) at page 13 state that both the State Department and the Commerce Department deplore the Arab boycott and maintain it is present policy to condemn restrictive trade practices and boycotts. However, according to the supplemental views filed by a majority of the committee:

Their testimony before the committees of both Houses indicates that even if we adopt this declaration of policy, they do not intend to change their practice, but will continue to review these matters on a case by case, doing what they think may be indicated should be done in each case.

The committee majority said, "The only way we can stop it is by adopting implementing language," and recommended rules and regulations to prohibit the furnishing of information or the signing of agreements.

The gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. WIDNALL] has offered the stronger, mandatory provision as a substitute. I support it for the very reasons which persuaded the majority to sign the supplemental views.

Mr. Chairman, ever since 1951 the Arab League has maintained an economic boycott of U.S. firms doing business with Israel. I have long been concerned over this affront to American citizens and have written numerous letters to the State Department and the President regarding this important issue.

I have also brought this matter before this House. On December 16, 1963, the New York World-Telegram and Sun published a list of 84 companies of the 114 which were officially boycotted by one or more Arab States in 1963. I brought that list to the attention of my colleagues on December 17, 1963. I will not repeat the list but refer the Members of this House to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 109, part 19, page 24835. The list has grown considerably since 1963 and as of January 1964, 164 U.S. firms were on the blacklist.

In order to provide evidence for their blacklist, Arab countries require that American firms fill out questionnaires and file affidavits concerning their business transactions with Israel. In addition, information is requested regarding the religion of the officers of American business firms, as well as the origin of component parts of the product to insure that they do not come from Israel.

In order to end this unwarranted and pernicious intervention in American commerce and discrimination against American firms and citizens, I joined with several of my colleagues and introduced H.R. 4802. This bill contains the same language as is found in section

2(4) of H.R. 7105, the bill before us today:

The Congress further declares that it is the policy of the United States to oppose restrictive trade practices or boycotts fostered or imposed by foreign countries against other countries friendly to the United States.

It is, of course, important that the Congress and the United States express themselves against the Arab boycott. But expressions of opposition to this nefarious boycott are not enough. My bill also prohibits:

The taking of any actions, including the furnishing of information or the signing of agreements, by domestic concerns engaged in the export of articles, materials, or supplies, including technical data, from the United States which have the effect of furthering or supporting the restrictive trade practices or boycotts fostered or imposed by any foreign country against another country friendly to the United States.

While the language of the substitute is different, the purpose is to prohibit the furnishing of information or the signing of agreements which further the boycott.

Mr. Chairman, the time is long overdue for this country on behalf of all its citizens to vigorously oppose the nefarious Arab boycott and to prohibit any American firms from cooperating with the boycott by furnishing information. We must take a firm stand on this matter and take it now.

Mr. JOELSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ASHLEY. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. JOELSON. Mr. Chairman, I will quickly try to review the bidding and clear the air here. As I understand it, the gentleman from New York [Mr. MULTER] has agreed on a compromise. There is no denying that he was the man who first sparked the idea of legislation aimed at the Arab boycott. I think that having agreed on the compromise, he now finds himself in a position where something stronger is offered. I, for one, think the gentleman has rendered a great service in trying to get the compromise and I am going to accept the stronger offer and if I have to fall back on the compromise, I intend to do it.

Mr. ASHLEY. Mr. Chairman, I would like to say to my good friend, the gentleman from New York [Mr. LINDSAY] that at no time has the State Department or the Department of Commerce tried to equate the situation with which we are dealing this afternoon with that of Cuba. Nothing could be further from any of our thoughts. The plain fact is if we pass the kind of legislation suggested by Mr. WIDNALL we will be the first country to take governmental action of this kind. We are not in a very strong position to do this because of our own information denial programs.

We would do nothing more than to invite the same kind of legislation from other countries from whom we seek information, in our information-denial program.

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ASHLEY. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. HALPERN. Is it not true that Secretary of Commerce Conner testi-

fied before our committee and did cite Cuba as an instance of U.S. trade restrictions; and did not Secretary Ball do the same?

Mr. ASHLEY. If the gentleman from New York will review the testimony he will find that neither Secretary Ball nor Secretary Connor equated the Cuban situation with the Arab boycott. They made that abundantly clear in response to questioning by the gentleman from New York.

Mr. Chairman, in conclusion I would say that there would not be a single "nay" vote against the amendment of the gentleman from New Jersey if it held out any hope of outlawing the Arab boycott. But no action of this body or by the United States can achieve this result, so let us look at the issue before us. The issue is simply whether the Congress will go this far beyond what was requested by the administration when it sent down this bill.

We have written a statement of policy. We have buttressed that statement of policy with additional language. Now, shall we insist on going all the way? If we do, then we should support the language of the gentleman from New Jersey. If, however, we wish to take any cognizance of the responsibility of the administration in a matter which most certainly does bear upon the conduct of foreign affairs, then I say we can accept the amendment and should support the amendment of the gentleman from New York [Mr. MULTER].

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ASHLEY. I yield to my friend from New Jersey.

Mr. WIDNALL. I believe the gentleman referred earlier to a compromise effected, and said it was a fine compromise. With whom was the compromise effected? Was it with other Members of Congress, or a Member of Congress and the State Department? That is the question.

Mr. ASHLEY. The gentleman has heard time and again that the gentlemen from New York [Mr. HALPERN and Mr. MULTER] worked out this language. Mr. MULTER does not deny that nor does Mr. HALPERN. I have discussed the language proposed by Mr. MULTER and Mr. HALPERN with Members on this side of the aisle. The gentleman has had as much time as we have had to analyze it. We find it does represent the kind of compromise—although I personally am not overly fond of it—that we can live with.

I hope the gentleman from New Jersey, if he will take a few moments, will come to the same conclusion.

Mr. Chairman, I ask for a vote.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I should like to have the attention of the gentleman from New York [Mr. MULTER].

I notice, in the amendment offered by the able gentleman, the language which reads:

And at page 6, immediately after line 7, added the following:

"(d) Section 3(a) of such Act is further amended by adding at the end thereof the following new sentence: 'Such rules and reg-

ulations shall implement the provisions of Section 2(4) of this Act.'"

In the first place, section 2(4), if I understand it correctly, refers to the policy declaration on page 5, which reads:

(4) The Congress further declares that it is the policy of the United States to oppose restrictive trade practices or boycotts fostered or imposed by foreign countries against other countries friendly to the United States.

Is that correct?

Mr. MULTER. That is correct.

Mr. PEPPER. The language is that "such rules and regulations shall implement the provisions" of that section just read. Who makes the rules and regulations relevant to our export trade and its government?

Mr. MULTER. Under section 3 of the Export Control Act of 1949, as amended, which we are extending by this bill, the President of the United States makes the rules and regulations.

Mr. PEPPER. In other words, the Congress, pursuant to its legislative responsibility, is imposing a mandate upon the President effectively to carry out this policy which the Congress is declaring.

Mr. MULTER. That is precisely the point I have been trying to make.

Mr. PEPPER. I thank the gentleman very much.

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Chairman, I rise in favor of the Multer-Halpern amendment. It is my hope that this amendment will bring to an end the offensive practices of Arab countries who try to use American business firms in their boycott of Israel. Sometimes the prospective American suppliers are asked whether they trade with Israel, use products from Israel, employ Jews or have Jews among their stockholders or managers. American firms should not be forced to answer these questions and supply such information to the Arab League boycott office.

May I call to the attention of my colleagues the supplemental views filed by the gentleman from New York, Congressman MULTER, and 16 other members of the Banking and Currency Committee, wherein they point out that an American employer or an American firm is prohibited by law from asking what one's religion is, what his race is, what his place of origin may be, or that of his ancestors. Yet the State Department and the Commerce Department give permission, despite such prohibitions in existing law, to Americans to answer to foreigners the very questions which they are prohibited from asking of, or answering to, other Americans. I agree that this is an intolerable situation and it should be stopped. I think that the Multer-Halpern amendment adds a great deal of strength to the declaration of policy worked out by the committee against restrictive trade practices and boycotts. The committee members are to be commended for their work on this legislation.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the substitute amendment offered by the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. WIDNALL].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. WIDNALL) there were—ayes 53, noes 85.

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chairman appointed as tellers Mr. PATMAN and Mr. WIDNALL.

The Committee again divided, and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 64, noes 96.

So the substitute to the amendment was rejected.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. HALPERN

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment to the Multer amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. HALPERN to the amendment offered by Mr. MULTER: Add following such amendment the following:

"(e) Rules and regulations required to be promulgated pursuant to the amendment made by subsection (d) of this section shall be promulgated as expeditiously as practicable, and shall be published in the Federal Register within 90 days after the date of enactment of this Act."

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Chairman, requiring rules and regulations, is not enough. It is vital that we show determination, that we mean business. All this amendment to the amendment does is to spell out that these rules and regulations about which we have heard so much today shall be promulgated and not be entwined in the cobwebs of the administrative branch; that they must be promulgated within 90 days and published in the Federal Register. I do not see how anybody can oppose this amendment, and I trust it will prevail.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HALPERN. I yield to the Chairman.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, in order to implement the agreement that was entered into by the gentleman from New York [Mr. MULTER] and the gentleman from New York [Mr. HALPERN] the committee on this side is willing to accept the amendment.

Mr. HALPERN. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HALPERN. I am delighted to yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Chairman, I support the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. HALPERN] and ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks on this bill today.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. HALPERN] to the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. MULTER].

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. MULTER], as amended.

The amendment, as amended, was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. LIPSCOMB

Mr. LIPSCOMB. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. LIPSCOMB: On page 5, strike out line 25, and insert in lieu thereof the following: inserting immediately after "technical data" the following: "or any other information".

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. PATMAN. The amendment is satisfactory to our side and we are willing to accept it.

Mr. LIPSCOMB. Mr. Chairman, I firmly support extending the Export Control Act of 1949, as amended, the act which provides the authority for a program of controls on exports to the Communist bloc.

It is essential to our national security and welfare that we have a system of controls over shipments of goods, materials, supplies, and technical data to the Communist bloc. This act, if it is adequately administered, can be an effective means to help prevent a buildup of the economic and military arsenal of the Communist bloc which we all know is relentlessly pursuing its designs to overcome the free world.

Many of my colleagues in the House of Representatives know of the work done in this area by the House Select Committee on Export Control of the 87th Congress. It was my privilege to serve on that committee and to cosponsor legislation which was passed in 1962 extending the Export Control Act until this year and making several amendments to the act. The most vital change made in the act at that time was to provide that the economic significance of exports, as well as their military significance, must be considered in weighing their effect on our national security.

I was completely convinced at that time and am equally convinced today that we must have a strong export control program. I regret very much to say that it appears the pattern over recent years has been toward weaker and weaker enforcement of the Export Control Act.

Total exports to the bloc have been increasing in volume over recent years. In addition, the nature of the exports to Communist bloc countries is a cause for much concern. Aside from certain food purchases, their buying here is to acquire equipment, supplies, and know-how essentially for the purpose of helping them to establish or build up industrial capability in vital areas of their economies. A good many of their purchases undoubtedly are to acquire items to serve as prototypes, in other words, items to study, evaluate, and copy.

A major aspect of the interest of the Soviet bloc countries in purchasing here is to acquire technical data. The emphasis is on acquiring information and technology in fields such as chemicals, petroleum refining, petrochemicals, synthetic fertilizers, synthetic fiber, and many others.

Here are some examples of items licensed for export to Communist countries recently.

On May 11, 1965, a license was granted to authorize shipment to Rumania of technical data, materials, and equipment valued at \$6,895,100 to construct and operate a fluid catalytic cracking unit with a capacity of 1,100 metric tons a year. This catalytic cracking unit is to produce gasoline, diesel fuel, distillate fuel oils. It also produces certain gases which can be converted to the production of petrochemicals.

Earlier this year a license was issued to authorize shipment to Rumania of technical data for a methane pipeline booster station. The station is a unit comprised of a 4,850-horsepower gas turbine driving a centrifugal compressor to boost the pressure on a 20-inch diameter pipeline carrying methane to Rumanian industrial facilities. This license was granted even though the Department of Commerce did not even know the route of the pipeline.

On May 13, 1964, an export license was granted authorizing shipment to Rumania of \$525,000 worth of tanks, gages, meters, valves, oil and gas separators, and other equipment for petroleum production.

Recently a license was granted authorizing the shipment of \$31,711 worth of ball and roller bearings to the U.S.S.R.

On March 3 of this year the Department of Commerce issued a license to clear for shipment to the U.S.S.R. technical data for the production of various chemical products such as ethylbenzene, styrene, and polystyrene. These products have a variety of industrial and domestic uses. Styrene is used in the production of various resins, styrene-butadiene rubber, polyesters, and exchange resins. Polystyrene is used for many items such as in packaging, refrigeration, air conditioners, electric coils, lamination of fabrics, wall tiles, records, and others. It is used as well for a large variety of military items.

A license was granted last year authorizing the sale of a \$13 million synthetic fiber process to Communist East Germany. Included was technical data for the design, engineering, construction, operation, repair, and maintenance of a plant. The location of the plant was not known.

The specific instances I have discussed here are only a few examples of items that are being cleared for export to the Communist bloc under the way the Export Control Act is being administered.

In addition to shortcomings in the administration of the Export Control Act, we are failing to achieve the maximum effectiveness of our COCOM arrangements, agreements we have with NATO countries and Japan to exercise controls on shipments of goods to the bloc. Instead of our working diligently toward making this really a cohesive, forceful working agreement, COCOM controls have been allowed to be watered down so that for practical purposes they have limited impact. Unfortunately, our reaction to the continued efforts on the part of other Nations to reduce COCOM

controls has been to acquiesce rather than to vigorously oppose. The result is that increasingly more important and strategic types of goods, materials, and data are being approved for sale to the Communists.

We are spending billions of dollars of the taxpayers' money and devoting the efforts of thousands of people to maintain adequate defenses against communism. It is tragically inconsistent with this effort to allow sales to the Communists of goods and data they can use to build up their military and economic potential and engage in economic warfare in world markets.

Basically I am in full support of the bill, H.R. 7105, to extend and amend the Export Control Act. This amendment to the bill is to help assure that the great stress by the Communist bloc on acquiring technical data and other know-how and information from the United States is clearly recognized.

The Export Control Act now authorizes the President to prohibit or curtail the exportation from the United States of "any articles, materials, or supplies, including technical data" which make a significant contribution to the military or economic potential of such nation which would prove detrimental to the national security and welfare of the United States. Section 4 of the bill before the House proposes to eliminate the words "technical data" and substitute the word "information." In essence all this amendment does is to leave the words "technical data" in the law.

According to the report on the bill the committee change is proposed for the purpose of making the prohibition all inclusive and to make it clear that the President is authorized to curtail or prohibit the exportation of all information, whether or not it could be labeled as "technical data." I am all for this but believe also that it is essential to underscore the fact that acquiring technical data from us to expand and improve the Communist bloc industrial capacity is a major purpose of the Communist bloc trade efforts. Therefore, in my view, it is necessary to keep this particular terminology in the bill so that there will be absolutely no question that this is fully recognized. The amendment proposed to the bill would do just this. It would amend the bill to leave the term "technical data" in the present law unchanged but would add language to provide that exports of any other kind of information could be prohibited or curtailed, in line with the committee recommendation.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California.

The amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the committee amendment, as amended.

The committee amendment, as amended, was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. DENTON, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of

the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 7105) to provide for continuation of authority for regulation of exports, and for other purposes, pursuant to House Resolution 412, he reported the bill back to the House with an amendment adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

The question is on the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

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

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 388, nays 1, not voting 44, as follows:

[Roll No. 127]
YEAS—388

- | | | |
|------------------|-----------------|-----------------|
| Abbutt | Conable | Gettys |
| Abernethy | Conte | Gialmo |
| Adair | Conyers | Gibbons |
| Adams | Cooley | Gilbert |
| Addabbo | Corbett | Gilligan |
| Albert | Corman | Gonzalez |
| Anderson, Ill. | Craley | Grabowski |
| Anderson, Tenn. | Cramer | Gray |
| Andrews | Culver | Green, Pa. |
| Glenn | Cunningham | Greigg |
| Andrews, N. Dak. | Curtin | Griider |
| Annunzio | Curtis | Griffin |
| Arends | Daddario | Griffiths |
| Ashley | Dague | Gross |
| Ashmore | Daniels | Grover |
| Aspinall | Davis, Ga. | Gubser |
| Ayres | Davis, Wis. | Gurney |
| Baldwin | Dawson | Hagan, Ga. |
| Bandstra | de la Garza | Hagen, Calif. |
| Barrett | Delaney | Haley |
| Bates | Dent | Hall |
| Battin | Denton | Halpern |
| Beckworth | Derwinski | Hamilton |
| Belcher | Devine | Hanley |
| Bennett | Dickinson | Hanna |
| Berry | Diggs | Hansen, Idaho |
| Betts | Dingell | Hansen, Iowa |
| Bingham | Dole | Hansen, Wash. |
| Blatnik | Donohue | Hardy |
| Boggs | Dow | Harris |
| Boland | Dowdy | Harsha |
| Bolling | Dulski | Hathaway |
| Bolton | Duncan, Tenn. | Hawkins |
| Brademas | Dwyer | Hays |
| Brock | Dyal | Hechler |
| Brooks | Edmondson | Henderson |
| Broomfield | Edwards, Calif. | Herlong |
| Brown, Calif. | Ellsworth | Hicks |
| Broyhill, N.C. | Erlenborn | Hollifield |
| Broyhill, Va. | Evans, Colo. | Horton |
| Buchanan | Everett | Hosmer |
| Burke | Fallon | Howard |
| Burleson | Farbstein | Hull |
| Burton, Calif. | Farnsley | Hungate |
| Burton, Utah | Farnum | Huot |
| Byrne, Pa. | Fascell | Hutchinson |
| Byrnes, Wis. | Feighan | Ichord |
| Cahill | Findley | Irwin |
| Callan | Fino | Jarman |
| Carey | Fisher | Jennings |
| Carter | Flood | Joelson |
| Casey | Foley | Johnson, Calif. |
| Celler | Ford, Gerald R. | Johnson, Okla. |
| Chamberlain | Ford, | Johnson, Pa. |
| Cheif | William D. | Jonas |
| Clancy | Fountain | Jones, Ala. |
| Clark | Fraser | Jones, Mo. |
| Clausen, | Frelinghuysen | Karsten |
| Don H. | Friedel | Karth |
| Cleveland | Fulton, Pa. | Kastenmeyer |
| Clevenger | Fulton, Tenn. | Kee |
| Cohelan | Fuqua | Keith |
| Colmer | Gallagher | Kelly |
| | Garmatz | Keogh |
| | Gathings | King, Calif. |

- | | | |
|---------------|----------------|-----------------|
| King, N.Y. | O'Hara, Ill. | Selden |
| King, Utah | O'Hara, Mich. | Senner |
| Kirwan | O'Konski | Shiplee |
| Kluczynski | Olsen, Mont. | Shriver |
| Kornegay | Olson, Minn. | Sickles |
| Krebs | O'Neal, Ga. | Sikes |
| Kunkel | O'Neill, Mass. | Sisk |
| Laird | Ottinger | Skubitz |
| Langen | Passman | Slack |
| Latta | Patman | Smith, Calif. |
| Lennon | Patten | Smith, Iowa |
| Lindsay | Pelly | Smith, N.Y. |
| Lipscomb | Pepper | Springer |
| Long, La. | Perkins | Stafford |
| Long, Md. | Philbin | Stalbaum |
| Love | Pickle | Stanton |
| McCarthy | Pike | Steed |
| McClary | Pirnie | Stratton |
| McCulloch | Poage | Stubblefield |
| McDade | Pool | Sullivan |
| McDowell | Price | Sweeney |
| McEwen | Pucinski | Talcott |
| McFall | Quie | Taylor |
| McGrath | Quillen | Teague, Calif. |
| McMillan | Race | Teague, Tex. |
| Macdonald | Randall | Tenzer |
| MacGregor | Redlin | Thomas |
| Machen | Reid, Ill. | Thompson, La. |
| Mackie | Reid, N.Y. | Thompson, N.J. |
| Madden | Reifel | Thompson, Tex. |
| Mahon | Reinecke | Thompson, Wis. |
| Mailliard | Resnick | Todd |
| Marsh | Reuss | Trimble |
| Martin, Ala. | Rhodes, Ariz. | Tuck |
| Martin, Mass. | Rhodes, Pa. | Tunney |
| Martin, Nebr. | Rivers, Fla. | Tupper |
| Mathias | Rivers, S.C. | Tuten |
| Matthias | Roberts | Udall |
| May | Robison | Ullman |
| Meeds | Rodino | Utt |
| Miller | Rogers, Colo. | Van Deerlin |
| Mills | Rogers, Fla. | Vanik |
| Minish | Rogers, Tex. | Vigorito |
| Mink | Ronan | Vivian |
| Minshall | Roncalio | Waggoner |
| Mize | Rooney, N.Y. | Walker, Miss. |
| Moeller | Rooney, Pa. | Walker, N. Mex. |
| Monagan | Roosevelt | Watkins |
| Moore | Rosenthal | Watts |
| Moorhead | Rostenkowski | Weitner |
| Morgan | Roudebush | Whalley |
| Morris | Roush | White, Idaho |
| Morrison | Roybal | White, Tex. |
| Morse | Rumsfeld | Whitener |
| Morton | Ryan | Whitten |
| Mosher | Satterfield | Widnall |
| Moss | St Germain | Williams |
| Multer | St. Onge | Wilson, Bob |
| Murphy, Ill. | Saylor | Wolf |
| Murphy, N.Y. | Scheuer | Wright |
| Murray | Schisler | Wyatt |
| Natcher | Schmidhauser | Wydler |
| Nedzi | Schneebell | Yates |
| Nelsen | Schweiker | Young |
| Nix | Secret | Younger |
| O'Brien | Goodell | Zablocki |

NAYS—1

NOT VOTING—44

- | | | |
|---------------|---------------|------------|
| Andrews, | Downing | McVicker |
| George W. | Duncan, Oreg. | Mackay |
| Ashbrook | Edwards, Ala. | Matsunaga |
| Baring | Evins, Tenn. | Michel |
| Bell | Flynt | Poff |
| Bonner | Fogarty | Powell |
| Bow | Green, Oreg. | Purcell |
| Bray | Halleck | Smith, Va. |
| Brown, Ohio | Harvey, Ind. | Staggers |
| Cabell | Harvey, Mich. | Stephens |
| Callaway | Hébert | Toil |
| Cameron | Helstoski | Willis |
| Cederberg | Holland | Wilson, |
| Clawson, Del. | Jacobs | Charles H. |
| Coilner | Landrum | |
| Dorn | Leggett | |

So the bill was passed.
The Clerk announced the following pairs:

- Mr. Hébert with Mr. Halleck.
- Mr. Fogarty with Mr. Brown of Ohio.
- Mr. Smith of Virginia with Mr. Poff.
- Mr. Evins of Tennessee with Mr. Ashbrook.
- Mr. Dorn with Mr. Callaway.
- Mr. Cabell with Mr. Edwards of Alabama.
- Mr. Helstoski with Mr. Harvey of Indiana.
- Mr. Jacobs with Mr. Cederberg.
- Mr. Powell with Mr. Del Clawson.
- Mr. Staggers with Mr. Bray.

Mr. Toll with Mr. Collier.
 Mr. Willis with Mr. Bow.
 Mr. Charles H. Wilson with Mr. Bell.
 Mr. Mackay with Mr. Michel.
 Mr. Downing with Mr. Harvey of Michigan.
 Mr. Bonner with Mr. Baring.
 Mr. Cameron with Mr. Duncan of Oregon.
 Mr. Flynt with Mrs. Green of Oregon.
 Mr. Purcell with Mr. Matsunaga.
 Mr. Landon with Mr. Leggett.
 Mr. George W. Andrews with Mr. Stephens.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may be allowed 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and to include therein any relevant explanatory matters in connection therewith.

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

There was no objection.

ADDITION TO THE PROGRAM FOR THIS WEEK

Mr. ALBERT. 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 Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I take this time to advise the House of an addition to the program. Following the disposition of the bill H.R. 8464, to increase the debt limit, we are adding House Concurrent Resolution 285 to distribute and show the John F. Kennedy film. Mr. Speaker, in order to dispose of these matters tomorrow on schedule it is hoped that we may meet early. Therefore, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet at 11 o'clock tomorrow.

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

There was no objection.

GENERAL HOUSING BILL

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. Speaker, I am hopeful that President Johnson's general housing bill, H.R. 7984, will be scheduled for floor action in the very near future. This is one of the most important pieces of domestic legislation which will be considered by the House this year. It covers nearly all of our programs in the field of housing and community development and is needed to extend and improve those programs.

It has become apparent that the opposition has singled out the President's pro-

posal for rent supplements as the focus of their attack. This is the program which President Johnson has called "the most crucial new instrument in our effort to improve American cities." I think it is most unfortunate that they have chosen to concentrate on a program designed to help lower income families to obtain decent housing. Those are the people who would be the victims if the opposition is successful—families whose income is too low to afford decent housing and who, in addition, are elderly or handicapped, now living in slum housing, or displaced by Government action. As is clearly set forth in the bill, these are the people who would be eligible and these are the people who would lose if we should fail to keep the rent supplement in the bill.

Personally, I am confident that a majority of this House will vote in support of the rent-supplement program. Over the years we have lived up to our responsibility to achieve the goal set forth in the Housing Act of 1949. That goal is "a decent home and a suitable environment for every American family." I cannot believe that the 89th Congress will turn its back on that objective or on low-income families.

Mr. Speaker, the proposed rent supplement program would build on our very successful 4 years of experience under the below-market interest rate program under FHA section 221(d)(3). While that program has suffered from the steady rise in interest rates, it has been meeting a need for rental and cooperative housing within the means of our middle income families. This program, which would be extended for 4 years by the housing bill, has reached a level of approximately 400,000 units a year. The proposed rent supplement would differ in that the interest rate would be sufficiently high to attract private financing and therefore take the mortgage money out of the budget, and instead would provide rent supplements which would enable the proposed program to get down even lower in the income scale.

The way that the rent supplement program would operate is very simple:

First. The housing would be rental and cooperative housing built under FHA section 221(d)(3).

Second. The sponsors would be limited to nonprofit and limited dividend corporations and cooperatives.

Third. The mortgages would bear market interest rates and the housing would be privately financed, thereby reducing the impact on the Federal budget.

Fourth. The families to be aided would be low income families who cannot afford decent private housing by paying one-fourth of their income.

Fifth. The income ceilings would be set individually for each community to reflect different cost levels and would differ by size of family.

Sixth. In addition to being low income, the family would have to be either elderly or handicapped, displaced by Government action, or now living in substandard housing.

Seventh. The family would pay one-fourth of its income for rent and the rent supplement would make up the difference between that amount and the fair market rental of the unit.

Eighth. Finally, when a family's income rose to the point where one-fourth of its income would cover the rent, the supplement payments would stop.

Mr. Speaker, this new program would accomplish a number of things. It would make a net addition to the supply of decent housing available to low income groups. It would enlist the energy and imagination of churches, unions, and civic-minded private citizens. It would complement the existing public housing program and offer low income families another alternative to the choice between slums or regular public housing. It would reduce the impact on the Federal budget of direct Government financing of the whole cost of a unit. Also it would provide a flexible formula that would extend aid to families when they need it, curtail that aid when their incomes rose, and terminate when they could afford housing on their own without the painful necessity of evicting them as is the case in public housing.

Mr. Speaker, the President's rent supplement proposal embodied in section 101 of the housing bill is one of the best new proposals in many years to help the housing problems of low income families, and I urge our colleagues to support section 101, as well as the entire bill, when the bill reaches the floor.

BEAUTY IN THE LONE STAR STATE

Mr. THOMPSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. THOMPSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, every once in a while, I pause to reflect on the institutions that flourish as a part of the Washington scene. One of the most interesting, and perhaps one of the most essential, is the columnist. I, being human, have my pets and as I look them over from time to time, I find that I stick closest to those who are the most objective. Occasionally, I read the writings of one of the other kind—the guy who flourishes by "innuendoes."

Of course, those of us in public office are used to such things, but somehow it always goes against the grain when a columnist has nothing better to do than to hurl barbs at some of the great ladies who carry on their work, sometimes behind the scenes and sometimes in the public eye, basically helping make a success of whatever their husbands may be doing.

The first one that I recall to come under the columnists' guns was that great lady of the whole world, Eleanor Roosevelt. It carries right on down to our present First Lady whose loyalty and devotion to her husband are particularly well known to the old timers in the Texas delegation. We knew her "when."

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

225. By Mr. COHELAN: Petition of Mr. Charles H. Knapper and several others of Berkeley and Oakland, Calif., in support of the challenge brought by the Mississippi Freedom Democratic Party; to the Committee on House Administration.

226. By Mr. RYAN: Resolution of the Council of the City of New York urging that all Congressmen from the State of New York, and particularly the Congressmen from the city of New York, vote to unseat the five Congressmen from the State of Mississippi until such time as a congressional delegation is elected from that State through the operation of an electoral system open to all people without regard to race or color and conducted in a manner in accord with the Constitution of the United States and further urging that the Congressmen from the State and city of New York support the calling and holding of special elections following a period of open voter registration to be carried out under Federal supervision; to the Committee on House Administration.

SENATE

WEDNESDAY, JUNE 9, 1965

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, and was called to order by the President pro tempore.

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

O Thou compassionate Father of us all, without whom life has no destiny but dust: Strengthen, we pray, with Thy wisdom and might those who here speak for the Nation, that the strain of these fateful days may not break their spirits, and that no denials of human freedom now loose in the world may intimidate their souls.

Enrich our attitudes and actions, we beseech Thee, with the love for our fellows, without whose golden gleam all we say, though we speak with the tongues of men and angels, is but as tinkling cymbals.

When the problems which confront these servants of Thine and of the Republic under Thee seem insoluble; when the very principles for which brave men have died, and are now dying, are basely betrayed, as fair dreams seem to sink into the sands of futility, still may they labor on, serene and confident, knowing that while the weeping for hopes deferred may endure for a night, the joy of Thy sure victory cometh in the morning.

In the dear Redeemer's name, we pray. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Tuesday, June 8, 1965, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

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

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Hackney, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed the following bills, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 396. An act to provide that until June 30, 1969, Congress shall be notified of certain proposed public land actions;

H.R. 7105. An act to provide for continuation of authority for regulation of exports, and for other purposes; and

H.R. 8775. An act making appropriations for the legislative branch for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, and for other purposes.

HOUSE BILLS REFERRED

The following bills were severally read twice by their titles and referred as indicated:

H.R. 396. An act to provide that until June 30, 1969, Congress shall be notified of certain proposed public land actions; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 7105. An act to provide for continuation of authority for regulation of exports, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 8775. An act making appropriations for the legislative branch for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Appropriations.

REPORT OF A COMMITTEE SUBMITTED DURING ADJOURNMENT

Under authority of the order of the Senate of Tuesday, June 8, 1965, the following report of a committee was submitted on June 8, 1965:

By Mr. ROBERTSON, from the Committee on Banking and Currency, with amendments:

S. 1698. A bill to amend the Bank Merger Act so as to provide that bank mergers, whether accomplished by the acquisition of stock or assets or in any other way, are subject exclusively to the provisions of the Bank Merger Act, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 299).

LIMITATION ON STATEMENTS DURING TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE MORNING BUSINESS

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, statements during the transaction of routine morning business were ordered limited to 3 minutes.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSION

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the Subcommittee on the Judiciary of the Committee on the District of Columbia, the Subcommittee on Constitutional Rights of the Committee on the Judiciary, the Committee on Banking and Currency, and the Subcommittee on Employment and Manpower of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare were authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to consider executive business.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Montana.

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

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

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

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

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. If there be no reports of committees, the clerk will state the nominations on the Executive Calendar.

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Fred J. Nichol, of South Dakota, to be U.S. district judge for South Dakota.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Irving Hill, of California, to be U.S. district judge for the southern district of California.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, the Senate is about to confirm the nomination of a distinguished California judge and lawyer to be U.S. district judge for the southern district of the State that I have the honor, in part, to represent. I now rise for a moment to say that my fellow Californian whose nomination is about to be confirmed, Irving Hill, of Los Angeles, will be an excellent member of the judiciary. The bench, the bar, and the people of my State are honored that the President of the United States should have seen fit to nominate him for Federal judicial service.

This Nebraska-born lawyer, whose college and law school days reflected an outstanding record of education, during which he became a member of Phi Beta Kappa, served his country in World War II, with combat service in the Atlantic. He served his country in peacetime as an attorney for the Antitrust Division of the U.S. Department of Justice, as assistant to the General Counsel of the Bonneville Power Administration, as special assistant to two U.S. Attorneys General, Clark and Biddle, and as legal adviser to the U.S. delegation to the United Nations Economic and Social Council. He served the people of California as a member of the highest trial court in our State. He brings with him to Federal judicial service a relatively long career as lawyer and judge in a relatively young life.

What is it that constitutes a good judge? Honor, integrity, education, sound judgment, and devotion to the high public trust which the judicial establishment, State or Federal, requires, always tempered by compassion. In my judgment, that would describe the happy qualifications which Irving Hill has. I am glad to spread my views on this record as the Senate proceeds to confirm the nomination.

and Public Welfare, the Subcommittee on Constitutional Rights and the Subcommittee on Constitutional Amendments of the Committee on the Judiciary, and the Subcommittee on Intergovernmental Relations of the Committee on Government Operations were authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the Subcommittee on Health, Education, Welfare, and Safety of the Committee on the District of Columbia was authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. CHURCH, from the Committee on Foreign Relations, without amendment:

S. 1903. A bill to amend the United Nations Participation Act, as amended (63 Stat. 734-736) (Rept. No. 360).

By Mr. CHURCH, from the Committee on Foreign Relations, with an amendment:

S.J. Res. 71. Joint resolution to amend the joint resolution of January 28, 1948, providing for membership and participation by the United States in the South Pacific Commission (Rept. No. 361).

By Mr. FULBRIGHT, from the Committee on Foreign Relations, without amendment:

S. 1760. A bill to authorize the acceptance of a settlement of certain indebtedness of Greece to the United States and to authorize the use of the payments resulting from the settlement for a cultural and educational exchange program (Rept. No. 362).

By Mr. ROBERTSON, from the Committee on Banking and Currency, without amendment:

H.R. 7105. An act to provide for continuation of authority for regulation of exports, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 363).

By Mr. BARTLETT, from the Committee on Commerce, without amendment:

H.R. 5988. An act to provide that Commissioners of the Federal Maritime Commission shall hereafter be appointed for a term of 5 years, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 364).

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED

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

By Mr. AIKEN:

S. 2178. A bill to establish the Robert Frost National Historic Site in the State of Vermont, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. PROUTY:

S. 2179. A bill for the relief of Serafin Singla and Teresa Tornos Singla; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MCGEE (for himself and Mr. Moss):

S. 2180. A bill to improve the safety of railroad transportation under the jurisdiction of the Interstate Commerce Commission; to the Committee on Commerce.

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

By Mr. LONG of Missouri:

S. 2181. A bill for the relief of Israel Giladi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MCGOVERN:

S. 2182. A bill to revise the boundary of Jewel Cave National Monument in the State of South Dakota, and for other purposes;

to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. MUNDT:

S. 2183. A bill to revise the boundary of Jewel Cave National Monument in the State of South Dakota, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. JAVITS (for himself and Mr. MURPHY):

S. 2184. A bill to require clinical laboratories which transact business in interstate commerce to comply with minimum standards prescribed by the Surgeon General in the performance of laboratory procedures, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

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

By Mr. INOUE:

S. 2185. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to establish eligibility for burial in national cemeteries, and for other purposes," approved May 14, 1948, so as to permit the parents of certain persons to be buried in national cemeteries; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. ERVIN:

S. 2186. A bill conferring jurisdiction upon the U.S. Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of Bernard J. Campbell; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ANDERSON (for himself and Mr. MONTORA):

S.J. Res. 92. Joint resolution authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to establish a memorial museum at Las Vegas, N. Mex., in honor of the Roosevelt Rough Riders; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

IMPROVEMENT OF SAFETY OF RAILROAD TRANSPORTATION UNDER THE JURISDICTION OF THE INTERSTATE COMMERCE COMMISSION

Mr. MCGEE. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference, with my good friend the junior Senator from Utah [Mr. Moss], a bill to improve the safety of railroad transportation under the jurisdiction of the Interstate Commerce Commission.

This bill would do this by reducing the maximum permissible number of continuous hours that a railroad employee may work from 16 to 12. This bill would make it unlawful for any railroad to require or permit an employee to continue on duty after 12 consecutive hours or to go back on duty if he has not had at least 8 consecutive off-duty hours in the preceding 24-hour period.

Mr. President, it seems obvious to me that in a profession such as railroading where there is rapid movement and heavy equipment that the chance for accident and injury increases markedly when employees are fatigued from long hours of service. Therefore, I think this bill would go a long way toward promoting safety on the railroads and I hope it shall be given prompt consideration by the Congress. I would note that an exemption is provided for crews of wreck trains or relief trains, who may be allowed to remain on duty to clear the scene of a wreck or for other emergency duties.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be held at the desk until July 9 so that any of my colleagues

who so desire may join me in sponsorship.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be held at the desk, as requested by the Senator from Wyoming.

The bill (S. 2180) to improve the safety of railroad transportation under the jurisdiction of the Interstate Commerce Commission, introduced by Mr. MCGEE (for himself and Mr. Moss), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

REGULATION OF LABELING OF CIGARETTES

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the amendment of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 559) to regulate the labeling of cigarettes, and for other purposes, which was, to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That this Act may be cited as the "Federal Cigarette Labeling and Advertising Act".

FINDINGS

SEC. 2. The Congress hereby makes the following findings:

(a) A Federal program dealing with cigarette labeling and advertising is desirable to provide national uniformity in labeling and advertising requirements for the cigarette industry.

(b) The production, processing and distribution of cigarettes, the employment directly and indirectly resulting therefrom, and the revenues derived from taxes imposed thereon, affect commerce and the national economy.

DECLARATION OF POLICY

SEC. 3. It is the policy of the Congress, and the purpose of this Act, to establish a comprehensive Federal program to deal with cigarette labeling and advertising with respect to any relationship between smoking and health, whereby—

(a) the public may be adequately informed that cigarette smoking may be hazardous to health by inclusion of a warning to that effect on each package of cigarettes.

(b) Commerce and the national economy may be (1) protected to the maximum extent consistent with this declared policy and (2) not impeded by diverse, nonuniform, and confusing cigarette labeling and advertising regulations with respect to any relationship between smoking and health.

DEFINITIONS

SEC. 4. As used in this Act—

(a) "Cigarette" means any roll of tobacco or other substance wrapped in paper or in any substance other than tobacco, and intended for smoking.

(b) "Commerce" means (1) commerce between any State, the District of Columbia, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, Guam, the Virgin Islands, American Samoa, Wake Island, Midway Islands, Kingman Reef, or Johnson Island and any place outside thereof; (2) commerce between points in any State, the District of Columbia, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, Guam, the Virgin Islands, American Samoa, Wake Island, Midway Islands, Kingman Reef, or Johnson Island, but through any place outside thereof; or (3) commerce wholly within the District of Columbia, Guam, the Virgin Islands, American Samoa, Wake Island, Midway Islands, Kingman Reef, or Johnson Island.

(c) "United States," when used in a geographical sense, includes the several States, the District of Columbia, the Commonwealth

by the Mutual Educational and Cultural Exchange Act of 1961, as amended (22 U.S.C. 2451-2458), in relation to Greece and the people of Greece.

BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (H.R. 7105) to provide for continuation of authority for regulation of exports, and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

INCREASE IN AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS FOR THE GORGAS MEMORIAL LABORATORY

The bill (S. 511) to increase the authorization of appropriations for the support of the Gorgas Memorial Laboratory was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

S. 511

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, effective for fiscal years ending after June 30, 1963, the first section of the Act entitled "An Act to authorize a permanent annual appropriation for the maintenance and operation of the Gorgas Memorial Laboratory", approved May 7, 1928, as amended (45 Stat. 491; 22 U.S.C. 278), is amended by striking out "\$250,000" and inserting in lieu thereof "\$500,000".

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 365), explaining the purposes of the bill.

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

EXPLANATION

S. 511 would increase the annual authorization for appropriations for the Gorgas Memorial Laboratory from \$250,000 to \$500,000.

This increase is required to maintain the research program of the Laboratory at an optimum level and make the most effective utilization of the additional research space that was provided by the enactment of Public Law 86-617.

BACKGROUND

The Gorgas Memorial Laboratory is the medical-research component of the Gorgas Memorial Institute of Tropical and Preventive Medicine. The Laboratory was established in 1929 through legislative agreement between the Governments of the United States and the Republic of Panama. It has long maintained close relations with the U.S. Public Health Service and its National Institute of Allergy and Infectious Diseases.

Located in Panama City, the Republic of Panama, its Laboratory is an internationally known research center in tropical medicine and parasitology. It has made important research contributions through (1) the valuable information it has gathered relating to organisms and their environment; and (2) its investigations of malaria, yellow fever, various types of encephalitis, and other diseases and conditions.

As a result of the addition of a new half-million-dollar facility, the Laboratory has been able to extend its research activities and to undertake new projects in experimental pathology, serology, tissue culture, comparative vertebrate zoology, and epidemiology. Its facilities are utilized by specialists

in tropical diseases from the United States and many other countries. The members of its staff are widely recognized for their achievements in tropical medicine.

In 1964, Dr. Martin D. Young was appointed Director of the Laboratory. Dr. Young is distinguished for his outstanding achievements in research on tropical medicine. He has won international renown for his work on malaria, particularly while Director of the Field Section of the Public Health Service Malaria Laboratory of Parasite Chemotherapy, Columbia, S.C.

The research activities have implications that extend beyond the tropics. Many of the human and animal diseases that flourish in tropical regions are also found in, or may spread to, the temperate zones. The United States depends on many tropical areas for a large share of its important strategic materials. The output of these areas is adversely influenced by debilitating infections of man and by diseases of meat-food animals that deprive the populations of sources of dietary protein and that contribute to undernourishment and the prevalence of nutritional disorders.

The Laboratory is performing a valuable, needed service in offering opportunities for field training in tropical diseases. It cooperates with the program of Louisiana State University fellowships in tropical medicine, under which teachers and research workers in disciplines relating to tropical medicine are able to take training tours of the Caribbean or Middle America in order to familiarize themselves with local research activities and to view clinical cases characteristic of the areas visited. The Army and Navy assign scientists to the Laboratory for various periods, to receive training and to participate in the research program.

The Laboratory occupies an ideal location for the study of certain viruses. Many of these viruses have been found to cause disease in man and to have extensive geographic distribution. In tropical America, the natural vectors and reservoir hosts may be readily investigated, and serologic surveys of human populations subject to infections may be conducted.

In one of its continuing research projects, the Laboratory is investigating yellow fever in areas near the Panama Canal and in eastern Panama. In an effort to discover a means of preventing the northward extension of the disease, Laboratory investigators are seeking to determine the factors which inhibit or favor passage of the virus from South into Middle America.

The Laboratory collaborates with many other research and public health organizations, including the Middle America Research Unit, a laboratory in the Canal Zone operated by the National Institute of Allergy and Infectious Diseases in collaboration with the Walter Reed Army Institute of Research. One cooperative endeavor was work on eastern equine encephalomyelitis.

The Laboratory has utilized its position on the Isthmus of Panama, a "crossroads of the world," to take advantage of many rich opportunities for research in tropical medicine. With its new and enlarged laboratory facilities, it has a modern research plant that will enable it to intensify and augment its work on broad problems of growing importance to the health of the Americas and of the world.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, that concludes the call of the calendar at this time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further morning business?

ALCOHOLISM—A SURVEY

Mrs. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, the addiction to alcoholic drinking—

alcoholism—is the fourth most serious health problem, after heart disease, cancer, and mental illness, in the United States today. According to the latest figures from the Public Health Service there are approximately 5 million alcoholics in our Nation. Four and a half percent of our total population over 20 years of age are alcoholics. School officials are becoming aware that an increasing number of school dropouts are due to teenage alcoholism. A recent study has demonstrated that in the past 10 years there has been an 18-percent increase in the admissions to mental institutions due to alcoholism. The losses in earnings and production due to alcoholic employees is costing American business and industry billions of dollars each year.

Clearly, one does not have to be a prohibitionist to be concerned with a medical, social, and economic problem of this magnitude. I have joined with the junior Senator from South Dakota and others in urging the President to call a White House Conference on Alcoholism and have welcomed the President's appointment of a study commission in the Public Health Service to lay the groundwork for such a meeting, perhaps to be held next year.

During the past 2 months the Christian Science Monitor has been carrying a series of articles on alcoholism in the United States and abroad. I ask unanimous consent that the articles be printed in the RECORD.

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

[From the Christian Science Monitor, Mar. 25, 1965]

EMPTY CHAIRS AROUND THE WORLD

The alcoholic drinking menace assails virtually every facet of world society today.

Few problems are at once so damaging and yet so controversial. On the one hand, individual well-being and the stability of families and careers, corporations, and campuses are widely threatened. On the other hand, age-old pro-drink customs, traditions, and beliefs are still strong.

Communications media on every hand glorify the presumed attractions of alcoholic drinking through a great variety of advertisements. Liquor imbibing is matched with manliness, pleasure, conviviality, prestige, career, and social success.

VIOLENCE IS EVERYDAY NEWS

Once targeted only for a male audience, advertisements today bring women into the picture—not yet portrayed actually drinking but shown holding a drink or admiring the man who indulges.

Movies and plays portray the drunk for comedy or ridicule, making only rare efforts to point up the tragedies of habitual alcoholic drinking or the urgent need for understanding and treatment of the problem.

News items almost daily report violence and degradation directly linked to alcoholic addictions.

U.S. authorities devote much time and money to detecting and prosecuting the "moonshiners" who produce illegal and often lethal alcoholic beverages.

Many nations are mounting substantial treatment and rehabilitation programs for alcoholics. Others are far behind the problem.

LOSS OF CONTROL DOUBTED

To ascertain the precise dimensions of this subject, the Christian Science Monitor

The House recesses with a clerical amendment.

Amendment No. 4: The first section of the bill as passed by both the House and the Senate amends the permanent provisions of the tariff schedules to provide an exemption from duty for \$100 worth (fair retail value) of articles acquired abroad; except that in the case of persons arriving directly or indirectly from American Samoa, Guam, or the Virgin Islands of the United States, the exemption is \$200 (fair retail value) not more than \$100 of which may have been acquired elsewhere than in such insular possessions. Under the bill as passed by the House the amendments apply with respect to persons arriving in the United States on or after July 1, 1965. Under Senate amendment No. 4, the amendments apply with respect to persons arriving in the United States on or after October 1, 1965.

Section 2 of the bill as passed by both the House and the Senate changes the basis for valuation from wholesale value to fair retail value in the case of the \$10 maximum exemption for gifts received from abroad, the \$10 maximum exemption for persons arriving from abroad who are not entitled to a personal exemption, and the \$1 exemption for other importations. Under the bill as passed by the House the amendments made by section 2 applied with respect to articles arriving in the United States on or after July 1, 1965. Under Senate amendment No. 4 the amendments apply with respect to articles arriving in the United States on or after October 1, 1965.

Under Senate amendment No. 4, the amendment made by the new section added to the bill by Senate amendment No. 3 applies with respect to persons arriving in the United States after the date of the enactment of the bill.

The House recesses.

WILBUR D. MILLS,
CECIL R. KING,
HALE BOGGS,
JOHN W. BYRNES,
THOMAS B. CURTIS,

Managers on the Part of the House.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the conference report on the bill (H.R. 8147) to amend the Tariff Schedules of the United States with respect to the exemption from duty for returning residents, and for other purposes.

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

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I assume we are going to have an explanation on what took place in the conference.

Mr. MILLS. Absolutely. We will have the statement of the managers on the part of the House read plus an explanation, if desired.

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

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the statement be read in lieu of the report.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 3 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, the House bill would have established a permanent \$100 exemption based on retail value for U.S. residents

returning from abroad except that in the case of persons arriving from American Samoa, Guam or the Virgin Islands the exemption was doubled provided not more than half of the exemption shall have been acquired elsewhere than in these insular possessions. Under the House bill, the articles would be entitled to duty and tax exemption if accompanying the returning resident or if shipped to him later. Senate amendment No. 1 eliminated the "articles to follow" privilege; that is, the exemption would apply only to articles accompanying the returning resident. The House recessed from its disagreement to Senate amendment No. 1.

In the House bill, the 1-gallon liquor allowance under the existing law was reduced to 1 quart except that in the case of tourists returning through American Samoa, Guam, or the Virgin Islands, they would be allowed 1 gallon provided not more than 1 quart was acquired elsewhere than in the insular possessions. Under Senate amendment No. 2, the quantity admitted free of duty would be limited to 1 quart in all cases. Under the conference agreement, the provisions of the bill as passed by the House, are restored with a technical amendment, the net result of which would be to allow U.S. residents returning from American possessions to include in their exemption 1 gallon of liquor provided not over a quart of it was acquired elsewhere than in the insular possessions. Of course, to receive the exemption, the liquor would have to accompany the person. In all cases, the liquor allowance is limited to persons 21 years of age or over.

Senate amendment No. 3 extends existing law 3 months, until October 1, 1965. The House conferees recessed on this. Senate amendment No. 4 makes October 1, 1965 the effective date of the permanent provision. The House conferees agreed to this.

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

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

Mr. GROSS. So, that takes care of the tourist season for this year?

Mr. MILLS. I assume the tourist season for this year was considered in connection with this amendment.

Mr. GROSS. And, so, it is not any help to the deficit in the balance of payments?

Mr. MILLS. Let me be serious in my answer to the gentleman from Iowa. Actually, there are a number of people who had already made arrangements to go abroad. They are now abroad. No doubt they have already made purchases. I assume the distinguished minority leader of the other body must have had this in mind in offering his amendment.

The question was whether or not we would very promptly and quickly—some might say abruptly—make this change from \$100 wholesale value to \$100 retail value. Bear this in mind, \$100 wholesale value means about \$166 retail value. So there is not actually as much of a difference for the 3 months as one might otherwise assume there would be. The

conference committee thought this was a reasonable amendment.

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

Mr. MILLS. Yes.

Mr. GROSS. I thought the President of the United States was very much concerned over the balance-of-payments situation.

Mr. MILLS. I am sure he is quite interested in it.

Mr. GROSS. And, I thought he was thus concerned as to this legislation. I assumed that the restrictions would be put on immediately, hard and fast.

Now does the gentleman from Arkansas think the President will sign this bill?

Mr. MILLS. Yes; I have every reason to believe that he will, because if the President does not sign it by midnight—

Mr. GROSS. If he does sign it he will not be meaning what he says, will he?

Mr. MILLS. Bear in mind this, that if the President does not sign this bill by midnight tonight, then tomorrow morning a returning tourist could bring back into the United States \$500 in wholesale value of products purchased abroad, exempt from all tax and exempt from all duties.

Mr. GROSS. All right; but that is only part of what he asked for, is it not?

Mr. MILLS. He asked initially for a reduction in the duty-free exemption to \$50, as the gentleman from Iowa recalls.

Mr. GROSS. That is what I mean.

Mr. MILLS. And it was the decision within the Committee on Ways and Means to establish the exemption at \$100 retail value, and put it on a permanent basis.

Mr. GROSS. I hope the President says what he means and means what he says. I think this would be a pretty good test of that, whether he signs this bill or not.

Mr. MILLS. I would not encourage the President, if I were the gentleman from Iowa, not to sign this bill, because I know the gentleman from Iowa feels as I do, that returning tourists should not have the privilege after midnight tonight of bringing back as much as \$500 wholesale value of products abroad with no duty being paid on them.

Mr. GROSS. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the conference report.

The previous question was ordered.

The conference report was agreed to.

CONTINUATION OF AUTHORITY FOR REGULATION OF EXPORTS

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H.R. 7105) to provide for continuation of authority for regulation of exports, and for other purposes, 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 4, line 10, strike out "agreements" and insert "agreements,".

Page 4, line 10, strike out "have" and insert "has".

Page 5, line 6, after "Act" insert "and shall require that all domestic concerns receiving requests for the furnishing of information or the signing of agreements as specified in section 2(4) must report this fact to the Secretary of Commerce for such action as he may deem appropriate to carry out the purposes of section 2(4)".

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

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, is this the export control legislation about which the gentleman from New York spoke to me earlier?

Mr. PATMAN. Yes.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. The House version, as I understand it, is intact with the exception of one Senate amendment that requires that an American business concern that receives an inquiry must report the receipt of that inquiry to the Department of Commerce; otherwise it is the House version of the legislation?

Mr. PATMAN. Yes.

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

There was no objection.

The Senate amendments were concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND REMARKS

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks in the RECORD on this bill, and to include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. 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 Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I take this time for the purpose of asking the distinguished majority leader the schedule for tomorrow, and the possible program for next week.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, the legislative program for the remainder of the week, so far as I know, will be the conference report on the District of Columbia appropriation bill that the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. NATCHER] intends to call up tomorrow.

We hope to have a program ready tomorrow. We expect to meet pro forma on Friday, and adjourn until Tuesday. I would like to withhold information on the program until tomorrow afternoon.

PROTEST AGAINST SPEECH BY DR. HENDRIK VERWOERD, PRIME MINISTER OF THE UNION OF SOUTH AFRICA

Mr. FARBSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. FARBSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, I feel it is incumbent upon me to rise in this Chamber today to protest as strongly as possible against the speech made last Friday, June 25, by Dr. Hendrik Verwoerd, Prime Minister of the Union of South Africa.

Speaking before a domestic political conference, the Prime Minister disclosed that he had informed the U.S. Government that American Negro scientists and engineers would not be admitted to South Africa for the purpose of working in a satellite tracking station operated under the auspices of our National Aeronautics and Space Administration.

Mr. Speaker, I suggest that the Union of South Africa has shown a disregard of the elementary rules of international courtesy by thus attempting to enforce its distasteful policy of strict racial segregation upon American citizens, and upon installations operated for the United States. I further suggest that the Union of South Africa has, in effect, interfered in American domestic policy by its official statement over the weekend, for the United States does not permit racial discrimination against its citizens at home, and it cannot permit such discrimination against its citizens in American-supported installations abroad.

The National Aeronautics and Space Administration makes use of three deep space and scientific satellite tracking stations in the Union of South Africa. They are operated for NASA by the South African Council of Scientific and Industrial Research. These tracking stations, at Johannesburg, Esselin Park, and Ollifantsfontein, were established by an agreement of September 13, 1960, and have to do with the Mariner and Surveyor satellite programs.

To the best of my knowledge, there are about 13 American citizens employed in these three stations, none of whom are Negro. All are employed by private American companies under contract to NASA.

The whole world is well-acquainted with the policies of racial subjugation and segregation in the Union of South Africa. Peoples in nations brought up in the tradition of Western liberalism deplore this unfortunate throwback to a less-enlightened age. However, in the interest of friendly relations with the South African Government, the United States has respected South Africa's right to handle her internal affairs as she sees fit.

But in the past few months, Mr. Chairman, the Union of South Africa has made it painfully clear that it intends to enforce its doctrine of race superiority beyond its normal sphere of sovereignty.

As recently as May of this year, the aircraft carrier U.S.S. *Independence* was forced to cancel a stopover at Cape Town, South Africa, because the South African Government made it known that American Negro airplane crewmen would not be welcome there. We wisely refused to be a party to apartheid, refused to subject American servicemen to embarrassment and humiliation.

Additionally, Mr. Chairman, Dr. Verwoerd has publicly complained that July Fourth receptions at the U.S. Embassy in South Africa have been integrated since 1963. I, for one, deplore his criticism of official American policy being carried out on the grounds of an American diplomatic mission. It smacks of arrogance and high-pressure tactics. Can you imagine the dismay of our friends around the world upon learning that the United States had enforced racial segregation at its Independence Day celebration?

I am informed that the reason for Dr. Verwoerd's declaration last Friday was that he wished to admonish the United States for trying to set an example in an attempt to change South African racial policy.

Indeed, we would like to see South Africa moderate fanatic abhorrence of integration. Indeed, our friendship for South Africa makes us concerned, lest that nation be the subject of scorn for the entire world. But we will not meddle in South African internal affairs. That is not our place.

What we will do, however, what we must do, is insist that American citizens and American installations be left untainted by the policy of apartheid. This we must do if we are not to be condemned by all the enlightened nations of the world.

I have written to the Secretary of State asking that he make immediate representations to the South African Government, requesting assurances that American scientists, engineers, and other personnel, of whatever race, will be admitted to the Union of South Africa and will be treated with the courtesy and respect due them as representatives of the United States of America.

I have done this because I personally believe that the United States must live up to the democratic heritage which makes it a great nation, and that in order to live up to that heritage, it cannot allow itself to be coerced into following the South African policy with regard to racial segregation.

THE HEAD START PROGRAM IN NEW YORK

Mr. HOWARD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. FEIGHAN (at the request of Mr. FOLEY), for 10 minutes, on Thursday, July 1, 1965; and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. FINDLEY (at the request of Mr. TALCOTT), for 30 minutes, today; and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. ASHBROOK (at the request of Mr. TALCOTT), for 30 minutes, today; and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. RYAN, for 15 minutes, today; and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. TALCOTT) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. HANSEN of Idaho.

Mr. HALL.

Mr. TALCOTT.

Mr. GOODELL.

Mr. CAHILL.

(The following Member (at the request of Mr. FOLEY) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. MULTER.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 3415. An act to equalize certain penalties in the Intercoastal Shipping Act, 1933;

H.R. 4493. An act to continue until the close of June 30, 1967, the existing suspension of duties for metal scrap;

H.R. 4525. An act to amend the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, to provide for the continuation of authority to develop American-flag carriers and promote the foreign commerce of the United States through the use of mobile trade fairs;

H.R. 5283. An act to provide for the inclusion of years of service as judge of the District Court for the Territory of Alaska in the computation of years of Federal judicial service for judges of the U.S. District Court for the District of Alaska;

H.R. 7105. An act to provide for continuation of authority for regulation of exports, and for other purposes;

H.R. 8131. An act to extend the Juvenile Delinquency and Youth Offenses Control Act of 1961; and

H.R. 8147. An act to amend the Tariff Schedules of the United States with respect to the exemption from duty for returning residents, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. FOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 6 o'clock and 47 minutes p.m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, July 1, 1965, 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:

1292. A letter from the Acting Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report of ineffective and inefficient administration of the training of foreign personnel under the military assistance program in a foreign country, Department of Defense; to the Committee on Government Operations.

1293. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Export-Import Bank of Washington, transmitting a report of the issuance of a guarantee in connection with a contract of sale covering the export of three bevel gear manufacturing machines to Yugoslavia, pursuant to title III of the Foreign Assistance and Related Agencies Appropriation Act of 1965; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1294. A letter from the Acting Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report of erroneous dislocation allowance payments to military personnel who moved their house trailers at Government expense, Department of Defense; to the Committee on Government Operations.

1295. A letter from the General Counsel, Pacific Tropical Botanical Garden, transmitting Pacific Tropical Botanical Garden financial statements for the period August 19, 1964, to December 31, 1964, pursuant to section 10(b) of Public Law 88-449; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. CELLER: Committee of conference. Conference report on S.J. Res. 1. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to succession to the Presidency and Vice-Presidency and to cases where the President is unable to discharge the powers and duties of his office; without amendment (Rept. No. 564). And ordered to be printed.

Mr. CELLER: Committee on the Judiciary. Report on State taxation of interstate commerce; without amendment (Rept. No. 565). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. UDALL: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H.R. 3320. A bill to authorize the establishment of the Hubbell Trading Post National Historic Site, in the State of Arizona, and for other purposes; with amendments (Rept. No. 566). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. HOLIFIELD: Joint Committee on Atomic Energy. H.R. 8856. A bill to amend section 271 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended; without amendment (Rept. No. 567). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. NATCHER: Committee of conference. Conference report on H.R. 6453. 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, 1966, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 568). And ordered to be printed.

Mr. KING of Utah: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H.R. 6280. A bill authorizing the establishment of the Golden Spike National Monument in the State of Utah; with an amendment (Rept. No. 569). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. MILLS: Committee of conference. H.R. 8147. An act to amend the tariff schedules of the United States with respect to the exemption from duty for returning residents, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 570). And ordered to be printed.

Mr. COOLEY: Committee on Agriculture. H.R. 9497. A bill to extend the time for conducting the referendum with respect to the national marketing quota for wheat for the marketing year beginning July 1, 1966; without amendment (Rept. No. 571). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ANDERSON of Tennessee:

H.R. 9563. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to promote the safety of employees and travelers upon railroads by limiting the hours of service of employees thereon," approved March 4, 1907; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 9564. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide that a survivor beneficiary shall not lose his or her entitlement to benefits by reason of a marriage or remarriage which occurs after he or she attains the age of 62; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ASHLEY (by request):

H.R. 9565. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to increase minimum benefits to \$100 and maximum benefits to \$200, with additional future increases based on rises in the cost of living; to provide full retirement benefits at age 60 for men and 55 for women; to eliminate the age requirements for wife's and widow's benefits; and to provide child's benefits beyond age 18 in the case of a child attending school; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GARMATZ:

H.R. 9566. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to promote the safety of employees and travelers upon railroads by limiting the hours of service of employees thereon," approved March 4, 1907; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mrs. GREEN of Oregon:

H.R. 9567. A bill to strengthen the educational resources of our colleges and universities and to provide financial assistance for students in postsecondary and higher education; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. HELSTOSKI:

H.R. 9568. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to improve the educational quality of schools of medicine, dentistry, optometry, and osteopathy, to authorize grants under that act to such schools for the awarding of scholarships to needy students, and to extend expiring provisions of that act for student loans and for aid in construction of teaching facilities for students in such schools and schools for other health professions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 9569. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to authorize and facilitate the deduction from gross income by teachers of the expenses of education (including certain travel) undertaken by them, and to provide a uniform method of proving entitlement to such deduction; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. JENNINGS:

H.R. 9570. A bill to amend the Federal Firearms Act to authorize the Secretary of the Treasury to relieve applicants from certain provisions of the act if he determines

the Senator from Indiana on another aspect of the proposed constitutional amendment. I think this would help in clarifying another important issue.

I go back to the colloquy which took place on the floor of the Senate when the matter was considered a month or so ago. Is it not true that the inability to which we are referring in the proposed amendment is total inability to exercise the powers and duties of the office?

Mr. BAYH. The inability that we deal with here is described several times in the amendment itself as the inability of the President to perform the powers and duties of his office.

It is conceivable that a President might be able to walk, for example, and thus, by the definition of some people, might be physically able, but at the same time he might not possess the mental capacity to make a decision and perform the powers and duties of his office. We are talking about inability to perform the constitutional duties of the office of President.

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. And that has to be total disability to perform the powers and duties of office.

Mr. BAYH. The Senator is correct. We are not getting into a position, through the pending measure, in which, when a President makes an unpopular decision, he would immediately be rendered unable to perform the duties of his office.

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. Is it limited to mental inability to make or communicate his decision regarding his capacity and mental inability to perform the powers and duties prescribed by law?

Mr. BAYH. I do not believe that we should limit it to mental disability. It is conceivable that the President might fall into the hands of the enemy, for example.

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. It involves physical or mental inability to make or communicate his decision regarding his capacity and physical or mental inability to exercise the powers and duties of his office.

Mr. BAYH. The Senator is correct. That is very important. I would refer the Senator back to the definition which I read into the RECORD at the time the Senate passed this measure earlier this year.

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. It was that definition which I was seeking to reemphasize. May I ask one other question? Is it not true that the inability referred to must be expected to be of long duration, or at least one whose duration is uncertain and might persist?

Mr. BAYH. Here again I think one of the advantages of this particular amendment is the leeway it gives us. We are not talking about the kind of inability in which the President went to the dentist and was under anesthesia. It is not that type of inability we are talking about, but the Cabinet, as well as the Vice President and Congress, are going to have to judge the severity of the disability and the problems that face our country.

Perhaps the Senator from New York would like to rephrase the question.

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. Is it not true that what we are talking about here,

as far as inability is concerned, is not a brief or temporary inability?

Mr. BAYH. We are talking about one that would seriously impair the President's ability to perform the powers and duties of his office.

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. Could a President have such inability for a short period of time?

Mr. BAYH. A President who was unconscious for 30 minutes when missiles were flying toward this country might only be disabled temporarily, but it would be of severe consequence when viewed in the light of the problems facing the country.

So at that time, even for that short duration, someone would have to make a decision. But a disability which has persisted for only a short time would ordinarily be excluded. If a President were unable to make an Executive decision which might have severe consequences for the country, I think we would be better off under the conditions of the amendment.

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. The Senator realizes the complications for the people of this country and the world under those circumstances.

Mr. BAYH. I do, indeed. I also recognize our difficulty if we had no amendment at all. The Senator from New York realizes the consequences in that case. The Senator is aware of the time limitations which give the President a certain amount of leeway now. If he recovers from the illness within the time limitations, he would have protection under the amendment.

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. As I said at the beginning, I believe there should be a continuing study of the problem. Based on my own personal experience and on what was brought out in the hearings, I believe that members of the Cabinet could be subjected to political strains of one kind or another under certain circumstances of danger which might arise for the United States. They might be impelled to challenge the President's ability and capacity for the wrong reasons. And when we think of the great crisis in 1919 with President Wilson and Mr. Lansing, it is apparent that under the procedure set out in section 4 of Senate Joint Resolution 1 there could actually be a question as to who was acting as President of the United States at a particular time. That is why this subject should receive continuing study by this body to determine whether an alternative to the Cabinet's acting could be evolved.

What if the President of the United States made a decision which was very unpopular with members of his Cabinet?

I think back to the time of Abraham Lincoln in 1863. I think back to the time of President Andrew Johnson, and recall how unpopular he was with all the members of his Cabinet. They could have taken action, under the slightest pretext, to have him removed. Even with all the protections provided, I say the situation is dangerous. We would be deluding ourselves in thinking that by adopting the amendment the danger to our people and the people around the world would disappear, because a danger

would still exist. The subject deserves our continuing effort and attention.

Mr. BAYH. I agree. There is leeway with respect to Congress and the committees and the Cabinet.

In discussing dangers to the people, think of the danger after President Garfield had been felled by a bullet and we had no President for 80 days. The danger of such a situation in this day and age is considerably more than the danger that could arise if the provisions of this amendment were invoked.

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. That is why I intend to support this amendment.

Mr. BAYH. I appreciate the Senator's comments.

CONTINUATION OF AUTHORITY FOR REGULATION OF EXPORTS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield without losing the floor?

Mr. BAYH. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I ask unanimous consent, for the purpose of providing regular procedure, that the consideration of Calendar No. 352, H.R. 7105, follow consideration of the present conference report.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H.R. 7105) to provide for continuation of authority for regulation of exports, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request? Without objection, it is so ordered.

PRESIDENTIAL INABILITY AND VACANCIES IN THE OFFICE OF THE VICE PRESIDENT

The Senate resumed the consideration of the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the joint resolution (S.J. Res. 1) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to succession to the Presidency and Vice-Presidency and to cases where the President is unable to discharge the powers and duties of his office.

Mr. BAYH and Mr. McCARTHY addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. McCARTHY. If it were not for the fact that the amendment provides that the Congress of the United States has a right to designate some body other than the Cabinet to pass upon the question of Presidential disability, I could not support the amendment. The Senator from New York has pointed out the necessity, and I hope that the appropriate committees of the Congress and the Congress will give consideration to some other body's passing upon the question of Presidential disability. If that provision were not in the amendment, I could not support the proposed amendment, and I would urge its rejection.

History shows that it is better to have one sane king rather than two who are not, each one of them claiming to be the

raised by the Senator from New York and the Senator from Minnesota and began to read and study the conference report, I detected language that seemed to me to be uncertain, if not ambiguous.

Mr. BAYH. Of course, the Senate of the United States is the world's greatest deliberative body. If my colleagues feel it should be debated more, I believe we should do so. I have tried, and will continue, to listen to every argument. However, I have studied this measure enough to know—and I say this from the bottom of my heart—that if we ever expect to have a constitutional amendment on this important question, the most complicated and intricate issue that we have ever tried to put into the Constitution, because of all the medical ramifications and power struggles that might exist—if we ever intend to get a measure with respect to which there will not be a scintilla of controversy, with very specific wording, we might as well terminate the debate and throw this year and a half's work in the ashcan, because we are not going to do it.

I have never pretended to the Senate or to my colleagues that this measure is noncontroversial or that it would cover every possible, conceivable contingency that the mind of man could contrive. I have suggested that it is the best thing we have been able to come up with, and it is so much better than anything we have ever had before—namely, nothing—that I dislike to see us, by delay, jeopardize the great protection we would get by this constitutional amendment.

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

Mr. BAYH. I am glad to yield.

Mr. GORE. I would not expect an amendment to be drafted to meet the imagination of all. The point I raise here is that the able Senator brings to us the intent of the amendment which, in my view, is not supported by the language of the amendment.

If this is the intention of the House and Senate and the conferees representing those two bodies, surely the language can be explicit.

I have previously referred to the language as being ambiguous. I may have used the wrong term. It seems to me it is rather plainly stated that either the Cabinet or the body to be created by Congress could perform this official function.

There may be some way that the courts could find that exclusivity ran to the body created by law, but if that is the intent, why leave the decision to a court under some possibly tragic circumstance that might arise? Surely, a few days of delay and a few days of further consideration should not be interpreted as being antagonistic to an amendment. On the contrary, it is suggested as a means of permitting more careful consideration.

Mr. BAYH. I appreciate the Senator's contribution.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MURPHY in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the pending business, the conference report on presidential succession, be laid aside temporarily, pending conferences, and that the Senate resume the consideration of the Export Control Act.

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

CONTINUATION OF AUTHORITY FOR REGULATION OF EXPORTS

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill H.R. 7105 to provide for continuation of authority for regulation of exports, and for other purposes.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be a time limitation of 25 minutes on the debate on the pending business, with 15 minutes allowed to the Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS] and 10 minutes to the Senator from Maine [Mr. MUSKIE] who is in charge of the bill on the Senate floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, before we settle on that question, may we have a quorum call? I should like to have the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. WILLIAMS] present. It may take a few minutes.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator permit the Chair to announce the agreement at the end of the quorum call?

Mr. JAVITS. Yes. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I ask for order in the Chamber. We are about to discuss something totally different from the presidential succession conference report.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. KENNEDY of New York in the chair). The Senate will be in order.

Is there objection to the unanimous-consent request that there be a time limitation of 25 minutes on the pending bill, that 15 minutes be allotted to the Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS] and 10 minutes to the Senator from Maine [Mr. MUSKIE]? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. MUSKIE. Mr. President, I yield myself 1 minute.

Mr. President, the Export Control Act of 1949 will expire at midnight tonight. The Banking and Currency Committee, after two sets of hearings in the general field, has reported the House bill on the subject, H.R. 7105. We urge the Senate to act at once on this bill so that

it can be sent to the President for his signature before it expires.

This is essential because the Export Control Act of 1949 is the act under which exports of strategic and critical materials from the United States are kept from going behind the Iron Curtain. In the absence of an extension, American producers and shippers will be free to send commercial and industrial materials and equipment to Communist China, the U.S.S.R., and the rest of the Soviet bloc.

The Banking and Currency Committee has accepted the House bill, without change.

The bill would accomplish three purposes. First, it would extend the Export Control Act for 4 more years—to June 30, 1969. Second, it would authorize the administrative imposition of civil monetary penalties not exceeding \$1,000 for violations of the act. Third, it will make a formal declaration that—

it is the policy of the United States (A) to oppose restrictive trade practices or boycotts fostered or imposed by foreign countries against other countries friendly to the United States and (B) to encourage and request domestic concerns engaged in the export of articles, materials, supplies, or information, to refuse to take any action, including the furnishing of information or the signing of agreements which have the effect of furthering or supporting the restrictive trade practices or boycotts fostered or imposed by any foreign country against another country friendly to the United States.

It will also require the issuance of regulations to implement this policy within 90 days after the enactment of the bill. The bill leaves in the President the necessary discretion as to the type and terms and scope of these regulations. This administrative flexibility is appropriate in view of the President's constitutional role in the field of foreign policy.

The committee's report contains a full description of the Export Control Act and its administration and enforcement. It also contains a full description of the several amendments made by the bill, which need not be repeated here.

The committee in considering the bill devoted considerable time to three proposals.

The first was a proposal by Senator WILLIAMS of New Jersey, to amend the provisions of the bill relating to boycotts, along the lines of the Senator's bill S. 948, on which hearings had been previously held. The committee agreed that the general purpose of S. 948 should be included in the bill. However, a majority of the committee felt that the provisions included in the House bill constituted an appropriate statement of policy and supplied adequate legal basis for enforcement of the policy, while at the same time providing the necessary flexibility to meet the changing needs and circumstances of our foreign policies.

Another amendment, strongly supported by Senator HARTKE, of Indiana, and other Senators, and strongly opposed by others, would have required the imposition of quotas on exports of materials under certain circumstances—when

exports had increased to five times the 1955 volume, and other countries imposed similar restrictions on similar products. This amendment was sponsored with a particular view to exports of black walnut logs.

This matter was discussed by the Secretary of Commerce, who testified that he had received a letter from the Senate Committee on Commerce requesting that he restudy his decision to remove export quotas on black walnut logs. He assured the committee that he would comply with this request.

Senator McGOVERN testified in opposition to the current requirements that 50 percent of wheat sales from the United States be exported in domestic bottoms. The Secretary of Commerce testified that he is making a thorough review of the problems of American shipping, including particularly requirements for shipment in American bottoms. The committee report calls upon the Secretary to consider the problem raised by Senator McGOVERN's amendment from the point of view of its effects on American agriculture and American shipping and from its relation to the policies and objectives of the Export Control Act.

I should like to urge again that the Senate act promptly on this bill so that it can be sent to the President for his signature before the expiration of the Export Control Act on June 30, 1965.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I yield myself 5 minutes.

On behalf of myself and the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. WILLIAMS], I send to the desk two amendments. After they are stated, I shall ask unanimous consent to have them considered en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendments will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 5, line 6, before the period at the end of the sentence, insert the following: "and shall require that all domestic concerns receiving requests for the furnishing of information or the signing of agreements as specified in section 2(4) must report this fact to the Secretary of Commerce for such action as he may deem appropriate to carry out the purposes of section 2(4)."

On page 4, line 10, after "agreements" insert a comma, and strike out "have" and insert in lieu thereof "has".

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President—

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

Mr. JAVITS. I yield.

Mr. PASTORE. May my name be added to the amendments as a cosponsor?

Mr. JAVITS. We shall be honored to do so. I ask unanimous consent that the name of the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE] may be added as a cosponsor, and also the name of the Senator from New York [Mr. KENNEDY].

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. JAVITS. I wish to state also that the only reason why the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. WILLIAMS] is not the principle sponsor of these amendments is that he most graciously asked me to do it.

We are equal partners, and I hope that in every respect it will be considered in that way.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the amendments may be considered en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, we have labored long and hard over a question arising under the Export Control Act. The question is, Shall anything be done in the act to deal with the practices to which U.S. firms and individuals—I emphasize that these practices relate to U.S. firms and individuals—have been subjected in being made party to the Arab boycott? The boycott operates against those who wish to sell in an Arab state any product which originates in Israel or has even a component of that character, against those who happen to be doing any business in Israel, against even those whose concern with Israel is on a rather casual or intermittent basis, and also against firms which may have Jewish persons as officers or directors.

Questions are submitted by the so-called Arab Boycott Office to firms which seek to do business in Arab countries, and various types of certificates are required, many of them of a negative character, applying to goods exported to Arab countries, which would make these firms liable to be subjected to the boycott.

There are quasi-public agencies engaged in this practice from which the Arab boycott office requires certification, either by negative representations or affirmative representations, in order to avoid the placing of certain firms on the boycott list.

Some 164 firms are on the boycott list. This boycott has been a constant bone in the throat of Congress, and on a number of occasions efforts have been made, by policy declarations, by denunciations on the floor, and by stimulating the State Department to put some iron in its back, so that the United States not be made party to the practice of permitting a boycott.

The boycott, of course, is not airtight. Many companies have properly and successfully defied the boycott and have done business in Israel without being put on the boycott list or without having it enforced against them.

There is eloquent correspondence on this subject, as for example, between the Hilton Hotel Corp. and those who threatened it with boycott because the corporation had a hotel in Cairo and was proposing to put up a hotel in Tel Aviv. Mr. Hilton turned down any idea of abandoning his plans to build in Israel, despite the warning that this meant placing the Cairo hotel in jeopardy. Today, Hilton has its hotel in Israel and its hotel in Egypt, no enforcement action having been taken against it.

I ask unanimous consent that an article from a special May 1965 issue of the Near East Report, containing excerpts from this exchange of correspondence, be placed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

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

A FIRM PUBLIC STAND
MR. HILTON GETS A LETTER

(NOTE.—Some businessmen have taken firm public stands against the boycott and have left it to the Arabs to justify their own defeat. In this connection, the story of Conrad Hilton and the boycott bears reviewing.)

Hilton Hotels International owns a hotel in Egypt. In 1961, the company contemplated building a hotel in Tel Aviv. Onto the scene came Alfred Lillenthal, Secretary and Counsel of the American-Arab Association for Commerce and Industry in New York.

Just when Hilton was concluding his Tel Aviv venture, Lillenthal happened to be in Cairo and Damascus, where he heard ominous noises from Arab officials regarding Hilton. He says he believed he was doing no more than his duty by the American-Arab Association when he wrote Hilton as follows:

"Perhaps you are not aware of the full details regarding the activities of the Boycott Committee and hence, as a member company of this Association, it is our duty to bring the facts as they were told to me to your attention.

"Should Hilton Hotels persist in going ahead with its contract in Israel, it will mean the loss of your holdings in Cairo and the end of any plans you might have for Tunis, Baghdad, Jerusalem or anywhere else in all Arab countries.

"It is important for me to put you on notice that the Arab visitors, including the Saudi Royal Family, Egyptian businessmen and the general flow of persons from the Arab world that have frequented your major hotels in New York City and elsewhere throughout the country, will unfortunately come to an end. And it may well adversely affect the ability of American companies from continuing to bring important business to your well-known establishments.

"I did what could be done to delay any action that the Boycott Committee will take. They have promised that no action to invoke the boycott will be taken prior to the end of January 1962, and I am writing to Colonel Aidi to remind him of this. This will give you and the members of your board of directors an opportunity to review the decisions which have been made and to redress this serious situation.

"As a friend to the Hilton Hotels and a long time political observer as well as the counsel to this association, I should personally add my own voice by asking you to consider whether your plan to enter into an economic relationship in Israel could possibly be worth the grave loss that you will be committing yourself to throughout the Arab world and in the United States. * * *

AND WRITES A REPLY

Mr. Hilton's reply speaks eloquently for itself. He did not take offense, as many Americans did, at Lillenthal's letter. But he took offense at the boycott:

"Many thanks for your letter. It is thoughtful of you to have postponed the action of the Boycott Committee relative to Hilton Hotels Corp.

"What that committee proposes is absolutely counter to the principles we live by and which we hold most dear. I speak of the principles of Americanism as set out by our Founding Fathers and of the principles for which America has stood since its founding. I also speak of the principles under which the Hilton Hotels Corp. goes about the world, establishing hotels so that people of all nations can gather in peace. We believe that through world travel we may

be helping in the goal that all Americans seek—world peace.

"As Americans, we consider Arabs and Jews our friends and hope that ultimately we can all live in peace with one another. There was no threat from Israel when we opened our hotel in Cairo. Our corporation finds it shocking that the committee should invoke the threat of boycott condemnation in the case of our contract with the people of Israel. Does the committee also propose to boycott the U.S. Government because it maintains diplomatic relations with Israel?"

The Tel Aviv Hilton is nearing completion—schedule to open in August. The Nile Hilton remained in Mr. Hilton's hands and stayed wide open for business—in fact, the Arabs held a summit meeting there.

How did the Arabs explain this surrender to the American hotelier? Since he had prized his dignity above theirs, since the exchange of letters received wide publicity, there had to be some explanation by the Arabs to themselves justifying capitulation.

The explanation was this: the profits which Hilton is taking out of Israel create a drain on the Israel economy; therefore the Arabs welcome hotel investment in Israel because it depletes Israel's hard currency reserves. (The same explanation applied to the Sheraton Corp. which defied the boycott successfully.)

This fantastic explanation applied to finished consumer goods as well. Thus, they convince themselves that Israel's prosperity, which has encouraged foreign investment, is really a sign of economic disintegration.

FOOTNOTE

The American-Arab Association for Commerce and Industry has about 100 company members, many of whom do business in both Israel and the Arab States. Alfred M. Lillenthal, the association's secretary and counsel, is a lecturer and journalist whose vehemently anti-Israel views are well known.

The association encourages Arab-American business contacts, social and cultural exchange. Mr. Lillenthal maintains that he never imposes his personal views on the association as a whole. "Some members agree with the boycott," he told the Near East Report. "Some do not. To all of them, I say: the boycott is an economic fact of life. You should obey it." Even though Arab boycott threats specifically state that the boycott is part of their war against Israel, Mr. Lillenthal considers that the boycott is economic rather than political activity.

The following article appeared on November 13, 1963, in *Al Gomhuria*, a Cairo daily:

"The ruler of Kuwait asked the American journalist, Alfred Lillenthal, what he thinks is the effect of the Arab boycott against Israel. To this, Lillenthal answered: 'For the boycott to be effective, it must be comprehensive and in effect in every Arab country. But today, parts of Frazier cars are being assembled in Rabat, Morocco. From there they are sold to Sudan and transferred to other countries. While the company is listed in the Arab boycott blacklist for 7 years.'

It seems rather unfair of Mr. Lillenthal to advise American businessmen that the boycott is too strong to resist on the one hand and recommend to the Arabs that they strengthen it on the other.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. JAVITS. I yield myself 2 additional minutes. This boycott activity has run so against the grain of American business morality that we felt duty-bound to do something about it, especially as the State Department has not

found any effective way to resolve the problem.

In an effort to do something about the situation, a bill was introduced by the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. WILLIAMS] and myself, called the Williams-Javits bill, and similar bills were introduced in the other body, which proposed to require that American firms should not in any way aid this boycott by furnishing information or taking other action in compliance with it. The bill which the House sent over to us adopted a statement of principles on the subject, to the effect that the United States would oppose such boycotts and would encourage and request domestic concerns engaged in this export business not to furnish requested information or otherwise become parties to the boycott.

Rules and regulations were required to be issued to implement that statement of policy. The provision for encouraging and requesting noncompliance with the boycott was the product of the work of the other body, particularly Representatives MULTER and HALPERN, of New York.

Representative WIDNALL tried to make the language of the amendment mandatory, rather than hortatory, but failed. We realize the great difficulty of providing an absolute prohibition. Other governments which enforce such prohibitions on their business concerns can do so more easily because their form of government permits them to communicate their views to their businessmen in a fairly informal way. We, on the other hand, because of our governmental practices, would have to incorporate a prohibition in a strict statute. Therefore we have done our utmost, because of the deep and continuing objections of the Departments of State and Commerce, to get something positive done, but without going all the way to a flat prohibition. We think that by these amendments we have arrived at a reasonable solution—a solution which does not do undue violence to the deep-seated feelings of our governmental authorities on this subject, yet which provides us with an effective weapon against the boycott.

What would these amendments do?

First, they would correct a mistake of grammar in the fundamental declaration of policy—the declaration of encouragement and request. More important, they would implement the purpose of the Congress by requiring that domestic concerns report to the Commerce Department situations in which they are called upon to furnish boycott information which the Williams-Javits bill sought to prohibit completely.

We believe this is a proper interim step, at least, which will result in firming up the attack of our authorities upon this very vexatious and commercially immoral policy.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I yield myself 1 additional minute.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New York is recognized for 1 minute.

Mr. JAVITS. I hope that the Senator from Maine will give us some of his time if we need it.

The effect of these amendments is supported by a letter which the majority leader has. I would not be so presumptuous as to read it into the Record, but the Senator from Maine will do so. The letter indicates that if we do what these amendments provide and what was done in the other body, we shall at long last, after all these years of trying and writing provisions of a precatory character into bills, be making a really determined effort to see that American business is not demeaned in the fashion in which it has been demeaned up to now.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I yield myself 1 additional minute.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New York is recognized for 1 minute.

Mr. JAVITS. As a result of our action today, the boycott practices may at long last cease, because American business will not cooperate with them. If the bill becomes law with these amendments, American business will finally be given some protection against the boycott practices to which it has for so long been subjected.

I ask unanimous consent that the names of the Senators from Michigan [Mr. HART and Mr. McNAMARA] be added as cosponsors of the two amendments.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from New Jersey.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, the amendment offered by my distinguished colleague is a good one. It will clearly put the administration on notice that the Congress will no longer tolerate the intrusions of the Arab boycott on the normal course of American trade. The Secretary of Commerce will have the authority to establish regulations to give effective aid and protection to American businessmen from Arab harassment—or from harassment by the boycott office of another nation or group of nations. The requirement that businessmen approached for information by the Arab boycott office must report these demands to the Secretary of Commerce will give teeth to these regulations. The Secretary of Commerce will be kept constantly informed of the actions of the boycott in this country and can act accordingly to carry out a program in behalf of American businessmen.

I am particularly heartened by the strong promises made by the Secretary of Commerce and the Secretary of State that they will conscientiously follow the mandate of the Congress, and that they will develop an adequate series of regulations. This pledge marks a significant change of direction from the administration's attitude at the beginning of this session, when we were blandly assured that legislation was not needed and that the Commerce and State Departments were already dealing effectively with the boycott. These claims were

refuted by every witness before the Banking and Currency Committees in the House and the Senate. The arguments of the administration simply did not convince the members of these committees.

Under the provisions of the bill, as it becomes law, the President will still maintain his control over the control of foreign policy. But he will have discretionary power to act against the Arab boycott. I am confident that he will use this discretionary power. I have the greatest respect for John Connor and Dean Rusk; I respect their public pledge that they will develop a good antiboycott program in accordance with the clear mandate of the Congress.

I appreciate the generous comments of my good friend the distinguished Senator from New York. In our joint efforts, we have worked along, and I think the amendments represent proof that the work has been fruitful.

Mr. MUSKIE. Mr. President, I yield myself 2 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maine is recognized for 2 minutes.

Mr. MUSKIE. It would be pertinent to quote the following from testimony of Under Secretary Ball in hearings on Senate bill 948, which was introduced by the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. WILLIAMS]. He said:

I need hardly tell this committee that the administration is opposed to that boycott. We have repeatedly made our position clear to the Arab Government. We shall continue to express our opposition and to assist American firms affected by the boycott.

The question with which we then struggled was to find an effective means of expressing the intent of Congress and also to implement the policy of the U.S. Government as stated by Secretary Ball. The report of the Senate committee contained the following language with reference to the House amendment which is before us on H.R. 7185:

The new provision requires the President to issue regulations regarding this matter. At the same time it leaves in the President necessary discretion as to the type and terms and scope of these regulations. In view of the President's constitutional role in the field for foreign policy, it is, of course, appropriate to continue in him the administrative flexibility which has marked the Export Control Act of 1949 and its predecessors over the past 25 years.

EXEMPTION FROM DUTY FOR RETURNING RESIDENTS—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I submit a report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 8147) to amend the tariff schedules of the United States with respect to the exemption from duty for returning residents, and for other purposes. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the report.

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

The legislative clerk read the report.

(For conference report, see House proceedings of today.)

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

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

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, H.R. 8147 relates to the exemption from customs duties for our residents who are returning from foreign travel. It carries out an important part of President Johnson's balance-of-payments program.

It will help reduce the \$3.1 billion deficit we suffered last year. It will help narrow the \$1.6 billion tourist gap—the amount our tourists spend abroad in excess of what foreign tourists spend here.

Mr. President, there were four Senate amendments to H.R. 8147 which we had to resolve with the House. I am glad to report that we resolved three of them, the most important ones, in favor of the Senate. On only one amendment, one dealing with U.S. possessions, did the House insist on its own version of the bill.

The first amendment dealt with so-called articles to follow. Under present law, which was unchanged by the House bill, a returning tourist could have articles purchased abroad shipped back to his home on a duty-free basis after he returned. Because of the administrative problems this procedure entailed, and because of the considerable abuse it has been subjected to, the Committee on Finance recommended, and the Senate approved, its deletion from the law. The Senate position was retained in the conference with the House.

The next amendment dealt with the quantity of alcoholic beverages which could be imported by a resident returning from the American possessions of American Samoa, Guam, and the Virgin Islands. The House bill generally reduced the 1-gallon provision in present law to 1 quart but retained it at 1 gallon for beverages purchased in the possessions. The House conferees stressed the fact that these islands are American possessions, that there was little balance-of-payments improvement under the Senate amendment, and that we should help the local economy of these islands. For these reasons, and because the House conferees insisted on their own provision, the Senate conferees had to yield on this amendment.

The last two amendments dealt with the effective date of the legislation. The House conferees agreed to accept both of them. Under these amendments, which were offered on the floor yesterday by Senator DIRKSEN, the present law is continued until October 1, 1965, and the new rules and restrictions provided by H.R. 8147 become operative on that date. This should considerably ease the transition to the new restrictions.

Under the bill as it has been agreed to by the conferees, returning residents will be entitled to bring in duty-free articles purchased abroad to the extent they do not exceed \$100 in retail value—\$200 in retail value if the articles are purchased in American Samoa, Guam, or the Virgin Islands. Included within these dollar limitations, 1 quart of al-

coholic beverages may be brought back by returning residents who are age 21 or over. Those who return through or from the Virgin Islands, American Samoa, or Guam may continue to bring back 1 gallon of such beverages. However, under no circumstances, may articles purchased abroad be shipped back and claimed as part of the tourist exemption. This does not mean that they cannot be mailed. It simply means that the resident must pay duty on the articles he chooses to mail back rather than bring with him.

This bill must be approved by the President today. If we delay, the returning tourist exemption goes up to \$500 tomorrow and then it will come back down when the President does sign this bill. By speedy action now we can prevent a hiatus from developing at our border ports.

I urge that the conference report, which represents \$55 million of balance-of-payments improvements each year, be agreed to and that the bill promptly be referred to the President.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I believe that what the Senator has stated is a very unwise policy. I understand that it must practically be done, and it will be done right now. I will not stand in the way of the action. But I think it is very unwise to do what we are doing, especially in relation to goods accompanying the returning tourist.

That policy will hurt and prejudice returning servicemen. It will be very uncomfortable and disagreeable to tourists. I predict that Senators and Representatives will hear a great deal about it. We shall make people drag goods back on their persons. We shall limit their choice in a way which is arbitrary and completely unnecessary, and I feel that it is my duty to protest against it.

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

The report was agreed to.

CONTINUATION OF AUTHORITY FOR REGULATION OF EXPORTS

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill H.R. 7105 to provide for continuation of authority for regulation of exports, and for other purposes.

Mr. MUSKIE. With reference to the amendment offered by the distinguished Senator from New York, and the Senator from New Jersey, we have the letter from Secretary of Commerce Connor to the distinguished majority leader, to which the Senator referred. I ask unanimous consent that the letter be printed at this point in the Record.

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

THE SECRETARY OF COMMERCE,
Washington, D.C., June 30, 1965.

HON. MIKE MANSFIELD,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MANSFIELD: In extending the Export Control Act, the House approved an amendment which provides that it is the policy of the United States to oppose restrictive trade practices or boycotts by foreign countries against countries friendly to the

refuted by every witness before the Banking and Currency Committees in the House and the Senate. The arguments of the administration simply did not convince the members of these committees.

Under the provisions of the bill, as it becomes law, the President will still maintain his control over the control of foreign policy. But he will have discretionary power to act against the Arab boycott. I am confident that he will use this discretionary power. I have the greatest respect for John Connor and Dean Rusk; I respect their public pledge that they will develop a good antiboycott program in accordance with the clear mandate of the Congress.

I appreciate the generous comments of my good friend the distinguished Senator from New York. In our joint efforts, we have worked along, and I think the amendments represent proof that the work has been fruitful.

Mr. MUSKIE. Mr. President, I yield myself 2 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maine is recognized for 2 minutes.

Mr. MUSKIE. It would be pertinent to quote the following from testimony of Under Secretary Ball in hearings on Senate bill 948, which was introduced by the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. WILLIAMS]. He said:

I need hardly tell this committee that the administration is opposed to that boycott. We have repeatedly made our position clear to the Arab Government. We shall continue to express our opposition and to assist American firms affected by the boycott.

The question with which we then struggled was to find an effective means of expressing the intent of Congress and also to implement the policy of the U.S. Government as stated by Secretary Ball. The report of the Senate committee contained the following language with reference to the House amendment which is before us on H.R. 7185:

The new provision requires the President to issue regulations regarding this matter. At the same time it leaves in the President necessary discretion as to the type and terms and scope of these regulations. In view of the President's constitutional role in the field for foreign policy, it is, of course, appropriate to continue in him the administrative flexibility which has marked the Export Control Act of 1949 and its predecessors over the past 25 years.

EXEMPTION FROM DUTY FOR RETURNING RESIDENTS—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I submit a report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 8147) to amend the tariff schedules of the United States with respect to the exemption from duty for returning residents, and for other purposes. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the report.

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

The legislative clerk read the report.

(For conference report, see House proceedings of today.)

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

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

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, H.R. 8147 relates to the exemption from customs duties for our residents who are returning from foreign travel. It carries out an important part of President Johnson's balance-of-payments program.

It will help reduce the \$3.1 billion deficit we suffered last year. It will help narrow the \$1.6 billion tourist gap—the amount our tourists spend abroad in excess of what foreign tourists spend here.

Mr. President, there were four Senate amendments to H.R. 8147 which we had to resolve with the House. I am glad to report that we resolved three of them, the most important ones, in favor of the Senate. On only one amendment, one dealing with U.S. possessions, did the House insist on its own version of the bill.

The first amendment dealt with so-called articles to follow. Under present law, which was unchanged by the House bill, a returning tourist could have articles purchased abroad shipped back to his home on a duty-free basis after he returned. Because of the administrative problems this procedure entailed, and because of the considerable abuse it has been subjected to, the Committee on Finance recommended, and the Senate approved, its deletion from the law. The Senate position was retained in the conference with the House.

The next amendment dealt with the quantity of alcoholic beverages which could be imported by a resident returning from the American possessions of American Samoa, Guam, and the Virgin Islands. The House bill generally reduced the 1-gallon provision in present law to 1 quart but retained it at 1 gallon for beverages purchased in the possessions. The House conferees stressed the fact that these islands are American possessions, that there was little balance-of-payments improvement under the Senate amendment, and that we should help the local economy of these islands. For these reasons, and because the House conferees insisted on their own provision, the Senate conferees had to yield on this amendment.

The last two amendments dealt with the effective date of the legislation. The House conferees agreed to accept both of them. Under these amendments, which were offered on the floor yesterday by Senator DIRKSEN, the present law is continued until October 1, 1965, and the new rules and restrictions provided by H.R. 8147 become operative on that date. This should considerably ease the transition to the new restrictions.

Under the bill as it has been agreed to by the conferees, returning residents will be entitled to bring in duty-free articles purchased abroad to the extent they do not exceed \$100 in retail value—\$200 in retail value if the articles are purchased in American Samoa, Guam, or the Virgin Islands. Included within these dollar limitations, 1 quart of al-

coholic beverages may be brought back by returning residents who are age 21 or over. Those who return through or from the Virgin Islands, American Samoa, or Guam may continue to bring back 1 gallon of such beverages. However, under no circumstances, may articles purchased abroad be shipped back and claimed as part of the tourist exemption. This does not mean that they cannot be mailed. It simply means that the resident must pay duty on the articles he chooses to mail back rather than bring with him.

This bill must be approved by the President today. If we delay, the returning tourist exemption goes up to \$500 tomorrow and then it will come back down when the President does sign this bill. By speedy action now we can prevent a hiatus from developing at our border ports.

I urge that the conference report, which represents \$55 million of balance-of-payments improvements each year, be agreed to and that the bill promptly be referred to the President.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I believe that what the Senator has stated is a very unwise policy. I understand that it must practically be done, and it will be done right now. I will not stand in the way of the action. But I think it is very unwise to do what we are doing, especially in relation to goods accompanying the returning tourist.

That policy will hurt and prejudice returning servicemen. It will be very uncomfortable and disagreeable to tourists. I predict that Senators and Representatives will hear a great deal about it. We shall make people drag goods back on their persons. We shall limit their choice in a way which is arbitrary and completely unnecessary, and I feel that it is my duty to protest against it.

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

The report was agreed to.

CONTINUATION OF AUTHORITY FOR REGULATION OF EXPORTS

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill H.R. 7105 to provide for continuation of authority for regulation of exports, and for other purposes.

Mr. MUSKIE. With reference to the amendment offered by the distinguished Senator from New York, and the Senator from New Jersey, we have the letter from Secretary of Commerce Connor to the distinguished majority leader, to which the Senator referred. I ask unanimous consent that the letter be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

THE SECRETARY OF COMMERCE,
Washington, D.C., June 30, 1965.

HON. MIKE MANSFIELD,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MANSFIELD: In extending the Export Control Act, the House approved an amendment which provides that it is the policy of the United States to oppose restrictive trade practices or boycotts by foreign countries against countries friendly to the

United States. Further, this amendment declares that it is the policy of the United States to encourage and request domestic concerns to refuse to take any action which has the effect of furthering or supporting such practices or boycotts. To carry out this new policy statement, there is an expressed requirement for the promulgation of rules and regulations.

This proposed amendment to the Export Control Act, contained in H.R. 7105, has been approved by the Senate Committee on Banking and Currency and is now pending before the Senate.

If the Senate approves the bill recommended by the Senate committee, the Department of Commerce will be required to issue rules and regulations within 90 days after the date of enactment.

The Department of Commerce will have the obligation, and will, in fact, request American business firms not to cooperate in restrictive trade practices or boycotts imposed by a foreign country against another foreign country friendly to the United States. I am expressly authorized by the Secretary of State to say that the Department of State would, if H.R. 7105 is enacted into law, take all appropriate steps through diplomatic channels and other means that may be available to the Department in opposing restrictive trade practices or boycotts by foreign countries against a country friendly to the United States.

Further, it is our understanding that an addition that strengthens the bill as passed by the House will be offered on the Senate floor as follows: On page 5, line 6, before the period at the end of the sentence: "and shall require that all domestic concerns receiving requests for the furnishing of such information or the signing of such agreements must report this fact to the Secretary of Commerce for such action as he may deem appropriate to carry out the purposes of section 2(4) hereof."

It is clear that the language of H.R. 7105, with the suggested addition quoted above would require specific action by the executive departments and the executive departments will, of course, follow through on those requirements if this bill is approved by Congress.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN T. CONNOR.

Mr. MUSKIE. Mr. President, I invite the attention of the Senate to the following language in the letter, which I believe is of particular pertinence to the concern of the Senator from New York and the other cosponsors of his amendment:

The Department of Commerce will have the obligation, and will, in fact, request American business firms not to cooperate in restrictive trade practices or boycotts imposed by a foreign country against another foreign country friendly to the United States. I am expressly authorized by the Secretary of State to say that the Department of State would, if H.R. 7105 is enacted into law, take all appropriate steps through diplomatic channels and other means that may be available to the Department in opposing restrictive trade practices or boycotts against a country friendly to the United States.

The letter also expresses approval of the additional language, similar to that offered by the Senator from New York. The differences between the language set forth in the letter and the language of the amendment actually offered by the Senator from New York are technical and do not change the substance of the amendment. So the letter of the

Secretary of Commerce can be construed as approving the amendment of the Senator from New York. As the manager of the bill, I am willing to accept that language on behalf of the Senate committee.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I yield myself an additional minute.

When the Senator amends his remarks, he will say "The Senator from New York and the Senator from New Jersey and the cosponsors."

Senator MUSKIE. I shall indeed be glad to recognize the devoted and effective efforts of the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. WILLIAMS] in support of this amendment.

Mr. JAVITS. I should like to ask the Senator from Maine a question, if I may have his attention, because this is an important point.

I consider this to be a very meaningful plan to be implemented and to have a material effect on stopping the Arab boycott against American firms, because the Secretary of Commerce will be notified by every firm which could be reached by the boycott. That will be required by law. Therefore, the Secretary will be in a position to act.

In view of the fact that this is a really meaningful step forward in trying to end the Arab boycott of American firms, unreasonable and immoral, as I have described it, I ask the Senator from Maine this question:

If the House does not accept the bill—I believe it will, and it certainly should—as we have passed it, and if it becomes necessary to go to conference, will the Senator from Maine assure the Senate that if there is to be any change in any of the amendments or this plan, he will not agree but will bring the bill back to the Senate?

Mr. MUSKIE. If I correctly understand it, the request of the Senator from New York is that the bill as approved by the Senate with the amendment which he has offered should be insisted upon in conference.

Mr. JAVITS. The Senator is exactly correct; and the Senator will bring it back to the Senate if he cannot have the amendment agreed to in conference.

Mr. MUSKIE. I agree to that.

Mr. President, I am prepared to yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. JAVITS. I yield back the rest of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Maine yield back the remainder of this time?

Mr. MUSKIE. I yield back the remainder of his time?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from New York.

The amendment was agreed to.

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

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

The bill was read the third time, and passed.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I move that the Senate reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed.

Mr. MUSKIE. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

SOCIAL SECURITY AMENDMENTS OF 1965

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of H.R. 6675, the so-called medicare bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H.R. 6675) to provide a hospital insurance program for the aged under the Social Security Act with a supplementary health benefits program and an expanded program of medical assistance, to increase benefits under the old-age, survivors, and disability insurance system, to improve the Federal-State public assistance programs, and for other purposes.

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

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

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, the purpose of having the bill laid before the Senate is to have it as the pending business before the Senate starts the Fourth of July recess tomorrow. No votes will be taken on the bill today or tomorrow, and it is not anticipated that action of any kind will be taken. But beginning with the return of the Senate next Tuesday, the bill will be the pending business and the Senate should be prepared to move with expedition.

AUTHORIZATION FOR THE SECRETARY OF THE SENATE TO RECEIVE MESSAGES; FOR COMMITTEES TO FILE REPORTS; AND FOR SIGNING OF DULY ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS DURING THE ADJOURNMENT OF THE SENATE

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that during the adjournment of the Senate, following today's session, until July 1, 1965, the Secretary of the Senate be authorized to receive messages from the President of the United States and the House of Representatives; that committees be authorized to file reports; and that the Vice President, President pro tempore, or Acting President pro tempore be authorized to sign duly enrolled bills and joint resolutions.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 10 A.M. TOMORROW

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it adjourn until 10 o'clock tomorrow morning.

It seemed to the leadership, therefore, that every effort should be made—even at the price of personal criticism—to guard its silence and await an appropriate moment to the end that the group might get off on the right foot, so to speak. I hope that the judgment which was made to postpone, until now, the establishment of this committee was a correct one. But in any event, it is one for which the leadership accepts full responsibility. The Senators who have been recommended to the Chair would bring to this committee the highest degree of integrity and discretion. I have every confidence that they would work together judiciously and without partisanship with respect for the rights of individuals who compose the Senate and its staff as well as with a deep dedication to the rights of the public and to the good name of this institution.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I rise merely to pay tribute to the distinguished Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER], for it was the Senator from Kentucky who offered to the Senate his proposal that a Select Committee on Ethics be established. I well remember the day when that subject was debated. I remember that many Senators opposed the proposal of the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER]. I am glad that the resolution was adopted, and speaking for the minority, I am glad today that the majority leader, representing the views of the leadership in both parties, has made the statement that he has, and has sent recommendations to the President of the Senate.

CONGRATULATIONS TO CANADA ON HER 98TH BIRTHDAY

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, on July 1, 1867, Canada became a nation. Therefore, it seems fitting at this time to extend congratulations to our neighbor on her 98th birthday.

I must say that Canada does not act at all like a 98-year-old lady but seems to be more like an attractive growing girl—and while we are congratulating Canada on her birthday, we should also congratulate ourselves upon having such a good neighbor.

At this time I ask consent to have printed in the RECORD an editorial appearing in this morning's Washington Post, entitled "Happy Birthday, Neighbor."

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

HAPPY BIRTHDAY, NEIGHBOR

On July 1, 1867, the British North America Act united the provinces which now form the Dominion of Canada. Today, on Canada's 98th birthday, is a good occasion for the United States to voice its congratulations and acknowledge its good fortune in its northern neighbor.

Not only are the two nations' birthdays near, so are the two peoples. Canadian English is indistinguishable from American English. The two peoples share the same pioneering gusto, the same delight in wide-open space. The unpolluted mutual frontier—and it is a long one—is a model for neighborly coexistence.

Since the United States is greater in numbers, years, in population, and in developed resources, there long has been a tendency to just assume that nice northern neighbor is up there without thinking much more of it.

The Canadians, like any people proud of their sovereignty, don't like being taken for granted and don't relish being condemned to living in the U.S. shadow.

Economically, when the domestic pressures build up, they have had to assert their bargaining rights with the United States. Politically, they have felt impelled to remind their big neighbor that while they are in basic agreement on international problems, they are not the U.S. yes-man.

When they are gifted with outstanding statesmen, as is the case with the current Prime Minister, Lester Pearson, Canada is able to take soundings in such ticklish areas as Vietnam and help this country in its quest for a someday solution to its southeast Asian troubles.

All in all, it's good to be reminded of that friendly, soft-spoken northern neighbor. Congratulations on your birthday, Canada, and may you have many more.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I am delighted to join with the distinguished senior Senator from Vermont [Mr. ARKEN], the senior Republican in this body and the chairman of the U.S. Senate delegation to the Canadian-United States Interparliamentary Meetings since the beginning. Senator ARKEN has done much to foster continued good relations between Canada and the United States, to bring about a better understanding of that which keeps us together and that which at times brings about differences between us. I am honored to join him in expressing our best wishes and congratulations to Canada on this, its 98th birthday and to wish for Canada many, many, many more happy anniversaries in the years ahead. From one good neighbor to another we say, "Good luck, and God bless you."

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED DURING ADJOURNMENT

The VICE PRESIDENT announced that on Wednesday, June 30, 1965, he had signed the following enrolled bills, which had previously been signed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives:

H.R. 3415. An act to equalize certain penalties in the Intercoastal Shipping Act, 1933;
H.R. 4493. An act to continue until the close of June 30, 1967, the existing suspension of duties for metal scrap;

H.R. 4525. An act to amend the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, to provide for the continuation of authority to develop American-flag carriers and promote the foreign commerce of the United States through the use of mobile trade fairs;

H.R. 5283. An act to provide for the inclusion of years of service as judge of the District Court for the Territory of Alaska in the computation of years of Federal judicial service for judges of the U.S. District Court for the District of Alaska;

H.R. 7105. An act to provide for continuation of authority for regulation of exports, and for other purposes;

H.R. 8131. An act to extend the Juvenile Delinquency and Youth Offenses Control Act of 1961; and

H.R. 8147. An act to amend the Tariff Schedules of the United States with respect to the exemption from duty for returning residents, and for other purposes.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

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

REPORT OF EXPORT-IMPORT BANK OF WASHINGTON ON GUARANTEE IN CONNECTION WITH CERTAIN SALE

A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Export-Import Bank of Washington, Washington, D.C., reporting, pursuant to law, that that Bank had issued a guarantee in connection with a contract of sale in the amount of \$39,501, covering the export of three bevel gear manufacturing machines to Yugoslavia; to the Committee on Appropriations.

REPORT ON DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE PROCUREMENT FROM SMALL AND OTHER FIRMS

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of Defense (Installations and Logistics), transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on Department of Defense procurement from small and other firms, for the period July 1964–April 1964 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

PROPOSED LEGISLATION RELATING TO DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

A letter from the President, Board of Commissioners, District of Columbia, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to prescribe stipends to be paid patients and residents employed in institutions of or under programs sponsored by the Government of the District of Columbia as an aid to their rehabilitation or for training purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

A letter from the President, Board of Commissioners, District of Columbia, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize the District of Columbia to advance funds to the National Park Service and the National Zoological Park (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

AMENDMENT OF SECTION 1011 OF UNITED STATES INFORMATION AND EDUCATIONAL EXCHANGE ACT OF 1948

A letter from the Director, U.S. Information Agency, Washington, D.C., transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend further section 1011 of the United States Information and Educational Exchange Act of 1948, as amended (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

REPORT ON EQUIPMENT TITLED IN NONPROFIT EDUCATIONAL INSTITUTIONS AND OTHER NON-PROFIT ORGANIZATIONS

A letter from the General Manager, U.S. Atomic Energy Commission, Washington, D.C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on equipment titled in nonprofit educational institutions and other nonprofit organizations, for the calendar year 1964 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

RETIREMENT OF COMPTROLLER GENERAL OF THE UNITED STATES

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, announcing his retirement for physical disability, as of July 31, 1965; to the Committee on Government Operations.

REPORTS OF COMPTROLLER GENERAL

A letter from the Acting Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a secret report on ineffective and inefficient administration of the training of foreign personnel under the military

This is a world where two great nations are striving to progress in conquering the unknowns of space, without first working out a climate for peace on earth.

This is a world in which a great premium is placed on intelligence. We need intelligence to live in today's world, intelligence to change it and intelligence to survive.

To many Americans, the immediate problem with respect to meeting the responsibilities of today's world, is how to pay the cost of a college education. College costs are spiraling. In the last 10 years, these costs have risen faster than the increase in average incomes. More and more students are going to college, placing a great burden on the facilities that now exist. In 1962, a report on higher education in Maryland from 1961 to 1975, the so-called Curlett report, predicted that the number of Maryland high school students entering college would rise from the figure of 10,000 yearly in 1961 to a figure of 23,000 yearly by 1975. This is an increase from 33 to 43 percent in the number of high school graduates that will attend college. Thus far, the estimates of the Curlett report have been conservative and even higher numbers of Maryland young people are seeking a college education.

Historically, the trend of higher education in America has been to encourage more and more young people from lower and middle income families to attend college. It has been necessary for many of these families to borrow large sums of money or for these students to work and attend school part time to secure a college education. I think it is in the best interests of Maryland and the Nation to increase the public investment in higher education to help keep costs down and maintain a climate which will enable every student with academic ability to secure a college education. In calling for this increased public support in terms of dollars and cents, I think we must not overlook the fact, especially here in Maryland, that brainpower brings industry. Economists estimate a return in terms of economic growth, of from 9 to 15 percent on the money we invest in education. Also, there is no room at the bottom in our complex technical society today and we must have increased public support for the cost of education, or eventually pay the social and economic costs of an uneducated people.

One proposal which we now have under consideration in the House Education and Labor Committee, is a doubling of the amount of Federal funds to be authorized next year for the construction of undergraduate classrooms and facilities. In the 1963 law we passed to aid the construction of higher education facilities, \$230 million was authorized annually. Under the terms of this bill and Maryland's plan for expansion for higher education; Montgomery Junior College, Salisbury State College, University of Maryland, Coppin State College in Baltimore, the College of Notre Dame in Baltimore, and St. Joseph's College in Emmitsburg, will soon receive about \$3½ million to expand their facili-

ties. The "higher education" subcommittee has suggested a doubling of the Federal funds available for this program next year.

We are also considering the establishment of a limited number of Federal scholarships or opportunity grants as they are being called, to aid needy young people with outstanding academic potential.

We are considering an expanded federally supported work-study program in the colleges and universities permitting additional students to earn and learn and finally, we are considering the greatly expanded program of federally insured loans that would be available to college students at a lower interest rate than they can at present receive.

These are some of the things that are happening on the Federal level to meet the problem of college costs.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. PUCINSKI, for 15 minutes, today.

Mr. RESNICK, for 15 minutes, today.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

Mr. BENNETT.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. HUTCHINSON) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. WIDNALL.

Mr. ASHBROOK.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. PATTEN) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mrs. SULLIVAN.

Mr. DONOHUE.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida.

Mr. POWELL in four instances.

Mr. ROOSEVELT in three instances.

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. 853. An act for the relief of Charles N. Legarde and his wife, Beatrice E. Legarde; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1098. An act to amend section 1(14)(a) of the Interstate Commerce Act to insure the adequacy of the national railroad freight car supply, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

S. 1666. An act to provide for the appointment of additional circuit and district judges, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1742. An act to authorize the U.S. Governor to agree to amendments to the articles of agreements of the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development and the International Finance Corporation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

S. 2212. An act to authorize the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to estab-

lish and administer a plan to provide for the care and protection of children through public day care services, and to provide public assistance in the form of foster home care to certain dependent children; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. BURLERSON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on June 30, 1965, present to the President, for his approval, bills of the House of the following titles:

H.R. 3415. An act to equalize certain penalties in the Intercoastal Shipping Act, 1933;

H.R. 4493. An act to continue until the close of June 30, 1967, the existing suspension of duties for metal scrap;

H.R. 4525. An act to amend the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, to provide for the continuation of authority to develop American-flag carriers and promote the foreign commerce of the United States through the use of mobile trade fairs;

H.R. 5283. An act to provide for the inclusion of years of service as judge of the District Court for the Territory of Alaska in the computation of years of Federal judicial service for judges of the U.S. District Court for the District of Alaska;

H.R. 7105. An act to provide for continuation of authority for regulation of exports, and for other purposes;

H.R. 8131. An act to extend the Juvenile Delinquency and Youth Offenses Control Act of 1961; and

H.R. 8147. An act to amend the Tariff Schedules of the United States with respect to the exemption from duty for returning residents, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. PATTEN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 55 minutes p.m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Friday, July 2, 1965, 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:

1296. A letter from the Secretary of Labor, transmitting a report of a study of the factors which might tend to result in discrimination in employment because of age, pursuant to section 715 of the Civil Rights Act of 1964; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

1297. A letter from the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, transmitting the Commissioner of Education's report on Public Laws 815 and 874, based on a study by the Stanford Research Institute; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

1298. A letter from the Director, U.S. Information Agency, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend further section 1011 of the U.S. Information and Educational Exchange Act of 1948, as amended; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1299. A letter from the Acting Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report of possible additional procurement costs resulting from award of subcontract for radio antenna systems on a sole-source

Thomas B. Mason, of Virginia, to be U.S. attorney for the western district of Virginia for the term of 4 years.

INTERNATIONAL BANK FOR RECONSTRUCTION AND DEVELOPMENT

Livingston T. Merchant, of the District of Columbia, to be U.S. Executive Director of the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development for a term of 2 years.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

THURSDAY, JULY 22, 1965

The House met at 11 o'clock a.m.

Rev. Father Americo Dinorcía, St. Bernadette Church, Silver Spring, Md., offered the following prayer:

Dear God, Our Father, through Jesus Christ, Your Son in the Holy Spirit, we ask you today and at all times to send guidance and aid to these your dedicated and devoted servants who have chosen to contribute their talents and efforts selflessly to the cause of their fellow man and more specifically to the salvation of our beloved Nation, a nation founded on principles which are a manifestation of Your divine will.

To say that we are living in troubled times is to repeat the obvious to You who knows our every need. However, our constant awareness of that truism will keep our prayer to You ever fervent. For we are all too aware that of ourselves we are nothing, but with You all things are possible.

Dear God, let this thought of Your omnipotence fill the souls of our country's servants in this 89th Congress with hope for a brighter tomorrow. Let this thought prevent discouragement, and enable them to face apparent failure with the consoling knowledge that You can draw good from all things.

God grant them the serenity to accept the things they cannot change, the courage to change the things they can, and the wisdom to know the difference. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Geisler, one of his secretaries, who also informed the House that on the following dates the President approved and signed bills and a joint resolution of the House of the following titles:

On June 24, 1965:

H.R. 214. An act to amend section 2104 of title 38, United States Code, to extend the time for filing certain claims for mustering-out payments, and, effective July 1, 1966, to repeal chapter 43 of title 38 of the United States Code;

H.R. 1732. An act to extend the act of September 28, 1961, relating to allotment and assignment of pay, to cover the Government Printing Office, and for other purposes; and

H.R. 8464. An act to provide, for the period beginning on July 1, 1965, and ending on June 30, 1966, a temporary increase in the

public debt limit set forth in section 21 of the Second Liberty Bond Act.

On June 28, 1965:

H.R. 8165. An act to authorize the establishment of the Pecos National Monument in the State of New Mexico, and for other purposes;

H.R. 6767. An act making appropriations for the Department of the Interior and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, and for other purposes;

H.R. 7717. An act to authorize appropriations to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration for research and development, construction of facilities, and administrative operations, and for other purposes; and

H.R. 7762. An act to amend titles 10 and 37, United States Code, with respect to the Reserve Officers' Training Corps.

On June 30, 1965:

H.R. 4493. An act to continue until the close of June 30, 1967, the existing suspension of duties for metal scrap;

H.R. 5988. An act to provide that Commissioners of the Federal Maritime Commission shall hereafter be appointed for a term of 5 years, and for other purposes;

H.R. 6032. An act to amend the act authorizing the Mann Creek Federal reclamation project, Idaho, in order to increase the amount authorized to be appropriated for such project (act of August 16, 1962; 76 Stat. 388);

H.R. 7060. An act making appropriations for the Treasury and Post Office Departments, the Executive Office of the President, and certain independent agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, and for other purposes;

H.R. 7105. An act to provide for continuation of authority for regulation of exports, and for other purposes;

H.R. 8147. An act to amend the tariff schedules of the United States with respect to the exception from duty for returning residents, and for other purposes;

H.J. Res. 541. Joint resolution to extend the Area Redevelopment Act for a period of 2 months; and

H.J. Res. 553. Joint resolution making continuing appropriations for the fiscal year 1966, and for other purposes.

On July 7, 1965:

H.R. 3994. An act to remove the present \$5,000 limitation which prevents the Secretary of the Air Force from settling and paying certain claims arising out of the crash of a U.S. aircraft at Wichita, Kans.;

H.R. 3996. An act to amend provisions of law relating to the settlement of admiralty claims;

H.R. 4525. An act to amend the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, to provide for the continuation of authority to develop American-flag carriers and promote the foreign commerce of the United States through the use of mobile trade fairs;

H.R. 6507. An act to make section 1952 of title 18, United States Code, applicable to travel in aid of arson; and

H.R. 6848. An act to amend section 35 of title 18 of the United States Code relating to the imparting or conveying of false information.

On July 8, 1965:

H.R. 5283. An act to provide for the inclusion of years of service as judge of the District Court for the Territory of Alaska in the computation of years of Federal judicial service for judges of the U.S. District Court for the District of Alaska; and

H.R. 8131. An act to extend the Juvenile Delinquency and Youth Offenses Control Act of 1961.

On July 9, 1965:

H.R. 8415. An act to equalize certain penalties in the Intercoastal Shipping Act, 1933.

On July 14, 1965:

H.R. 8708. An act to provide assistance in the development of new or improved pro-

grams to help older persons through grants to the States for community planning and services and for training, through research, development, or training project grants, and to establish within the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare an operating agency to be designated as the "Administration on Aging."

On July 15, 1965:

H.R. 2. An act to protect the public health and safety by amending the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to establish special controls for depressant and stimulant drugs and counterfeit drugs, and for other purposes.

On July 16, 1965:

H.R. 1236. An act for the relief of Salvador Munoz-Tostado;

H.R. 1306. An act for the relief of Loretta Negrin;

H.R. 3634. An act for the relief of CWO Edward E. Kreiss;

H.R. 5184. An act for the relief of the port of Portland, Oreg.; and

H.R. 6453. 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, 1966, and for other purposes.

On July 21, 1965:

H.R. 5874. An act to amend Public Law 815, 81st Congress, with respect to the construction of school facilities for children in Puerto Rico, Wake Island, Guam, or the Virgin Islands for whom local educational agencies are unable to provide education, to amend section 6(a) of Public Law 874, 81st Congress, relating to conditions of employment of teachers in dependents' schools, and for other purposes.

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. 8720. An act to amend the Organic Act of Guam to provide for the payment of legislative salaries and expenses by the government of Guam; and

H.R. 8721. An act to amend the Revised Organic Act of the Virgin Islands to provide for the payment of legislative salaries and expenses by the government of the Virgin Islands.

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

S. 1735. An act relating to the use by the Secretary of the Interior of land at La Jolla, Calif., donated by the University of California for a marine biological research laboratory, and for other purposes;

S. 1764. An act to authorize the acquisition of certain lands within the boundaries of the Uinta National Forest in the State of Utah, by the Secretary of Agriculture; and

S. 1988. An act to provide for the conveyance of certain real property of the United States to the State of Maryland.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the amendment of the House to a bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 26. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to acquire lands for, and to develop, operate, and maintain, the Golden Spike National Historic Site.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing